

The Deity's Nothingness towards a nihilistic mysticism of Eckhartian inheritance

Héctor Sevilla Godínez¹

Abstract

The main objective of this piece resides in demonstrating some of the essential elements of the Eckhartian Project that are fused to a nihilistic mysticism that observes (without observing) a manifestation of the deity in nothingness; this is to say, a Nothingeity. In fact, said term is introduced in this article, understanding it as a proposal about the manners in which to conceive that which is sacred, based on the contemplation of Nothingness. The attention is centred on some of the sermons elaborated by Eckhart, on two of his treatises and on the Bull, with which his writing was prohibited.

Keywords: Nothingness, Deity, Eckhart, Mysticism, Nihilism.

Whoever does not understand what I say should not be dishearted by that; for as long as a man is not one with his truth, he will not understand my words.²

Introduction

Eckhart of Hochheim³ (1260-1328), German Dominican and Professor of Theology in Paris, better known as Meister Eckhart, is currently considered a “master of life and normative figure of the spiritual man”.⁴ His brilliantness and lucidity are due, largely, to his capacity to overcome the established canons with regard to comprehension, closeness, and contemplation of the divinity. His philosophical-theological proposal that points towards a peak not visualized by other Dominicans and preachers of his time, even today are still partially unknown in Latin-America. This is probably due to the scarce translations of his works to Spanish or, depending on the case, due to the ecclesiastical prohibition of his writing during more than six hundred years. His congruence between his thoughts and actions resulted in admiration and persecution, both in high proportions. His work was widely conciliatory; he looked to combine reason and faith.

¹Doctor in Philosophy and Human Development Sciences; Member of the Mexican Philosophical Association (Asociación Filosófica de México) and Founding Member of the Ibero-American Transpersonal Association (Asociación Transpersonal Iberoamericana). He is part of the National Investigators' System, which belongs to the National Commission of Science and Technology of Mexico. Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, CUValles, University of Guadalajara. Email: hectorsevilla@hotmail.com

²Eckhart, “Los pobres de espíritu”, in: *El fruto de la nada y otros escritos*, p. 113.

³Amador Vega locates Eckhart's birth in the province of Tarnbach. *Cfr.* “Introducción”, in: *El fruto de la nada y otros escritos*, p. 19.

⁴For further detail about this affirmation see: Haas, *Maestro Eckhart: figura normativa para la vida espiritual*. Barcelona: Herder, 2002.

While he accurately pointed out the errors of those who follow God, with scarcely subtle plethoric acts, he also indicated the optimal alternative for what he considered to be a plan of consecrated life. Clearly, “the Eckhartian project was directed towards demonstrating the unity of knowledge more than towards pointing out the differences between the natural light of intellect and the supernatural light of faith”.⁵ Along this path, Eckhart solidly synthesized some of mysticism’s unique perspectives. The well-known expression *gelâzenheit* (abandon) contains an ample staging of the Dominican’s proposal.

The transcendence resulting from the Meister’s works, which had its implications and apostolic work with feminine religious communities, and some of the influences generated on it by the conceptions usually attributed to it, has already been studied. Among the fundamentals that Eckhart took from feminine spirituality⁶ that are found in his sermons, are virginity, spiritual nakedness, or non-willingness. From this optic, the Meister was able to connect with a more sensible, emotive, and mystical manner of comprehending (without comprehending) what the deity can come to signify. He would refuse to promote an instrumental theology centered on dogmas and conventions. Such as can be observed in this text, Eckhart denied any nomination or manner in God; he believed the soul’s supreme emptiness to be the only place susceptible of receiving God’s action.

1. Moral Nihilism as a guideline of mysticism.

Eckhart searched in the empty soul (*ledic*) for a model of mysticism in which the principal form was an informal state. In that sense, the moral and intellectual Nihilism of the Eckhartian expressions promotes an alternate meaning of the nihilistic term in modern and contemporary metaphysics. It is not, in this case, about a denial of things, systems, people, or creeds with the intention of demotivating; rather, it is about the preparation, in such a point of purity, for the reception of something superior.

In his sermon titled *The empty temple*,⁷ Eckhart mentions that “God wants to have the temple empty so that in it there won’t be anything that is not Him”.⁸ The empty space (*leererraum*) that the Meister refers to, must be understood from a paradoxical logic of the symbolic and mystical language in which being empty of oneself assumes having achieved being full of God (*Seiner selbst leer sein heist Gottes voll sein*). Emptiness, as an analogy of the nothingness implied, must be so radical that the latter is implied, in such a way that the proposal is to keep oneself as empty of everything “as empty is nothingness, and is neither here nor there”.⁹ Furthermore, the individual must arrive at the point of “not desiring absolutely anything”.¹⁰ If the alternate path is followed, in other words the path of those criticized by Eckhart for their merchant vision of God; possession by the divinity is not accomplished. The Meister points out: “See, merchants are those who preserve themselves against grave sins and those who would like to be good people who do their good deeds to please God, such as fasting, watching, praying, and the like; all types of good deeds, and they do them so that Our Lord will give them something in exchange or so that God may do something for them that pleases them: they are all merchants”.¹¹

The idea of “temple” in Eckhart is similar to the Paulian one; in other words, it refers to the interior. When that temple is emptied of all impediments, personal attributes, and ignorance, harmony is accomplished. Under those conditions, it is possible for the clarity of the un-created God to shine majestically.¹²

⁵ Vega, “Introducción”, in: *El fruto de la nada y otros escritos*, p. 28.

⁶ One of the main representatives of medieval feminine mysticism is Marguerite Porete, who wrote *Le Mirouer des simples âmes aienties et qui seulement demeurent en vouloir et désir d’amour* (published in Spanish as *El espejo de las almas simples*), a book that is considered highly significant during the Middle Ages regardless of the constant prohibitions to which it was subjected. The author, French beguine whose centre of meditation was the implications of divine love, neither claudicated nor denied her own ideas, for which she was condemned to the stake in 1310. Eckhart’s moral Nihilism has been compared to the process of separation of the spirit as *anima anichilata*, proposed by Porete.

⁷ Probably pronounced on February 11, 1326; is part of a series of Lenten reflections. Cfr. Vega, “Notas”, in: *El fruto de la nada*, p. 239.

⁸Eckhart, “El templo vacío”, in: *El fruto de la nada*, p. 54.

⁹*Ibid.*, p. 55.

¹⁰*Ibidem.*

¹¹*Ibid.*, p. 54.

¹²*Ibid.*, p. 57.

That is why the central question of the sermon titled *The Soul's Virginity*¹³ is the following: "How can the man who has been born and reached an intellectual life, remain empty of any image as when he yet was not?"¹⁴ Though the emptying of the soul can be related to spoliation, the denial of personal attributes or characteristics (*eigenschaften*), or the rejection to what one is, only through such an aphorism can what is truly vitalizing be accomplished. It is a fertile Nihilism that is directed towards the construction of a new identity without the self. The man who mistakenly searches for "what is his" in the difference between others, has not managed to be persuaded that the detachment from all attributes and the annihilation of all differences with others is the necessary precedent in order to find oneself as a new man, as Eckhart proposes. The virgin state, associated to the vacuity of the pure and free soul, is dispatched by Eckhart to the state preceding creation and prior to having been born. The emptying must be accomplished also in regard to the images of God; the detachment from them. This mysticism promotes, naturally, an alternate step to traditional religion, centered on forms, appearances, and guidelines that have been predefined by rational mediation. When Eckhart refers to potency further from intellect and will, he overcomes the merchant mediations of those called messengers of God.

2. The depth of God

Upon achieving an absolute emptiness, man is capable of penetrating the depth of God, for he has become Him. The intimate depth (*in dem innersten grunde*) in which all bounty belonged to the uncreated man, was also where the birth of God occurred. In this way, the pretense is to have human nature return to the place in which it was originally included; this is to say, in the bosom of divine nature. There, in the no-manner, is where God's manner is. Precisely, "he who searches for God according to a manner takes up the manner and forgets God, who hides in the manner. But he who searches for God without a manner, understands Him such as He is in Himself."¹⁵ The depth of God is the bottommost *place* that escapes space-time conditions. Its bottom is *there* where everything becomes nothing; hence, "the depth of God is my depth, and my depth is the depth of God."¹⁶ Coincidentally, "God doesn't ask anything else of you other than for you to come out of your creature-likeway of being and to let God be God in you."¹⁷ The "bottomless bottom" (*grunt âne grunt*), homologous to the Eckhartian dessert (*einöde*), achieved by "knowing without knowing" (*wise âne wise*), makes evident the absurdity of any denomination of God. To remain in nakedness, which allows the contemplation of the bottom without a bottom, is a condition achievable based on the self-longing for oneself which is quite different from the self-consciousness so proudly proclaimed in distinct tendencies and disciplines. To know oneself as distinct from what one believes one is, initiates the path towards self-longing, which is why we have represented our supposed personal essence by attributing characteristics to it that are reliable, static, and apparently immobile.

The evangelical passage that affirms that "nobody goes into heaven that has not come from heaven",¹⁸ is consequent with the Eckhartian lucubration in which we warns, referring to the noble divine will, that "all things have been created from nothing; that is why their true origin is nothingness and to the degree in which such noble will is inclined towards the creatures, it falls with them into their own nothingness".¹⁹ Prior to that return to the ground without a ground of the *Nothingeity*, it is opportune to partially go closer in life; for it, the purity produced through the exercise of emptying is a form of negative ascetic that liberates the individual from the impurities of created nature. The ground (*grunt*) is the place without a place (*locus non locus*) in which nomenclatures, structures, and images of God based on a sign or due to a thing, or tangible or intangible object, vanish. Just so, the search for God does not assume a specific guideline, unless this is God's nothingness and, therefore, the incomprehensible darkness of the deity; or, in other words, the denial of denial, the trifle (*versagen des versagennes, nihtes nihit*).

¹³ The sermon is one of those included in the list of those condemned in the *ProcessusColoniensis*. It is motivated on the evangelical citation Lc 10, 38. *Cfr.* Vega, "Notas", in: *El fruto de la nada*, p. 244.

¹⁴Eckhart, "La virginidad del alma", in: *El fruto de la nada*, p. 61.

¹⁵Eckhart, "Vivir sin porqué", in: *El fruto de la nada*, p. 72.

¹⁶*Ibidem*.

¹⁷*Ibid.*, p. 73.

¹⁸Jn 3, 13.

¹⁹Eckhart, "Vivir sin porqué", in: *El fruto de la nada*, p. 73.

In all of this, it can be observed that Eckhart insists that man must come out of himself in order to find his life. Paradoxically, said exit also constitutes his entrance. Eckhart constantly reminds his listeners that “if someone knows something in God and attributes a name to it, that is not God. God is above names and nature”.²⁰ If God is above everything visible, he is further than time. His being further than time lies in the nothingness of his being; his non-being, which is his *Nothingness*.

3. Unity with God in nothingness

For Eckhart, liberating oneself from personal attributes allows for a true delivery to he who is free by his own self: God. Hence, the complete acceptance of his will causes man to evade judgements over good and evil, the greater and the lesser, leaving him indifferent to the world's criteria. In this point, one lives such a fusion with God that no division exists. In the words of the Dominican: “If I were to receive something from God, I would be below God like a servant and He, upon giving it to me, would be a Lord. But this must not happen to us so in eternal life”.²¹ The adhesion achieved is such, to the point that every one is a One that Eckhart affirms: “the being of God is my life. If, therefore, my life is the being of God, then the being of God has to be my being and the essential being of God my essential being; neither more nor less”.²² The relationship is not delimited solely by contact but, rather, it falls into a penetration: “by knowledge I conceive God in my interior; by love, on the contrary, I penetrate into God”.²³ There exists no need to see God as an Omnipotent giver from whom services or favours are received. On the contrary, He is observed in Unity with Him. And though, “some simple people imagine that they must see God as if He were there and they were here,²⁴ Eckhart affirms that this is not so. His critique to the traditional manners of understanding God can be summarized in the following: “they wish to see God with the same eyes with which they see a cow and they wish to love God as they love a cow, which they love for its milk, cheese, and the benefits they obtain (...) but they do not love uprightly; rather, they love their personal interest”.²⁵

The abandon of the world and things (*gelâzenheit*) that the Meister proposes, leads to the reunion with the origin where things were a unit in themselves. It is evident that abandon, as reciprocal exits and entries, has a double and linking aspect which is so befitting of the mystical paradox. In his sermon, *How you must live*, Eckhart refers to the example of those he calls spiritual glasses. These, distinct from material glasses, are identical to what they contain, for its content had to have taken the form of the container in order to be poured into it. Contrarily, in common material glasses, the container is different from the content, which is why it can contain it. In what applies to Eckhartian mysticism, God cannot receive anything that is not of its same nature and man, as a spiritual glass, must make himself one with God so that He may be able to give Himself. The manner of resembling God is to be like Him in the space preceding creation, as a Nothingness from which everything emerges. In this, it is understood that man's divinity is similar to God's in the increated nature that resides in him still. This is why blooming, emerging and flowing, Eckhartian adaptations to Neoplatonic Emanationism, is only possible when man denies himself and manages to resemble the nothingness from which he emerged, even when creation was not yet so.

All of the above points out that the image of the deity is printed on the soul; on the portion of man that is most spiritual. In that sense, “there is no becoming in God but rather only a now, a becoming without becoming, a being once more, without renewal, and that becoming is its being”.²⁶ Given that movement in the originating nothingness did not imply time, it is therefore understood that “nothing is so contrary to God as time”.²⁷ For Eckhart, all of this cannot be correctly expressed with language; the comprehension of such conjectures can only occur in the interior and, though the will to express occurrences and related experiences may be present, the reduction of the virtue cannot be eluded in the explanation due to the friction that man has had with the other creatures. In other words, to belong to creation provoked in man his inclusion in the sphere of time, from which his imperfection

²⁰Eckhart, “Dios es un verbo que se habla a sí mismo”, in: *El fruto de la nada*, p. 116.

²¹Eckhart, “Dios y yo somos uno”, in: *El fruto de la nada*, p. 81.

²²*Ibid.*, p. 78.

²³*Ibid.*, p. 81.

²⁴*Ibidem.*

²⁵Eckhart, “Cómo tenéis que vivir”, in: *El fruto de la nada*, pp. 93-94.

²⁶Eckhart, “La imagen de la deidad impresa en el alma”, in: *El fruto de la nada*, p. 103.

²⁷*Ibid.*, p. 102.

prevailed over the image of the deity which operated in him, and that he constituted, before his origin.

Upon being impregnated into an earthly experience that becomes personal attributes due to learning, the individual, upon searching to understand himself as distinct and creating his own differentiation procedures, has withdrawn from the intimate connection with his essence of vacuity. Living, the individual cannot do more than roam, timidly approaching the true explanation of his material background. In such conditions, “man must voluntarily accept death and die so that he can be granted a better being”.²⁸ In creation, being part of it, God is hidden to man, who has created images of Him that end up distorting Him for his image is the non-image. So, the process of unveiling God consists in stripping him of all images and there, in the empty space derived from the release of his clothing, will the naked image of God emerge; his being not-being what we have believed.

The comprehension that “God is further from the names and is ineffable”,²⁹ is a necessary preamble for the nakedness of man before his naked God. In such a way, “if man unites himself to God for love, he is stripped of images and formed and transformed in the divine uniformity, in which he is one with God”.³⁰ In order for this to be achieved, it is inevitable for the individual to learn and live authentically poor in spirit.

4. Emptiness and spiritual poverty

The sermon *Poor in spirit* is one of Eckhart’s most important ones. In its pages, the Dominican explains what must occur in order to obtain the poverty that allows partial access to divine wisdom. A poor man, says the Meister, “is he who wants nothing, knows nothing, and has nothing”.³¹ Authentic Eckhartian poverty is not only referred to a distancing from the things and attributes of the world but also, and above all else, to the distancing from images, names, conceptions, considerations, explanations, and comprehensions of what God is. To not want anything or, better phrased: not wanting anything implies, even, not wanting God, what has been understood of Him. Upon not wanting to understand, an estrangement of worldly things and of God himself is accomplished; in other words, that which man knows of God and which, therefore, he had to have been taught by someone else, who in turn learnt it. God’s makeup through words distorts Him, the assumption of his will fades from him, the worship to that which He is considered to be forcibly destroys Him, He becomes triviality. On the contrary, from Eckhartian hermeneutics, it is assumed that comprehension can only exist to the degree that man is transformed, as a spiritual glass, into the object of comprehension. The subject is objectified, like so, into that which now possesses him. The naked God, the non-speaking deity prior to creation, receives with his imaginary arms he who, naked before him, has given himself without measure in the most absolute poverty. Likewise, “while man has the will to fulfill God’s precious will, he does not possess the poverty of which we speak; for he has yet a will that wants to satisfy God and that is not the correct poverty”.³²

Eckhartian poverty is coherently associated with emptiness, for the fuller that man is of representations of God, in the understanding that only representations of him can be made in life, the emptier he is of the deity. Eckhart’s final invitation, closing the mentioned sermon, is didactic and clear: “we pray to God that he empty us of God and that we reach the truth and eternally enjoy it, there where the supreme angels and the flies and the souls are the same, there, where I was and wanted what I had been and had been what I wanted”.³³ It is understandable, then, that Eckhart attributes to man an existence fused to the primal origin, from which he could choose himself in accordance with the essence from which everything has emanated, life and the conditions that in it had to be experienced. His idea of a pre-existence are reiterated in the following affirmation: “If man wants to be poor in will, he must be able to want and desire as little as he wanted and desired when he yet was not”.³⁴ It could be argued that

²⁸Eckhart, “El anillo del ser”, in: *El fruto de la nada*, p. 86.

²⁹Eckhart, “Dios es un verbo que se habla a sí mismo”, in: *El fruto de la nada*, p. 116.

³⁰Eckhart, “La imagen desnuda de Dios”, in: *El fruto de la nada*, p. 99.

³¹Eckhart, “Pobres de espíritu”, in: *El fruto de la nada*, p. 106.

³²*Ibid.*, p. 107.

³³*Ibid.*, p. 108.

³⁴*Ibidem.*

this not-being of which Eckhart speaks implies that man could not want something; however, from the point of view of the exemplary Dominican that we discuss, man was, then, one with the deity, not only part of it.

This is to say, “when man was in God’s eternal being, he did not only live in him; furthermore, what he lived there was himself”.³⁵ In such a way, all the famed proposals of complying with God’s will remain interdict, for “a poor man is he who does not want to fulfill God’s will and lives in such a way that he is empty of his own will and of God’s, such as he was when he was yet not. Of this poverty we say that it is sublime poverty”.³⁶ In the being that emanated from the beginning, in which God is above the being and all differences, Eckhart says: “there I was myself, I loved myself, and I knew myself in the will to create this man that I am”.³⁷ In that tenor, what occurs today has been previously established or, at least, what could occur was previously approved. Nothing can disturb the individual for everything follows a master plan. The manner without a manner, referred to previously, therefore also applies to the individual prior to being, or to being what he is today. Man, in that Eckhartian perspective, is no longer a finite being but an eternal one, for “according to the manner of my not having been born, I have been eternal and I am so now and I will be always”.³⁸ On the contrary, that which entered the dimension of time, that which has been derived to the world and that belongs to the sphere of the being, that must end. Man’s step towards conceiving of himself as mundane, as being the world, occurs during birth and “what I am according to my birth must die and be annihilated, for it is mortal; that is why it must disappear over time”.³⁹ Time, annihilator of the being, is the diaphanous reality of the existent.

He who wants nothing, knows nothing, and has nothing (*nibt enwil und nibt enweiz und nibt enbât*), has a goal to live as an unborn (*ungeborn*); inalienable condition in order to return to the deity, the point from which one cannot ever die. In order to achieve such a state, man doesn’t only recognize that he has fluidly emanated from God but that he crosses creation itself, including his mundane condition, to be (and not only to contemplate) what he truly is. This assumes such a transfiguration that identity no longer matters for one is the non-identity: “Upon crossing, however, where I remain free of my own will and of God’s will and of all his deeds and of God himself, I am then above all creatures and I am neither God nor creature. Rather, I am what I was and what I will keep being now and forever. So I feel an impulse that must throw me over top of all the angels. In such impulse, I feel a richness so large that God cannot suffice for me with everything that God is, regarding God, with all his divine works; for it is in that crossing that I realize that God and I are one”.⁴⁰

This “crossing” that Eckhart refers to consists in the path, trip, process of transfiguration, odyssey, or trajectory that man must walk in order to manage to arrive at the deity in which, having become nothingness and completely empty, he becomes one with her. The crossing or traversing is, in a certain way, an overcoming of all possible representation; and, given that man cannot avoid representing, it is necessary for him to cease being what he is in order to achieve a state of non-representation. In such a manner, can “the nothing that we are and the Nothingness that we are not yet”,⁴¹ be affirmed. Now, it is obligatory to make a distinction between God and Deity from Eckhartian parameters. Firstly, if we locate an atimely moment, far from creation, in a preceding form (or circular form, considering the disavowal of observing time as a line), in which everything that exists today were not as is currently shown, it wouldn’t make sense to speak of God. Neither can it be affirmed that “it wasn’t”, for it could refer, in any case, to a deity in which God was what he was prior to God (*er was, daz er was*), in a function of being outside of creation; he was not a creator and remained prior to everything, even to himself.

Now, when creation occurs, or the emanation of the being, it is difficult to intuit a deity; this is to say, a God in itself from which nothing has emanated, neither creatures nor things, people, nature, or cosmos. What remains is what is conceived as a Substance that has fluidly run in what was derived from it. In that order of ideas, the ultimate intention of everything created, creatures included, could not be God, understanding it to be that which is already contained in the container that the emanation received; for it is not possible to be the finality of oneself nor to go towards the place in which one is already, nor to want to be what one already is. From such a situation, it is derived

³⁵*Ibidem.*

³⁶*Ibid.*, p. 110.

³⁷*Ibid.*, p. 111.

³⁸*Ibid.*, p. 112.

³⁹*Ibidem.*

⁴⁰*Ibidem.*

⁴¹*Vid.* Sevilla, *Contemplan la Nada*, p. 301.

that the ultimate finality of what is created is the return to the deity preceding the divinity present in what has emanated; in other words, that which is (without being) further than the being and further than creatures. The “crossing” Eckhart referred to is the acknowledgment of the deity prior to the cosmic derivation of God; in other words, what I have given the title of *Nothingeity*. Considered so, to what man aspires is an emptying oneself of God (*gotes ledic werden*). Assuming the implications of everything explained, Eckhart invites “man to be empty of himself, such as he was when he was not yet, and to stop acting as he wants to, so that man can keep himself empty”.⁴²

Eckhart undergoes the following distinction in the same line of thought: “The Deity and God are such distant realities as Heaven and Earth (...) “God” only appears when all the creatures announce him (...) All the creatures speak then of God. And why do they not speak of the Deity? Everything that is in the Deity is Unity and nothing can be said of it. God operates, but the Deity does not operate; she has no further doing left to undergo; there is no operation in her; and never has she placed her eyes on any operation. God and the Deity differ as the operation and the Non-operation.”⁴³

Likewise, the Meister criticized the theologians who say that God is a being and an intelligible being that knows all things. He, on the contrary, affirms that: “God is neither a being nor is he intelligible; neither does he know this nor that. That is why God is empty of all things and that is why he is all things”.⁴⁴ If “Nothingness is prior to everything that is”,⁴⁵ and if the Being from which everything that has been created emanates was contained in it prior to time as we know it, then that is Nothingness and it would be worth it to understand that deity, together, as a *Nothingeity*. Considering that the deity of which Eckhart speaks is without a form, without a manner, and without a location, distinct to a personified deity like God, then it can no longer be attributed that “nothingness is the non-deity”⁴⁶ rather, in fact, that it was and that it will be. Once having crossed the dark night of the senses and the spirit, man’s substance will find support in the bottomless foundation of the *Nothingeity*.

5. The ring of the being and its empty center

The image of a ring efficiently contributes to the analogy that Eckhart creates about God. Though a ring has a circumference, the central aspect of it is the empty space which allows the material circumference to be. In God, according to Eckhart, exists a ring configured by the being, but its center is essentially emptiness. This understanding of divinity as a circle without a center allows it to be, in turn, everywhere, for everything that it is surrounds and configures it. The center of God, just so, has no specific place or site, it is not in a natural space; in that optic, it is inaccessible for he who does not transfigure himself into such nature. God, upon being in himself, this is to say, in his emptiness surrounded by being, is outside of time and, so, is not contaminated by what time touches. The factor of timeliness, as a decadent factor of existence, is outside of God.

For man, the particular manner of being outside of time, the only possible one, is death. If “what time touches is mortal”,⁴⁷ only upon dying would he exit the condition of mortality. The paradox is present in that itself: death saves us from mortality upon allowing mortality to achieve its consummation. Eckhart bases himself on this fundament when he affirms that “we must behave as if we were dead, in such a manner that neither love nor suffering may move us”;⁴⁸ only in such conditions can one partially share the empty center of divinity, in spite of a periphery of the being still surrounding man. Nevertheless, the death that Eckhart proposes is a giver of life, since “for God nothing dies; all things live in him”.⁴⁹ The giver-of-life death cannot be any death; rather, it is imperative that it be profound (*grunttôt*), for only so can it be possible to allow man (that which may yet remain of him) to penetrate divinity’s abyss without a bottom (*abgrund*).

⁴²Eckhart, “Pobres de espíritu”, in: *El fruto de la nada*, p. 109.

⁴³Eckhart, *Obras escogidas*, p. 189.

⁴⁴*Ibidem*.

⁴⁵Sevilla, *Op. cit.*, p. 154.

⁴⁶*Ibid.*, p. 153.

⁴⁷Eckhart, “El anillo del ser”, in: *El fruto de la nada*, p. 87.

⁴⁸*Ibid.*, p. 83.

⁴⁹*Ibid.*, p. 86.

According to Vega, in the sermon *The ring of the being*, Eckhart follows the quadruple sense of medieval exegesis: a) Literal, life has a purpose in this world; b) allegoric, the earthly tasks are not to provide any fruit for us since there is a purpose also for them; c) moral, man must behave as if he were dead; d) analogical and eschatological: death gives the gift of the being.⁵⁰ Evidently, the intention of emptiness' own purity, the space in which man awaits, surrounded by the being, to coexist with divine nothingness, must not blind the individual, for this would turn him into a merchant. Though the project implies a finality, the course of the project is worthy in itself. On the way to the purity of utter vacuity, "God must not be loved because of his kingdom of the heavens or of any other wish. Rather, he must be loved because of the bounty that he is in himself. For he who loves because of any other thing, he does not live in him, but in that thing which is the cause of the love".⁵¹

What man first must take into account if he wants to live in God, according to Eckhart, is to deny himself and all things; likewise, "that he not depend on anything that the senses touch internally".⁵² In the negative radical mysticism that the Meister proposes, man "must not accept God for his bounty or justice. Rather, he must comprehend him in the pure and clean substance in which he understands himself in his purity".⁵³ Along the way of the crossing of worldly things, man must alienate himself from the symbolisms of God and contemplate that "God is a Verb, an unspoken verb",⁵⁴ hence anything that may be said of him (that) will imply a distortion. That is why the Dominican imperatively emphasizes: "Remove from God everything that enrobes him and take him pure in the dressing room where he is uncovered and naked in himself. Then will you remain in him".⁵⁵ It is highly significant that this "pure taking" of God adverts a permanence fused in him, upon both entities being a single one in utter vacuity. In such a manner, the pretentious rituals that emphasize forms and conventionalities are deprived of the comprehension that the radical Eckhartian mysticism, centered in a negative dialectic, proposes. Concretely, "those who hold true to penitence and the exterior exercise (...) are called saints by reason of appearances, but in the interior they are asses, for they do not know how to discern the divine truth".⁵⁶

He who authentically remains in God, from the vision of the Eckhartian nihilistic mysticism, understands that: a) "Between himself and God there is no difference, rather, they are one",⁵⁷ there where emptiness unites and makes one only Unity be, upon not being; b) Likewise, man "takes his blessedness from the purity from which God himself takes it",⁵⁸ which is why the source is, more than shared, unified. From the original *Nothingness*, God as well as man have drunk in order to be substantiated; and now, finally, united after man's transfiguration, they are ported by a same spiritual glass that integrates, fuses, and converges; c) Furthermore, man that has suffered death due to his crossing the world, "has a knowledge with God's knowledge and has an action with God's action, and a knowing with the knowing of God"; there is no longer Lord and follower, owner and slave, Father and son, God and believer, giver and receiver, highness and triviality, perfect and imperfect; rather, the divisions have been lost, the distances dumbfounded, and the relationship extirpated from an equality; d) In such conditions, "God is always born in man"⁵⁹ when man has become vacuous such as the first deity; e) In the same manner in which God is born in man, "that man is always born in God".⁶⁰

To summarize, the original deity came forth from nothing, the *Nothingness*, ceased to be what it was in the moment in which it surrounded itself by the ring of the being in everything created; this is to say, in that which though having emanated from it, was no longer it. Creation gives sense to the invocation of God; a God that, eventually, is distorted by the same thinking creation based on images, assembled in the fantastical creativity of those who feel themselves illuminated to dote the world of representations of God. There, in the massifying tumult of those who believe to know God by giving him a name, Eckhart proposes an unveiling of the deity, his comprehension further than the configurations of God.

⁵⁰Cfr. Vega, "Notas", in: *El fruto de la nada*, p. 255.

⁵¹Eckhart, "La imagen desnuda de Dios", in: *El fruto de la nada*, p. 97.

⁵²*Ibid.*, p. 96.

⁵³*Ibid.*, p. 97.

⁵⁴Eckhart, "Dios es un verbo que se habla a sí mismo", in: *El fruto de la nada*, p. 114.

⁵⁵Eckhart, "La imagen desnuda de Dios", in: *El fruto de la nada*, p. 97.

⁵⁶Eckhart, "Pobres de espíritu", in: *El fruto de la nada*, p. 106.

⁵⁷Eckhart, "La imagen desnuda de Dios", in: *El fruto de la nada*, p. 97.

⁵⁸*Ibidem.*

⁵⁹*Ibidem.*

⁶⁰*Ibid.*, p. 98.

Only so, in the undressing God of the imposed vestments, can the tearing off of what covers the deity be accomplished until, having eliminated all the vestments, names, and postulates, may the empty space remain to which man adheres himself when he is capable of being surprised, even of himself and of what he has believed he was. This denial of everything, in its affirmation of the remaining nothingness, that which remains when there is nothing left anymore, unites man's spirit which, purified, is ready to be surrounded by being and penetrate the pure and virginal ring of God: *Nothingeity*. Deferring the definitive encounter with it, in profound and definitive death, all that is left for man is to separate himself from what he knows, to isolate himself from what is created and yet know himself to be a part of it, but highly exalting his belonging to the pure origin from which he emanated in the beginning alongside God. Man, as fruit of nothing, must become a separate being from which may come forth, sublime and eloquent, the reason of his existence.

As can be observed, the Eckhartian hermeneutic, swung in the tension between what can be comprehended and that which is further from all comprehension, implies knowing oneself to be in the possibility of crossing the limits of knowledge. In turn, that which has been comprehended as a notion, in spite of the will to be expressed, crashes and fades on the wall of ineffability and refuses to be contented with a distorting symbolization, which is why the response remains contained in silence. The hermeneutic circle proposed by Eckhart implies that alienating oneself from any sign of God is the entrance to his pure and vacuous kingdom.

In the dimension in which exiting is entering, descending is ascending, and receding is to approach, to assume oneself without God is to possess him, to deny him is to affirm him, atheism is an optimal theism in which the offense is transfigured into a sophisticated adoration. To the same degree it is also possible to understand that there is no possible separation from the being (entity-wise) emanated from God that refuges us until *Nothingeity* is of the promised non-ruling kingdom, that in which the union will be inalienable. Comprehension of this type has no place until the world is abandoned, time and becoming implied; only then can it be accomplished to be wholly comprehended in the point in which comprehension is not possible upon no longer being. That *location* in which all occurrence is suspended, is above all possible conception and it is to what the Meister refers to in the following manner: "There is a light above lights where the soul escapes all lights 'in the mountains of the high' where there is no more light".⁶¹ I coincide with Castañeda when he affirms that: "To say "*God is nothing*" points out that which is fundamental in an experience of the Divinity, its non-nameability, its intangibility, the hiddenness of its mystery and of its presence".⁶²

It suffices to intuit, briefly contemplating, that the brightest light is that which does not allow seeing and so combines us with the darkness to coincide with Eckhart in that "free from hurdles are they who order all of their activities according to the model of the eternal light; and those are beside the things but not in the things. They are very close to them which is why they have no less than if they were thereabove in the circle of eternity".⁶³ Precisely, the "circle of eternity" (*umberinge der ênicheit*) to which the Meister refers is equivalent to the "ring of the being", as long as it is forewarned that a Deity without a being is possible and real (*gottheit âne wesen*), *Nothingeity*.

6. Impregnated in nothingness in the *non-manner*

The search for God, for Meister Eckhart, implies a no-search; for when something is searched for, a manner has been given to it, which one desires to verify upon its finding. The categorization of God in specific manners is an affront to what is. From there, it is derived that it should not be found, given that it is desired to be verified in the pre-established manners. That is why "God must be taken in as much as a *manner without a manner* and in as much as a *being without being*, for he has no manner".⁶⁴ The Meister cites Saint Bernard when he affirms: who would want to know you, God, must measure you without a measurement.⁶⁵

⁶¹Eckhart, "La montaña verde", in: *El fruto de la nada*, p. 131.

⁶²Castañeda, "Dios y ser. Una aproximación desde Eckhart y Heidegger", in *Teología y Sociedad*, p. 114.

⁶³Eckhart, "Marta y María", in: *El fruto de la nada*, p. 142.

⁶⁴Eckhart, "El fruto de la nada", in: *El fruto de la nada*, p. 126.

⁶⁵*Ibidem*.

If God has no manner, it consequently follows that he is un-nameable and that “he is further from all words in the purity of his neither depth, where God cannot contain any word nor speech, where he is ineffable and unspeakable for all the creatures”.⁶⁶ In such a manner, no guide for the encounter with divinity can be established for “there is no road towards God”.⁶⁷ Likewise, there are no scales of greater or lesser closeness to the divinity and “he who yet meanders in the rising and growing in grace and light, he yet has not arrived at God”.⁶⁸ According to the Dominican, care must be had in regard to the manners of taking God. He emphatically warns that if he is taken “as a light or as a being or as a good, and you recognize something from it; that is not God”.⁶⁹ Along that path of denial, the only alternative is to divest the preconceived ideas, in a divesting that is an analogy of nothingness, for “to be full of all the creatures is to be empty of God”.⁷⁰ In turn, if a personal emptying is allowed, if the effort arrives at the point of the separation of ideas and representations, then the state has been reached in which “being empty of all creatures is to be full of God”.⁷¹

To remain in the *non-manner* is to enable the possibility of being impregnated with nothingness, and out of such condition emerges the fruit of the nothingness itself that Eckhart equates to God. In the sermon titled *The fruit of nothingness*, which is characterized for clearly containing the apophatic elements of the Dominican’s mysticism, the following narration is exhibited: “A man once thought in a dream – it was a dream of vigil – that he was impregnated with nothingness, as a woman is of a child, and in that nothingness God had been born; he was the fruit of nothingness. That is why he says: “he arose from the ground and, with his eyes open, saw nothing”. He saw God, in whom all the creatures are nothing. He saw all the creatures as nothingness, for he (God) has in him the being of all the creatures”.⁷²

This passage refers to the essence of the Eckhartian nihilistic mysticism upon recognizing that God fructifies in man to the same extent that the latter has managed to be impregnated with nothingness, a consequence achievable by mediation of an emptying of oneself that is gradual, constant, and painstaking. The letting go of conceptions about the divine could be one of the most complex aspects for those who have been habituated to recognizing God in modalities, assuming that he is a visible entity or can be caught; being that, on the contrary, blinding oneself is a requirement. The Eckhartian proposal implies an attitude of caution, concretely recommending: “Do not believe anyone who says God is here or there (...). God is a true light; he who wants to see it must be blind and must keep God out of all the things”.⁷³ Blindness that makes *seeing* God upon not seeing, is represented in the biblical passage⁷⁴ in which it is warned that “Saul arose from the ground and, with opened eyes, saw nothing”. According to Eckhart: “he saw nothing, and that was God. God is a nothing and God is a something. That which is something, that also is nothing”;⁷⁵ hence, “he who speaks of God with nothing, does so correctly”.⁷⁶ Saint Agustín used to say that when Saul didn’t see anything, he saw God. It is possible to invert a word in such a manner that it is clearer: when he saw nothingness, he saw God. God resides in emptiness. The ecstatic vision of he who came to be Saint Paul, assumed a suspension of faculties in which he came to be in contact with the nothingness of the deity based on an extra-timely and trans-historically spiritual hermeneutic. God and man inherit their deity from the abysmal depth that nothingness is.

Such as Eckhart affirms in his *Treaty of a noble man*, it is not necessary to create additions to God; on the contrary, rather, to divest him of the images that represent him. In such a manner, his mysticism does not imply an addition less and a subtraction more. The need to divest the excess, which is everything that is tangible, becomes evident. The example of the Meister in this regard is very clear: “When a master makes an image of wood or stone, he does not introduce the image in the wood; rather, he cuts the slivers that have hidden and covered the image. He adds

⁶⁶Eckhart, “El enviado”, in: *El fruto de la nada*, p. 134.

⁶⁷Eckhart, “El fruto de la nada”, in: *El fruto de la nada*, p. 119.

⁶⁸*Ibidem*.

⁶⁹*Ibid.*, p. 122.

⁷⁰Eckhart, “Del ser separado”, in: *El fruto de la nada*, p. 171.

⁷¹*Ibidem*.

⁷²Eckhart, “El fruto de la nada”, in: *El fruto de la nada*, p. 123.

⁷³*Ibidem*.

⁷⁴Hch 9, 8.

⁷⁵Eckhart, “El fruto de la nada”, in: *El fruto de la nada*, p. 123.

⁷⁶*Ibidem*.

nothing to the stone, rather he strikes and sculpts the covering, throws out the slag, and then what was hidden below, shines".⁷⁷ It is not adding that precedes the exercise of mysticism; contrarily, rather, a subtraction, a diminishing, a making less, an opening towards nakedness. When man undergoes that same scrutiny with himself, he is capable of conceiving that he is impregnated with a nothingness of delayed emergence, which is why it remains leftover and surplus in man's being; thoughts, desires, wishes, emotions, and considerations about the forms, hinder nothingness' delivery; hence its fruit, that is God in Eckhartian mysticism, does not flourish freely.

To conceive the fruit derived from being impregnated with nothingness, is a scarcely achievable accomplishment for the contemporary man who, distracted by the modalities of religious conventionalisms, remains without access to the nihilistic mysticism upon being full of forms and statutes. Concretely, the six grades of mystical experience associated to what is proposed by Meister Eckhart, are the following: "The first grade of the interior man consists in the worship of the image, when the temple becomes yet necessary. With the second grade commences the ascetic life signaled by self-denial, the rejection of what is human, and the preparation of an absolutely virgin womb base; but even to that fundamental base must the spirit of the noble man die, who at this point finds himself further than any moral consideration along his path of separation and loss of all reference. The fourth grade is the death of all will and the loving submittal to God. The fifth is the acquisition of the *sapientia dei*. And the sixth is the perfection of the path to conversion initiated in the first grade: the undressing of the own image and the transfiguration (*entbildet und überbildet*)".⁷⁸ The ascetic proposal that accomplishes being crowned with the highest point of Eckhartian mysticism, is contained in the treaty *Of the separated being* in which the residue is taken to the nihilistic radicalism which, without yet premeditatedly searching for fructification, achieves a saving consequence.

7. Separation as a way of life.

To be separated (*abegescheidenheit*) is a term that expresses the fundament of Eckhartian mysticism and his followers. Essential in theological thought, it suggests a mystical emptying of everything that is cognoscible, including the self, with the intention of returning to the mystical union with the divinity as a function of coinciding in the *Nothingity*. In such a manner, "the pure separated being surpasses everything, for all the virtues have some sight on the creatures while the separated being is empty of all the creatures".⁷⁹ To be separated "is the highest and best virtue by which man can better and faster unite himself with God";⁸⁰ achieving by it, an assimilation to the image that he was in God in the state in which "there was not one difference between him and God before God created the creatures".⁸¹ Eckhart reiterates the primal condition of man in which there was no difference, prior to creation, between God and him. The Nihilism of Eckhart's mysticism does not suppose a destruction in itself; rather, it is a destroying that invites to vindication in the Absolute. Man must be diminished to the point in which it can be said that "the separated being so closely approaches nothingness, that between the pure separated being and nothingness, nothing can be".⁸² In such a condition, there does not exist any possible suffering, for "the separated being remains empty and is supported in itself and does not let itself be afflicted by anything; for while something afflicts man, something is not right in him".⁸³

When the separation becomes a lifestyle, significant adjunctions are discovered. He who is at the point in which one is assimilated to nothingness, obtains everything as an earning, for he is established in the state in which everything is an addition after the continuous subtraction. Even so, the creatural acquisitions obtained are not the sustainment of the individual who has achieved separation, for "the man who finds himself completely in the separated being shall be hastily grabbed towards eternity, in a manner that no perishing thing may move him any longer and he may no longer feel what is corporal; and he may be pronounced dead to the world, for what is earthly no longer appears to him".⁸⁴ For Eckhart, the separated being is a greater virtue than love itself, for even "that God is

⁷⁷Eckhart, "Tratado del hombre noble", in: *El fruto de la nada*, p. 158.

⁷⁸Cfr. Vega, "Notas", in: *El fruto de la nada*, p. 273.

⁷⁹Eckhart, "Del ser separado", in: *El fruto de la nada*, p. 166.

⁸⁰*Ibidem*.

⁸¹*Ibidem*.

⁸²*Ibid.*, p. 168.

⁸³*Ibid.*, p. 170.

⁸⁴*Ibidem*.

God comes to him from his immobile separated being, and from the separated being comes his purity, his simplicity, and his immutability”.⁸⁵ In such a manner, in this contrary case to the Paulian posture, Eckhart understands love as a secondary virtue in comparison to the separated being; for he who loves, perceives God as a good and as someone specific, which implies an obstacle for the union with God if it is considered that “nobody can go so far as to name God”,⁸⁶ which is why God is the greatest separated being.⁸⁷

Pure nullification, or the pure nothingness (*blózen nihte*) that man does, is facultative because “the originating capacity of Nothingness is strengthened when the individual is capable of voluntarily emptying himself of false idols, of his own rational supports, of his untangled intellectual faculties, in order to deposit him in the contemplation of the uncontentable”.⁸⁸ This coincides with Eckhart when he recognizes that “for the heart to have a predisposition towards the highest, he must remain over a pure nothingness, and in it consists as well the greatest possibility there can be”.⁸⁹ A metaphor in the same regard could be the following: “If I want to write on a wax slate, then there can be nothing written on it (...) I must erase and empty everything that is on the slate, and it is never presented to me so well for writing than when there is isn’t absolutely anything. In a very similar manner, if God in the highest must write in my heart, then everything must leave my heart, be it this or that; so are the things with the separated heart”.⁹⁰

The authentically separated heart does not ask for absolutely anything and “its prayer is no other thing than being uniform with God”,⁹¹ while it becomes “free from love due to love and dark due to light”.⁹² With its separated being, the individual manages to abandon the world confused by forms and arrives at the state of the *non-form*, which is constituted by God himself in his characteristic of deity. In the estrangement (*entfremdung*) that proceeds from the separated being, the self achieves a death that liberates the intimate being, though the physical existence continues. If God is considered a foundation of all of existence, it can be observed that he himself is sustained on nothingness in such a manner that, according to Eckhart, in the man that has managed to be a separated being can be found an unfounded soul that returns to its habitat due to its proximity with nothingness, in such a way that the creature-likeness of man is annulled and a connection with the deity contained in God is achieved. In such a manner, “the separated being, to the degree to which he is nothingness, can aspire to be filled with God’s being”.⁹³ That is why in his poem, *The mustard seed*, Eckhart expresses himself in the following manner: “O, my soul, get out, God in! Sink all my being into God’s nothingness”.⁹⁴

8. The Eckhartian inheritance

The mysticism that Eckhart proposed and lived was a motive of persecution, even in his own order, due to some of his brothers regarding with displeasure his manner of preaching to the people.⁹⁵ Evidently, “it is not surprising that a doctrine which avoided the manners and, as a last resort, the orders, was not tolerated by the ecclesiastic hierarchy”.⁹⁶

As the reader could surely predict, “the history of the process against Eckhart is plagued with irregularities”,⁹⁷ which didn’t end until the 27th of March of 1329. Pope John XXII publishes the Bull *In agro dominico* (Act 65), in which it is consigned that Eckhart “has wanted to know more than is necessary”⁹⁸ and “has pointed out countless

⁸⁵*Ibid.*, p. 171.

⁸⁶Eckhart, “El fruto de la nada”, in: *El fruto de la nada*, p. 122.

⁸⁷*Cfr.* Eckhart, “Del ser separado”, in: *El fruto de la nada*, p. 180.

⁸⁸Sevilla, *Op. cit.*, p. 162.

⁸⁹Eckhart, “Del ser separado”, in: *El fruto de la nada*, p. 176.

⁹⁰*Ibid.*, p. 177.

⁹¹*Ibidem.*

⁹²*Ibid.*, p. 178.

⁹³ Vega, “Notas”, in: *El fruto de la nada*, p. 277.

⁹⁴Eckhart, “El grano de mostaza”, in: *El fruto de la nada*, p. 186.

⁹⁵ The Dominican Nikolaus von Strassburg was forced by John XXII to undergo an investigation about Meister Eckhart’s German writings; the inquiries initially centered on the *Liber Benedictus* and the propositions contained in said writing proceeded to be declared “dangerous”. Hermann von Summo and Wilhelm von Nidecke took some of individual phrases from Eckhart’s work to accuse him of heresy. *Cfr.* Vega, “Introducción”, in: *El fruto de la nada*, pp. 38-42.

⁹⁶*Cfr.* Vega, “Introducción”, in: *El fruto de la nada*, pp. 32.

⁹⁷*Ibid.*, p. 38.

⁹⁸ Vid. “In agro dominico”, in: *El fruto de la nada*, p. 232.

articles that darken the true faith in many hearts”.⁹⁹ Furthermore, it is warned that Eckhart had been “seduced, in effect, by the said father of the lie, who frequently adopts the figure of an angel of light in order to spread the gloomy and hateful darkness of the senses”,¹⁰⁰ due to which his writings “contain errors or have been stained by heresy”.¹⁰¹ In such a manner, the Meister was judged for his free reading of life and mysticism, just like his precise intention of liberating his audience of the forms that the authority places on God, including his name and will. Eckhart died in the beginning of 1328, awaiting a resolution for the accusations. He never read the mentioned bull. Being treated as heretics for approving Eckhart’s writings didn’t stop Johannes Tauler and Henrich Seuse, who, promptly, became continuers of Eckhart’s school. Contemporarily, on his behalf, is Alois Hass considered¹⁰² as one of the greatest studiers of the Meister’s works. It is fitting to mention that in 1992, in a process derived from various petitions of the members of the Order of Preachers, the Catholic conviction of Meister Eckhart’s writings was lifted by way of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, directed then by Joseph Ratzinger.

Eckhart’s work has also raised interest in the philosophy of the last century, to the degree that Heidegger undergoes various mentions of the Meister in various passages of his work, including the references in his habilitation *Categories and the doctrine of significance in Duns Escoto*, or in later texts such as *What does it mean to think?*, just as *Technique and rotation*, *The field path* and *The question concerning the thing*. By this, it can be affirmed that “Heidegger not only knew Eckhart’s thought, but he even had it in mind in one manner or another, from the beginning until the last stage of his intellectual defeater”.¹⁰³

In the East, Eckhart’s thoughts are present in Nishitani, who related him to Nietzsche’s *Sospeaketh Zaratustra*. The Japanese also related the Meister to Heidegger’s thought, as well as to European Nihilism and German mysticism in general, specifically based on the coincidences on his approaches on nothing.¹⁰⁴ For Nishitani, the overcoming of the myopic conception of “relative nothingness”, from which European Nihilism was forged, can only be achieved based on a look at “absolute nothingness”, which “is totally related to everything that is”.¹⁰⁵ In that sense, the nihilistic mysticism of the Meister can find similarities with Zen Buddhism in his intention of achieving absolute liberation, whether it be by mediation of the Eckhartian *mors mystica*, in which the individual pleads to God to empty him of God, or the *Great death*, understood in the Zen as a radical conversion of the spirit.¹⁰⁶ Nishitani, in his praiseful work *Religion and nothingness*, finds that Eckhart considered the essence of the personal God as an absolute nothingness,¹⁰⁷ concretely, as a “field of death-in-the absolute life”.¹⁰⁸ In that sense, the Eastern philosopher affirms that “Eckhart himself declared that the depth of God resides in the interior of the self, closer to the self than it is to itself”¹⁰⁹ and he equates it to the Buddhist position of the *sūnyatā* which is “the place in which we manifest ourselves in our own ownness”.¹¹⁰ Common places can also be found among the Mahāyāna tradition, the greatest representative of which is Nāgāryuna and the experience of nothingness or of Eckhartian emptiness.

By way of conclusion, there only remains to emphatically clarify that the congruence in the Meister’s speaking and acting cover a profound interest for the achievement of a Nihilism of mystical reaches. To assume the nothingness of the deity, the *Nothingeity*, subtracting the political and collective contrariness that could be derived from it, is in consonance with Eckhart’s direct invitation: “separate everything added to the deity and take it naked in

⁹⁹*Ibid.*, p. 233.

¹⁰⁰*Ibidem.*

¹⁰¹*Ibid.*, p. 237.

¹⁰² Hass donated close to 40,000 works about humanity’s spiritual traditions to the Universitat Pompeu Fabra; inaugurated in the year 2003 based on that fund, the *Bibliotheca Mystica et Philosophica Alois M. Haas* continues to offer summits, conferences, and various events in order to disclose and dialogue about Western spiritual inheritance, including Meister Eckhart’s works.

¹⁰³Filippi, “Martín Heidegger y la Mística Eckhartiana”, in: *Invenio*, p. 34.

¹⁰⁴*Cfr. Japan und Heidegger*, p. 34.

¹⁰⁵Sevilla, *Op. cit.*, p. 160.

¹⁰⁶*Vid.* Tanabe, *Filosofía como Metanoética*, 2014.

¹⁰⁷*Cfr.* Nishitani, *La religión y la nada*, p. 143.

¹⁰⁸*Ibidem.*

¹⁰⁹*Ibidem.*

¹¹⁰*Ibid.*, p. 144.

itself?¹¹¹ The Eckhartian inheritance will opportunely grow to the degree to which its message, the didactic *crossing* of which has taken the common man a process of almost seven hundred years of comprehension, is taken, assimilated, and assumed by those who have managed to make of their own depth a *manner without a manner* in which, once again, the fruit of nothingness can be born.

References

- Castañeda José (2011). “Dios y ser. Una aproximación desde Eckhart y Heidegger”, in: *Teología y Sociedad*, Núm. 9, pp. 107-127.
- Eckhart Maestro (1980). *Obras escogidas*. Barcelona: Visión libros.
- _____, (2011). *El fruto de la nada y otros escritos*. Madrid: Alianza.
- Filippi Silvana (2003). “Martín Heidegger y la Mística Eckhartiana”, in: *Invenio*, Noviembre, pp. 33-39.
- Haas Alois (2009). *Viento de lo absoluto. ¿Existe una sabiduría mística de la posmodernidad?* Madrid: Siruela.
- _____, (2002). *Maestro Eckhart: figura normativa para la vida espiritual*. Barcelona: Herder.
- Japan und Heidegger* (1989). ed. Hartmut Buchner, Sigmaringen.
- Nishitani Keiji (2003). *La religión y la nada*. Madrid: Siruela.
- Sevilla Héctor (2012). *Contemplar la Nada: Un camino alternativo hacia la comprensión del Ser*. México: Plaza y Valdés.
- Tanabe Hajime (2014). *Filosofía como Metanoética*. Barcelona: Herder.
- Vega Amador (2011). “Notas”, in: Maestro Eckhart, *El fruto de la nada y otros escritos*. Madrid: Alianza.

¹¹¹Eckhart, “El enviado”, in: *El fruto de la nada y otros escritos*, p. 137.