

THE LIFE OF THE SPIRIT IN GEORGE SANTAYANA AND ITS APPLICATION TO THE IDEA OF CHRIST*

By

MICHAEL MACRAKIS
B.A., M.A. in Philosophy

CHAPTER III

THE TWO NATURES OF CHRIST (GOD IN MAN)

A striking analogy subsists between [the] union of the rational with the animal nature in man and the union of the divine with the human nature in the idea of Christ... This analogy is important to our inquiry, because it clarifies the problem of salvation by the imitation of Christ, and helps to define the presence of God in man (ICG, 227).

26. The Idea of God in Man as the Main Subject of Santayana's Essay on Christ (This Idea in the Gospels)

Christ as supreme spirit incarnate voluntarily in a human creature born from the Virgin Mary, which was the subject of our consideration in the previous chapter, is identical with the idea of God in man, which we shall now consider. «Christ is God in man;... he is the divine spirit incarnate and crucified in the world» (ICG, 165). However, what interests us in this chapter is not so much its relation to the previous chapter, as the relation of this chapter to its parallel chapter of the first part. This chapter, concerning the idea of Christ as God in man, that is, the unity of the divinity with the humanity of Christ (the two natures of Christ) corresponds to the third chapter of the first part, the chap-

* Continuation from *Theologia*, No 48, January-March 1977, p. 184.

ter in which we treated the two natures of the human soul, the nature of the spirit and the nature of the psyche.

The subject of this chapter is the main question of Santayana's book, *The Idea of Christ in the Gospels*. He says: «The idea of Christ as it appears in the Gospels: that is to say, the idea of God in man» (ICG, 105, 171) «on which this book is a meditation» (ICG, 231) «is my subject» (ICG, 6). Santayana finds in general that among the four Gospels, the Gospel of Mark is the most perfect from this point of view of his subject, that is, of the idea of God in man, as Santayana himself, of course, understands this idea. «The image of Christ in *Mark*», he says, «seems to to me the most perfect to be found in the Gospels» (ICG, 22) because, as he explains, «in *Mark* the image of Christ, his spontaneous mind, his action, his mysterious ascendancy dominate the scene with greater lifelikeness and force than in other synoptic Gospels» (ICG, 21). Especially in comparison with the fourth Gospel Santayana says the following:

This mystery [of the idea of God], as touched upon in *Mark*, seems truer to life and deeper... In *Mark* Jesus never becomes, as he tends to become in *John*, a visiting God speaking through a glazed mask of humanity. He remains an impetuous, virile, commanding human being, yielding to circumstances and himself living dramatically... The modesty in concealing divinity is not feigned; there is a genuine confession of humanity in it which, however, does not exclude, on occasion, a bold and overpowering assertion of divinity (ICG, 22). It is noticeable in *Mark* that at those moments of high tension when the divine nature in Christ breaks through, as before his judges or during his Passion, the human nature is not superseded, as sometimes in *John*, but on contrary remains spontaneous, manly and young (ICG, 24).

The reason, therefore, that the image of Christ in the second Gospel seems to Santayana the most perfect is its equal emphasis on both natures of Christ, or rather its emphasis more on his humanity than on his divinity. A proof of his stress on the humanity of Christ is that this Gospel begins by contact with the human Jesus. However, Santayana finds that the two other synoptic Gospels «had begun as the Gospel of Saint Mark begins, by contact with the human Jesus or reports about him: that he was the Son of God had been a later discovery, or rather act of faith on their part» (ICG, 56).

One can see, for example, this later discovery of Christ as the Son of God, according to Santayana, in the first Gospel. «In *Matthew*», he says, «a first retrospective implication of his being the Son of God

is advanced: he was born of a virgin, and had no earthly father» (ICG, 27). Perhaps this difference between the two first Gospels, the one (of Matthew) with its emphasis on the divinity of Christ, the other (of Mark) with its emphasis on the humanity of Christ, is for Santayana one of the proofs that the latter was written first. He believes that:

the Gospel of *Matthew*, though it is placed first in our canon, and begins with a genealogy of Jesus (or rather Joseph, his legal father) is written from the point of view of a Church already established. It offers not the recollections of a disciple, but a defence of his belief (ICG, 25).

For this reason Santayana does not find in the first Gospel the originality he finds in the second. He says:

The compiler in *Matthew* does not seem to have much personal inspiration. The genealogy of the beginning, the preoccupation with finding prophetic texts fulfilled paradoxically in casual events, and the monotonous appeal to dreams and angelic visitations to guide the action, all smack of a secondary composition (ICG, 26).

Concerning the Gospel of Luke from the point of view in which Santayana is interested in his book, that is, of the idea of Christ or God in man, he thinks that this Gospel is less important than the others. He says: «The idea of Christ is less firmly composed here than in the other Gospels, as if it had been drawn from secondary sources and not vitalised by a strong personal inspiration of enthusiasm» (ICG, 29). However, he finds this Gospel as important in the liturgical character (ICG, 20, 26, 27), as also in the literary style and the sense of beauty: «In *Luke* Christ is again conceived graphically, picturesquely, not with the spasmodic force of specific glimpses, but with the diffused luminosity of a conventional work of art. All is tender and edifying, for Saint Luke is a pious artist» (ICG, 27; also 29). Another important element in the Gospel of Luke is the mystic which, besides the graphic in the exhibition of the idea of Christ, characterizes the fourth Gospel, too. «In both Gospels we see the idea of Christ, pictorially and mystically» (ICG, 41). Especially of the fourth Gospel Santayana says: «The humanity and the divinity of Christ are interwoven in that book, both with graphic power and with mystical unction» (ICG, 60).

However, the mystic element in Luke compared to that in John is secondary, for in the latter this element becomes primary and almost new. «That which is new in *John*», says Santayana, «and indispensable

to any profound religion, is the influx of a great flood of contemplative rapture and mystic passion» (ICG, 37). «It is only in *John* that [the] mystic union with Christ appears in the Gospels» (ICG, 21). This Gospel is characterized in general by the «mystical sentiment» (ICG, 49) of its writer and by the «mystical note» (ICG, 35) of Christ's words in it. We can see already the mystical character of the fourth Gospel from its very beginning, from «the five mystic verses» (ICG, 33). For this reason, Santayana finds that the «idea of Christ in *John*, even if it be earlier than that in *Luke*, is certainly more nature and philosophical» (ICG, 41). «The fourth Gospel is much the most speculative» (ICG, 20). The notions of Christ «in the fourth Gospel begin to grow abstract and non-human» (ICG, 31). The emphasis in this Gospel is not on Christ as the Son of Man but on Christ as the Son of God. The first words of this Gospel: «In the beginning was the Word», this Word or Logos designates «the divine nature of Christ» (ICG, 64). Even when we return to earth, after this opening in heaven, to the story of John the Baptist, «the writer falls back on his ontology», «to tell us the whatness and the non-whatness of the personage he is about to introduce» (ICG, 33). «Throughout this Gospel, this interest in ontology that dictated the opening verses appears also in the discourses of Jesus... These theological and Christological discourses in *John* enlarge and etherialise the idea of Christ and carry it out of earthly time and space» (ICG, 34). «Realism and subtle truth to life are not wanting in *John*» (ICG, 38).

27. Traditional Interpretations of the Idea of Christ or God in Man

Such, as we gave it in the previous section, is the «Character of the Several Gospels» which by this title Santayana describes in the second chapter of the first part of his book, *The Idea of Christ or God in Man in the Gospels*. Now, before we talk of his own interpretation of the idea of Christ, according to these Gospels, let us see in general the traditional interpretations which Santayana himself mentions in his book, that is, the pantheistic, the idealistic, and the realistic interpretations.

a. Pantheistic Interpretation («God exists in man because everything is a part of God»). The first interpretation, the pantheistic, is based on the main principle of pantheism, on the «identity between man and God» (ICG, 176) which is another expression of the identity between

God and the universe, for man is a part of the universe. In view of this identity we can understand that «when a creature has a mind, God and all things, for a pantheist, may therefore be said to exist in him doubly: materially, by identity or interchangeableness of substance, and ideally by revelation to the spirit» (ICG, 175). Thus «the presence of God in man is something obvious and inevitable, since everything, according to those systems (which the religions and philosophies called pantheistic), is a part of God and perfectly at peace in being at once a specific thing and a phase of the infinite» (ICG, 175). «God lives in all the parts, every part lives in God» (ICG, 196-197); this implication existing, of course, not only in the divine life, as in monarchical theism, but also in the relation between God and man.

Now, in view of this doctrine we may give to the phrase: God in man the interpretation «that God exists in man because everything is a part of God» (ICG, 249). But, according to Santayana, «with the idea of Christ before us, we must exclude at once the pantheistic sense of that phrase», for «it is obviously not in this sense that God is in Christ» (ICG, 249).

b. Idealistic Interpretation («God exists in Christ because Christ knows and loves God»). Though the second interpretation of the idea of Christ or God in man is characterized as idealistic, it has a «realistic background [which] is proper to monarchical theism» (ICG, 250), that «God is an absolute monarch»¹, a theism which comes to Christianity from Jewish tradition. «The God of Israel is a living God» (ICG, 177). «God for the Jewish tradition, is a power, a will, an individual not composed of parts; he is a spirit and can enter into man only in spirit, that is to say, ideally. For there is spirit in man also» (ICG, 249). In this sense, therefore, man lives «as far as his nature permits, in an ideal union with God» (ICG, 250).

According to the idealistic interpretation, then, the meaning of the phrase: God in man in the case of Christ is that the idea of Christ is «that of an ordinary man who has been more or less inspired by the spirit of God; that might be the Jewish or Mohammedan view of Jesus, or that of some of his disciples before they discovered who their Master really was» (ICG, 250). From this point of view «God exists in Christ, then, because Christ knows and loves God» (ICG, 250). In other

1. ICG, 176; see also Chapter II in the second part of this book of Santayana, the chapter entitled «Monarchical Theism».

words, Christ is a «godly man» (ICG, 250). Santayana, however, rejects also the idealistic interpretation, for «idealism», according to him, «inspires the same religious sentiments as pantheism and the same morality» (ICG, 250).

c. Realistic Interpretation («God exists in Christ because Christ is real God»). The third interpretation, the realistic, concerns the doctrine of a supernatural human soul. In this doctrine the theologians felt «compelled to satisfy the claims both of the natural psyche and of the intellect addressed to the ideal and the eternal, and they do so by fusing the psyche and the intellect into a supernatural soul» (ICG, 227). Insofar as «a physical origin is assigned to life» (ICG, 226), that is, to the soul (ICG, 221, 223, 224), «naturalism is accepted». But, when «nature is extended congruously and continuously into another sphere, not normally revealed to the senses, but designed to crown earthly life ideally and to explain it morally», «the system is therefore properly called *supernaturalism*. Far from abolishing the real and material world, it adopts and completes it, as the rational soul in man adopts and perfects his animal psyche, or as the divine person in Christ adopts and sanctifies his humanity» (ICG, 226).

According to the realistic interpretation of the idea of Christ, with this corresponding theory of a supernatural soul in man, the meaning of the phrase: God in man in the case of Christ is this:

He [Christ] was really God become man; and that is a very different idea from that of a man living, as far as his nature permits, in an ideal union with God. Nevertheless, it is the model of Christ, not that of a godly man, that inspires the Christian, and that is really adequate to guide a free and heroic spirit. This is the crux of my problem. It is what forced Catholic theology to adopt the doctrine of a supernatural human soul; so that only a sacrificial human life and a sacrificed human body should be truly natural to man and compatible with his perfect happiness. This implies the sacrifice of almost everything that a man ordinarily cares for, including the animal will and his animal self (ICG, 250).

But, the question of Santayana as concerns this interpretation, according to the doctrine of a supernatural soul, is: «Can this really be the universal vocation of spirit?» (ICG, 250), that is, the «inalienable vocation of the spirit to detach itself from the flesh and the world that is defended by the doctrine of a supernatural soul» (ICG, 233)? This doctrine, as Santayana remarks, «shows us the supernatural, as it culminates and triumphs over the natural, triumphing also over itself, and

culminating in the ideal» (ICG, 230). The motive of the theologians in this doctrine is «not love of life but respect for the ideal» (ICG, 230). According to them, «the life we call natural is diseased. No alien good is therefore proposed to man now by this supernatural soul. He is simply recalled to his pristine condition, to his truly *normal* life» (ICG, 229), like that of Adam in Paradise in which he «had been raised to a supernatural state of grace and endowed with immortality, for body as well as soul» (ICG, 229). And such will be again the Paradise of the future by the «triumph in the Resurrection; the endless reign of Christ will be on earth, or at least in a material world comparable to the earth» (ICG, 229). In their teaching of such a Paradise Santayana finds the theologians to be mistaken. He says:

I think this paradox of heaven realized in an arrested earth typically exhibits the mistake involved in the notion of the supernatural. The supernatural is the ideal hypostasized. But if you hypostasize the ideal you kill it. To quicken it again you must revert to the plane of nature, reincarnate the spirit there, and let circumstances awaken in that spirit once more some eternal image of the real become an ideal. Yet the mistake, as I call it, of positing the supernatural is no gratuitous mistake. It arises in the effort to do justice at once to nature and to the ideal, and to vindicate the superiority or rather the exclusive ultimate value, of the latter (ICG, 232-233).

In general Santayana thinks that this doctrine escapes two pitfalls: «One is to deny matter and propose a moralistic or dialectical magic ruling a multitude of pure spirits... The other pitfall in the path of heathen spiritual systems is the infinite» (ICG, 234). He finds that this doctrine escapes these two pitfalls but that «the idea of Christ, with the corresponding theory of a supernatural soul in man» is mistaken. Still he concludes that «the illusion that may attach to this is innocent and the truth conveyed is important» (ICG, 248).

28. Santayana's Interpretation of the Two Natures of Christ, the Divine and the Human, as Symbolizing the Spirit and the Psyche

a. The Son of God and the Son of Man (The Divinity and the Humanity of Christ). The important truth which is conveyed in the theory of a supernatural soul in its relation to the idea of Christ is «a striking analogy» «between [the] union of the rational with the animal nature in man

and the union of the divine with the human nature in the idea of Christ», «an analogy» which, as Santayana remarks, «is important to our inquiry, because it clarifies the problem of salvation by the imitation of Christ, and helps to define the presence of God in man» (ICG, 227). However, this analogy, though it is important for Santayana's interpretation of the idea of Christ or God in man, he notes, is not perfect. He says:

Lest this analogy should mislead us we may note that it is not perfect. For in Christ it is the divine nature that is original and persistent and that assumes the human nature as an apanage or appendix, and thereby the divine nature raises the human to a supernatural sanctity and power. In man, on the contrary, what is original and persistent is the animal psyche, which when assumed by a rational soul infects the latter with its hereditary taints, physical and moral (ICG, 227). [In other words], man is irremediably a human person assuming and adopting a divine nature, and not, like the Christ of theology, a divine person assuming a human nature added to and subordinate to his native divinity (RS, 208). In Adam, in the human psyche, the spirit is secondary... But in Christ, in the spirit that then enters into us, the opposite happens. There the centre is divine, and what is put on like a garment or a dramatic mask is human nature... The humanity that can coexist with divinity in the same person must be a singularly chastened, subordinated humanity. Such in fact is the humanity depicted in Christ and admitted by Christians into their ideal life (RS, 214). [For this reason], as Christ remains the same person, the Son of God, when he becomes man, so each human soul remains the same soul, no matter what new affections it may develop (ICG, 247). [So], that a man should remain man is the first condition of God's coming to dwell in him (ICG, 248).

What Santayana means by saying that the original and persistent in man is the animal psyche and that man remains always the same human soul is that the spirit in its origin springs and depends for its existence from and on matter (RS, 49, 79) which matter, for this reason, «may be called mind-stuff of psychic substance inasmuch as it can become on occasion the substance of a Psyche, and through the Psyche the basis of mind» (SE, 221n.). In other words, «psyche creates spirit» (RS, 64) and «gives birth to spirit» (RM, 162), spirit being in this case the «product» (RS, 13) and the «child» (RS, 63) of the psyche, for the psyche is the mother of the spirit and the intellect (SE, 29). So, the intellect did not come «into the psyche from outside», as Aristotle maintains, but it is «internal to the psyche and a potential there» (ICG, 235). In this sense, therefore, «the soul [psyche] transformed into spirit [intellect]» (RS, 212),

that «soul that carries the body's burdens must have sprung from the same root as the body» (ICG, 228); and so «the spirit grafted on the animal psyche is a continual hypostasis of natural life» (RS, 209).

In opposition to man, in whom the animal psyche and not the rational soul (spirit) is original, Christ's original nature is divine and not human, for «in Christ, God dwells absolutely, his person being essentially divine» (ICG, 151). He is the «son of God, who is not merely called a son but really is one» (ICG, 114); this divinity, of course, in the symbolic sense, as Santayana understands it, that is, the Son of God as «the allegory of expressed thought» (ICG, 65), God's «Word or his Thought» (ICG, 196). But, «Christ, being God, positively chose to assume a human body and a human psyche. Spirit could not otherwise have had a history» (ICG, 253). «If he is the Son of God, [he] is also the son of man» (ICG, 25, 124). «He was the Word made flesh, and accepted the flesh for himself in all its humble accidents» (ICG, 75; also 71). So, «as the theologians tell us, the Word in becoming flesh assumed a *perfect* humanity; a *complete* human psyche, as well as a human body» (ICG, 131-132). He was, therefore, not as Saint Paul «had seen Christ distinctly as the Christ, never as the human Jesus» (ICG, 27), but as the Evangelists had seen him, that is, as a man, too. «That Christ was a man is everywhere presupposed in the Gospels» (ICG, 67). His Father gave him an «earthly mother» «to bring him into this world and define the place, time, and circumstances of his incarnation» (ICG, 150). And during his life «he *prefers* low company, for the sake of a certain bitter realization of his humanity» (ICG, 70). His humanity was not like that of the gods in Greek mythology, for example, in which they appear in human form, that is, a humanity which «was only a mask or a deception: in Christ it was a dire reality. It was not the semblance of man that he had assumed but his flesh and blood, his banishment and his sorrows» (ICG, 154). «He has entered into a human body, accepting the life and death proper to that body» (ICG, 151; also 211).

We can see especially his humanity in his suffering, in the last words of the dying Christ, the seven words uttered by him upon the cross, those words, drawn from Scripture, and which are «the initial cry of human nature», «the voice of the whole soul in the dark night of the spirit». «If in a myth, we were describing God become man, should we include the Dark Night of the soul among his experiences? I think we should»². In this cry and the voice of the human soul in the dark night

2. ICG, 134. The expression «the Dark Night of the soul» is taken by Santayana from the title of St. John of the Cross' book: *The Dark Night of the Soul*.

Christ «is the truer man» (ICG, 133), for it is «human nature that speaks in these words (ICG, 136).

b. Illustration of the Idea of Christ or God in Man by the Cursed Fig Tree, the Repentant Thief, and the Institution of the Eucharist. From what we have said of the two natures of Christ, we can see that though the original nature in him is the divine which concerns «his native heaven» he assumes also human nature which concerns his «adopted earth» (ICG, 125); and this latter is not less perfect and complete in him than the former. He is both the Son of God and the Son of Man³, the native of heaven and the native of earth (ICG, 24). In Christ we find «the existence of two natures or two worlds, one physical, the other spiritual... conjoined in a single person» (ICG, 33-34); «the conjunction of the two natures in one person» (ICG, 69), «the union in a single person» (ICG, 174), «of divinity with humanity» (ICG, 71), of «his habitual humanity» with «his solitary unseen divinity» (ICG, 111), for «it was necessary to create a bridge between existence and eternity, between man and God» (ICG, 122), «a bridge from Christ on earth to Christ in heaven» (ICG, 165).

It is evident, then, that the idea of Christ involves both natures of God-Man, the divine and the human, for he is both the Son of God and the Son of Man. In this sense, Santayana finds in the withered or cursed fig tree of the Gospels (Matt. 21:18-20; Mark 11:12-14, 20) «a perfect miniature of the idea of Christ». He says:

It exhibits his humanity frankly and naïvely: he is parched and tired walking in the heat of the day, and the sight of a green fig tree by the dusty road suggests refreshment. Christ has a human psyche: ideas and impulses arise in him spontaneously; and he goes up to the fig tree, imagining the figs. He knows of course that it is not the season, but the impulse acts of itself, and keeps the knowledge, for the moment, in abeyance. Finding no figs, but leaves only, he suffers the inevitable revulsion of a balked instinct: and then, with his revulsion, the divine prerogative in him comes to the fore. He curses that innocent fig tree, and the next day it is found withered (ICG, 87-88).

«Now», Santayana remarks, «cursing is a most human thing, a kind of malignant prayer». But, «if when Christ curses the fig tree his curse is efficacious, we see that his divinity has suddenly come to the

3. By these titles «The Son of God» and «The Son of Man» Santayana treats in two separate chapters (chs. IV and V of the first part) of his essay on Christ his two natures, the divine and the human.

fore, and that he has passed from the disappointed thirst of his body to the zeal of his heart for the Kingdom of God» (ICG, 88). So, Santayana concludes, «the curse that falls on that tree is the shadow of his unsuspected divinity. He is being every inch a God, yet in honour of the humblest and most pathetic needs of his human nature» (ICG, 89).

Another «incident [which] exhibits the idea of Christ to perfection» is «the episode of the repentant thief» (ICG, 137). On the words which Jesus in this case addresses to this man: «*Today thou shalt be with me in Paradise*», Santayana remarks:

The human soul of Christ has become the instrument for that exercise of divine prerogatives... Christ speaks in his human person, moved by human feelings, yet armed with divine powers; and this can happen without any conflict or sense of duality in his will, because now, in his human soul, the part dominant is precisely the part always secretly flooded with divine light and knowledge (ICG, 138).

Santayana finds that the *idea* of Christ which is that of God in man is also exemplified in «the institution of the Eucharist [which] is perhaps the most remarkable of the miracles of grace» (ICG, 85-86). He says:

The *idea* of Christ is that of God in man: this *idea* may be exemplified in some degree in anybody, as we find it so perfectly exemplified in Christ; and the Eucharist is a sacrament by which through a material instrumentality always indispensable for spiritual contacts, we may absorb something more of that spirit and that form (ICG, 86). The mystery of this bodily presence of Christ in the Sacrament (ICG, 36), [by which] Christ leaves indeed a memorial of his body and blood, that have been offered up for the salvation of many (ICG, 49), is a symbol: not merely that the bread represents Christ's body and the wine his blood, but that the eating and drinking represent, and ought to induce, participation in his divinity (ICG, 144). For ultimately and essentially Christ himself is the whole life of the world. Unless we eat his flesh and drink his blood we cannot be his disciples, we cannot become what the spirit in each of us aspires to be. To feed us is to kindle that spirit in us (ICG, 164).

c. The «Divine» Spirit and the «Human» Psyche. From our general account of the idea of Christ or God in man with its illustration by the cursed fig tree, the repentant thief, and the institution of the Eucharist, we can understand that this idea concerns the union of the two natures of Christ, the divine and the human, as the phrase itself: God in man

expresses. These «Two Natures of Christ (God in Man)», which is the subject of this chapter, symbolize, according to Santayana, the two natures of the soul, «The Nature of Spirit and the Nature of Psyche», which was the subject of the third chapter of the first part. From this alone, then, we can see the correspondence of these two chapters, the third chapter of the first part with the third chapter of the second part. But, let us consider here in more detail this correspondence and symbolism.

As the person of Christ consists of two natures, the divine and the human, so «the *life* in the human body is distinguished into *spirit* and *psyche*. Spirit is feeling and thought. Psyche is plant and animal» (RM, 139). Now, as we have seen, according to the doctrine of a supernatural soul, «a striking analogy subsists between this union of the rational with the animal nature in man and the union of the divine with the human nature in the idea of Christ» (ICG, 227). This analogy, as Santayana remarks, is important to his inquiry, because it «helps to define the presence of God in man» (ICG, 227). However, for himself, there is between the union of the spirit with the psyche in man and the union of the divine with the human nature in the idea of Christ something more than a simple analogy; there is a real identity. «There is», he says, «a type of transcendental reflection... that can identify the idea of God in man with that of spirit incarnate anywhere: and that indeed is all that 'any soul' can reasonably care about» (ICG, 18).

In this sense, therefore, the «spirit» which has «become incarnate in Christ or more or less in all sensitive animals» (ICG, 50) is the same with «spirit in us [which] is identical with spirit everywhere, a divine witness, a divine sufferer, immortal and only temporarily and involuntarily incarnate in a myriad of distracted lives» (RS, 207). It is evident, then, that «the divine element especially incarnate in human existence is spirit» (RS, 297), «the light that burns» (ICG, 154), «the spark of divinity [which] lives always within us» (ICG, 154). For this reason, the spirit is characterized by Santayana as «divine», as on the other hand the psyche or the soul is characterized simply by him as «human» (RS, 208), «the human soul which obediently hears it [the divine spirit]» (ICG, 139), for this psyche is simply «an animal, the emblem and secret seat of a god» (ICG, 144), that is, of the spirit, which is «the god incarnate in his chosen animal» (ICG, 145). In other words, the animal psyche is characterized as human because she is the original and persistent part in man (ICG, 227), that part which makes man remain always the same soul (ICG, 247, 248); while the spirit, on the other hand, is characterized as divine because it is that «part of us» which, «though created, is created

in God's image, as if it were generated from him spontaneously, like Christ, who is his Word of his Thought» (ICG, 196). «The Father is the Creator, the Master, the Judge, not the cosmic process of evolution; and the true union to be established with him is moral and spiritual... Because the universe and our bodily life are not made in the image of God; it is not they that are our Father; only the spirit in us is of his race; and, when it conquers the flesh in us, it allows us to become really his children by a regeneration and readoption, like that of the Prodigal» (ICG, 198).

Now, after this symbolic interpretation of the idea of Christ or God in man by Santayana, that is, the divine and human nature in Christ as symbolizing the nature of spirit and the nature of psyche in man, we can understand better the way in which «this *idea* may be exemplified in some degree in any body, as we find it so perfectly exemplified in Christ» (ICG, 86); or rather the moral meaning of this idea as Santayana understands it. This meaning in him is absolutely consistent with his naturalism: «the idea of Christ itself [traced] to its roots in the natural life of that very spirit» (ICG, 252). But, about this meaning we shall talk in the last chapter where we shall give in detail Santayan's naturalistic interpretation of the idea of Christ or God in man. For the present, let us see about Christ's wills corresponding to his natures.

CHAPTER IV

THE DIVINE AND THE HUMAN WILL OF CHRIST

...Beneath the play of his adopted humanity, the will of Christ and that of his Father is absolutely one (ICG, 136). Where matter and spirit move in harmony spirit may adopt the Will in nature as the will of God... (RS, 80). At such moments the Will at work in the spirit becomes unanimous with the Will of nature working beyond the animal soul. In religious parlance, it becomes identical with the Will of God (RS, 66).

29. The Union of Christ's Will with God's Will in Heaven and the Submission of His Will to His Father's Will on Earth

As Christ has two natures, the divine and the human, which was our subject in the previous chapter, so he has also two wills, the divine and the human, which is the subject of this chapter. From this alone, then, it is plain that there is a correspondence between this chapter about the two wills of Christ and the previous chapter about the two natures of Christ. But, the correspondence which especially interests us in this essay from the point of view of the arrangement of the chapters, according to the symbolism of the life of spirit by the idea of Christ, is that between the parallel chapters of the parts. From this point of view, then, there is also in a stricter sense, since it concerns not the nature and the will but the will itself, a correspondence between this chapter, the fourth chapter of the second part, and the fourth chapter of the first part, the chapter entitled «The Will in the Spirit and the Will in the Psyche». Since the spirit in man is characterized by Santayana as «divine» and the psyche as «human», we can see how these chapters correspond to each other. For it is the symbolism of the two Wills in man (the

will in the spirit and the will in the psyche) by the two wills in Christ (his divine and his human will) that justifies this correspondence.

As we have seen in the fourth chapter of the first part, the «conflict between Will in the Spirit and Will in the rest of the psyche and of the world» (RS, 80) is a conflict between spirit and matter (RE, 11-12) so that «where matter and spirit move in harmony spirit may adopt the Will in nature as the will of God or more proudly and histrionically as its own will» (RS, 80). «At such moments the Will at work in the spirit becomes unanimous with the Will of nature working beyond the animal soul» (RS, 66). Now, concerning the will in the person of Christ, which is the subject of this chapter, we must remark in the first place that the harmony and unanimity of the divine and the human will in him has existed from the beginning; for his union with God, which «in his case was congenital and perfect» (ICG, 167), his union with the Father, which is ineffable, «has existed from all eternity» (ICG, 34). It is «the eternal will of the Father eternally accepted and shared by the Son» (ICG, 228), for «Christ is the Son of God: in heaven his will and his Father's will were identical (ICG, 131). So, «beneath the play of his adopted humanity, the will of Christ and of his Father are absolutely one» (ICG, 136), «his will being intrinsically identical with that of his Father» (ICG, 74). In an eternal sense, therefore, «the will of his Father» «is his own... primitive will» (ICG, 143).

After Schopenhauer's principal work: *The World as Will and Idea* Santayana, speaking of the Father and the Son in terms of Will and Idea (Logos), says that «in a deity, or in the universe seen under the form of eternity, the Logos is as primitive as the Will» (RS, 294). And this is the real meaning of the first verse of the Gospel according to St. John: *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God*. Commenting on these words of St. John, and keeping the terms of Schopenhauer, Santayana says in *The Idea of Christ or God in Man* that «the burden of the Will is clarified by the Word [Logos or Idea]; through the Word all things were made into what they are; and from the reflection of the Will in the Word proceeds the Spirit» (ICG, 65).

Now, Christ as «the Word made flesh» is, according to Santayana, «supreme spirit incarnate in a human creature» (RS, 203). As such Christ was sent by his Father into the world for a mission, to work for the salvation of man (ICG, 34). To this work Christ devotes all his earthly life, without sleeping and eating many times, for his food is to do the will of his Father who sent him into the world. About this Christ himself says: «I came down from the heaven, not to do mine own will, but the

will of him that sent me» (John 6:38), «and to finish his work» (John 4:34). So, to «the will of the Father», as Santayana remarks, «Christ was conforming» (ICG, 83), giving thus a perfect example to his disciples to do the same, for «those who do the will of his Father who is in heaven are his mother and brethren and disciples» (ICG, 70; cp. Luke 8:21). For this reason, he teaches them to pray by saying: «Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven» (Matt. 6:9-10; Luke 11:2).

According to these demands, as Santayana remarks, «we not only acknowledge but we desire that God should be sovereign, That his name should be hallowed, that his kingdom should come and that his will should be done are almost synonymous ideas, repeated after the Hebrew poetic model» (ICG, 127-128). So, «in the Lord's Prayer under the simple name of the *will of God*, which bears two different meanings», the one is this: «We pray that the will of God may be done on earth as it is in heaven, that his will may be done, and his kingdom may come. This clearly assumes that the reign of God on earth has not yet begun, and that his will is not done here» (ICG, 115; also RS, 244).

For this coming of God's kingdom, then, and the recognition of his will on earth as it is in heaven Christ worked in all his earthly life. Not to conquer and to establish a material kingdom as, for example, the Jews expected from the coming of the Messiah, for «he [Christ] will do nothing and plan nothing to re-establish the kingdom of Judah» (ICG, 46). His interest is in a spiritual kingdom, in an «esoteric spiritual transformation», in «a complete change of spirit» (ICG, 45; also 107). He wants to establish God's kingdom in the heart of men by their regeneration. In other words, his kingdom concerns the salvation of man, for «to be saved we must be born again» (ICG, 124).

Is not this salvation of man the will of his Father who sent him into the world, the mission that he entrusted to him? To this will of his Father and the plan laid out for him by his Father it was his will to obey (ICG, 58, 89). He accepts «a sacrificial mission that he must fulfil obediently» (ICG, 37), «the special mission laid upon himself, his humanity, his Passion, his apparent many-sided failure» (ICG, 205). «[He] moves towards his death, he does so voluntarily and with full foreknowledge, because such is the Father's will» (ICG, 34). So deep is his obedience to his Father's will that, as St. Paul remarks, too, he «became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross» (Philip. 2:8).

30. The Struggle within Christ and the Re-established Union with His Father's Will

It is indeed in his Passion and his death that we can see especially his obedience and submission of his will to his Father's will, the harmony of the will in his human nature and the will in his divine nature, but a submission and a harmony which approach to their summit through a terrible struggle and a division within himself.

In Christ's prayer in the Garden there are passionate repetitions of the same words: «*O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me: nevertheless not as I will, but as thou wilt*». And again: «*O my Father, if this cup may not pass away from me, except I drink it, thy will be done*». On these words, which express in the deepest sense the agony of Christ in the sleepless night of Gethsemane, Santayana remarks: «Here is submission, but submission to an alien force, against which the whole soul speaking is passionately contrary» (ICG, 131). And since, instead of praying like this, he could pray to his Father to send him twelve legions of angels to defend him; «nothing, then, was easier than to let that cup pass from him, if he himself had willed it. It was not his Father that denied anything or made it impossible: it was not submission to an alien will that cost him this terrible struggle. It was division within himself, as all moral struggle must be within oneself. It was the stirrings of his adopted humanity, or rather of its animal part, against his fixed purpose» (ICG, 131).

Since Christ, as the theologians tell us, «assumed a *perfect* humanity; a *complete* human psyche, as well as a human body», we must expect for Christ to have a «dramatic imagination» which, according to Santayana, is «one of the richest endowments of the human psyche». This imagination, then, which is so strong in the author of the parables, becomes «more vehement» in his agony of Gethsemane, in the «sleepless night, between solemn partings and a cruel death». Santayana says:

That the whole bitterness of his life — and it must have been full of bitterness — should have flooded the mind of Christ during that vigil of Gethsemane; that the human nature and the animal nature within him should have found a voice, regardless of reason and of divine decisions, follows from the assumed reality of his human nature... Harmony can reign in the soul only over a heap of ruins. Human nature, assumed in order to be sacrificed and to be transformed, then utters its last cry at the foot of the altar (ICG, 132).

Such a last cry of human nature in the Dark Night of the soul is the word uttered by Christ upon the cross: «*My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?*». This, says Santayana, is a cry of despair which engages the whole soul, a cry of the animal will, though to call it despair is inconsistent with the idea of Christ held by Santayana, let alone the Christian theologians, as the idea of a divine spirit incarnate but innocent. To despair is to sin. Yet Santayana commenting on this cry, remarks:

Why have I been created, cries the animal will, only to be tortured, only to be crushed? In the Garden, this primary will to live to conquer had masked itself in the vague phrase, *if it be possible*. Now fully realizing how possible, how easy, victory would have been, the same will shuts out all contrary reasons, and sees nothing but defeat and darkness. It is human, it is honest, it is noble; but the other currents in the soul, deflected for a moment, are bound presently to flow in, and raise the level to the normal fulness and apparent calm (ICG, 133).

It is the calm that finally comes after the terrible struggle, the calm that is expressed by the last word cited in *John* of the dying Christ: «*It is finished*», or better it is «*consummated*», «*consummatum est*», «*τετέλεσται*» which, according to Santayana, must be understood in this transcendental sense:

The appointed course has been run, the sacrifice made, it is time to awake from the agony of this voluntary dream. This action will not be drowned and merged in the flood of time; it is stamped distinct in eternity. The divine spirit gives the blessed signal; the human soul obediently hears it, and the head drops upon the breast (ICG, 139).

31. The Struggle within Man and His Harmony with God's Will

The idea of Christ as symbolizing the life of spirit concerns also the struggle and the harmony of the will in the divine nature with the will in the human nature of Christ, which in the case of man correspond to a similar situation. As Christ, who sees above the heads and behind the actions of his accusers, his judges, and his executioners «the overruling will of his Father, which is his own deliberate and primitive will» (ICG, 143), in the same manner we ourselves must also see above and behind the several passions, which scourge our soul, the overruling will

of God with which we must unite our own will for our deliverance from these passions.

The tragedies of passion in relation to the will of God is «in reality, a contrast in ourselves between passion and reason, will and free imagination, egotism and love of the truth» (ICG, 105). This love of the truth is «sympathy with the truth and the will of God» into which «only free imagination can bring us». «People without free imagination think that God should have created nothing but themselves» (ICG, 102). Such a thought is egotism for God created not ourselves only but all men and all things. It is, therefore, contradictory to the sympathy with the will of God. Concerning this sympathy in reference to parables which are characterized by «the dramatic imagination» of their author (ICG, 132), Santayana says the following:

Sympathy with the will of God shines everywhere in the parables. It includes dramatic sympathy with the will of men also, and of men of all sorts: there is insight into the mammon of iniquity no less than into simplicity and warmth of heart. The wicked and the foolish are not hated or reviled; they too are God's creatures; but their predicament and fate are exhibited unflinchingly, because in both cases it is sympathy with the will of God that underlies and controls sympathy with created things. The lilies of the field are loved for their beauty; yet no tears are shed because they must fade. Others will bloom tomorrow: or if not, in any case God lives in eternity, with all things present to his unclouded vision, where nothing can be lost (ICG, 103).

As we can see, then, from the above quotation, «sympathy with the will of God» includes «sympathy with the will of men also» as «God's creatures», with the will of all «natural beings» as «created things», even with «the lilies of the field», for «in any case God lives in eternity». That in the will of God Santayana includes all natural things is understood since we must not forget that God, for him, is a symbolic name for matter or nature and in this sense, therefore, either «the will of God or the nature of things» (ICG, 193), is the same. Yet even «in the New Testament», as Santayana remarks, «we find sometimes the authority of nature asserting itself, and accepted as describing the ultimate will of God» (ICG, 94). This can also explain, according to him, how Christ «dives in perfect harmony with the universal order of things and with the will of God. Yet by a free act and prompting of God's will within him he has submitted, as in a dream, to live also in a human body» (ICG, 211; RS, 204). Besides this submission of Christ to his Father's will in choosing an earthly life in a human body, Santayana finds also his moth-

er's, Mary's «human nature», «submissive from the beginning to the will of God» (ICG, 151). Man himself, too, in general, like Christ and his mother, must submit to the will of God. This submission and dependence on «the dominant power — call it God, fate, or matter —» (ICG, 122) «does not exclude, but envelops, his own will and initiative» (ICG, 43).

32. «Thy Will Be Done»

Concerning the submission to the will of God, it is interesting to see the second meaning that Santayana gives to the expression *Thy will be done* in the Lord's Prayer, besides the regular meaning we know. According to this second view of Santayana, then, «God's will is done everywhere: *for thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory for ever and ever*»¹. This means that God's will is done in the whole world as the kingdom of God, irrespectively of the fact that «the kingdom of God seems not yet to have come» (RS, 244), which is the other, the regular meaning of *Thy will be done* for, as Santayana remarks, «this postponement, too, must be according to God's will» (RS, 244). Thus, in the sense in which Santayana interprets *Thy will be done*, this «will of God... means whatsoever happens» (RS, 244). In this sense, therefore, the will of God coincides with the physical order. This «contingency in the physical order», as Santayana remarks, «is quite irrelevant to freedom in the spirit or to responsibility of a moral sort» (ICG, 192).

Talking of the will in general, Santayana distinguishes «the physical from the moral order»². In the latter sense «the will is free, not be-

1. ICG, 116. The italicized words in this passage are the conclusion in the Lord's Prayer (Matt. 6:13). As we said in the first section of this chapter the three first demands referred to God in this prayer are synonymous for Santayana, for all these three concern the kingdom of God, that is, the «desire that God should be sovereign» (ICG, 127-128).

2. ICG, 192. Compare Santayana's solution of this «ancient riddle», as he characterizes the problem of the freedom of the will, with that of Kant. As Santayana solves this problem by the distinction of «the physical from the moral order» so Kant does in his case by the distinction of objects into sensible objects or phenomena (*φανόμενα*) related to the pure reason and supersensible objects or noumena (*νοούμενα*) related to the practical reason. By the former he understands things which concern the physical order (natural necessity) and by the latter he understands things which concern the moral order (human freedom). So, according to this distinction between phenomena and noumena (or things-in-themselves, Ger. *Ding-an-sich*), we can, without any contradiction, think the same thing about for instance, the human soul, its will, «when phenomenal (in visible actions) as necessarily conforming to the law of

cause it is uncaused historically, but because it is a moral choice and allegiance by its very nature» (ICG, 193). Now, as the will in the physical order is related to Santayana's interpretation of *Thy will be done*, so the will in the moral order is related to the other, regular interpretation of it. According to this interpretation, then, the will of God means «that which ought to happen» (RS, 244). «This clearly assumes that the reign of God on earth has not yet begun, and that his will is not done here» (ICG, 115). In other words, «a part of the universe, and perhaps also of our own wills, is subject to him, but another part is not. We desire that this rebellious part may disappear; but the fact that it is rebellious seems to make it absurd to beg God to suppress it. We ought to address ourselves rather to the rebels, or to our own sinful side, and persuade them to change their wills so that we might all live happily at peace with God» (ICG, 128). Here, then, we are in the case of the will in the moral sense in which «events are determined in part by the free will of other agents» (RS, 244).

The fact that there are rebels and thieves in the world is a proof that there is free will, too. Not in the sense that «sin is, or was in the beginning an inexcusable misuse of free will» (ICG, 87), but in the sense that God respects their will, for otherwise he could change them by his infinite power and kindness. On the other hand, we would be right to deny the existence of free will if such men could not change themselves. But, happily there are many examples of great sinners who have become great saints. Such an example is that of the repentant thief who «prays to Jesus: *Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom*. And then the answer comes, complete and immediate: *Today thou shalt be with me in Paradise*» (ICG, 138; cp. Luke 23:42-43). Paradise comes into the soul of every individual and the kingdom of God begins within him from the moment of repentance. Such is also the case of the great sinner Mihail in *The Brothers Karamazov* who, after the confession of his «terrible murder» before the crowd that had gathered in his house to celebrate his birthday felt himself to be born again into heaven, as he said to Father Zosima, who had visited him during his last moments: «There was heaven in my heart from the moment I had done what I had to do...»³.

nature, and so far, *not free*, and yet, on the other hand, when belonging to a thing by itself, as not subject to that law of nature, and therefore *free*» (Kant's Preface to the Second Edition to the *Critique of Pure Reason*. See *Kant Selections*; ed. by Theodore M. Greene, U.S.A., Ch. Scribner's Sons [w. d.], p. 20).

3. Dostoievsky, *The Brothers Karamazov* (*Bratya Karamazovy*), Pt. II, Bk. VI, Chap. II, § iv.

Considering this connection of the kingdom of God with repentance, we can understand why John the Baptist as «a prophet of the kingdom» (ICG, 47) conjoins in his message this kingdom with repentance. «The message of John the Baptist», says Santayana, «was simple and puts in a few words the whole burden of the gospel: *Repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand*» (ICG, 106; cp. Matt. 3:2). «John the Baptist had preached repentance and a change of heart» (ICG, 52). «There must be a change of heart, a complete new birth of the soul, which baptism symbolized. And it is evident that if this purely moral and psychological metanoia [Gr. *μετάνοια*, repentance] was alone required, it opened the kingdom to any repentant Gentile, and of itself changed Judaism in principle into Christianity» (ICG, 47). This message of John the Baptist is also the message of Christ himself (Mark 1:14-15) who «had shown us into what the heart was to be changed. He had given in his life and maxims a perfect example of that consecration, humility, chastity and charity which were the very essence of regeneration» (ICG, 52). «This was the esoteric spiritual transformation wrought by the gospel within the official setting of the Jewish prophecies concerning the Kingdom of God» (ICG, 45). This is the view of all Evangelists who put also the whole burden of the gospel in this: «to repent, and to set our hearts on the Kingdom of Heaven» (ICG, 243).

This close connection of repentance or the change of heart with the Kingdom of God shows also the relation of repentance to *Thy will be done* in the Lord's Prayer, since this expression, according to Santayana, is synonymous to *Thy kingdom come* in the same prayer (ICG, 128). For this reason, as he remarks, we ought to address ourselves rather to our own sinful side and persuade ourselves to change our will (ICG, 128). In consideration of this we can understand then how *Thy will* concerns *our will*, for this change is something which has to do with our free will. Change of «our own sinful side» is a regeneration, a new birth, a creation of ourselves, for «everyone would in a manner be creating himself, and his ancestors must have been doing so from all eternity. In this would lie the free will of individuals, the very essence of life, and if we like to call it so, the stress of divine creation...» (ICG, 18). Santayana, of course, says the above words with the relation of creation to evolution in a biological sense in mind, but this is also true in a spiritual sense, for «at the same time the notion of God as creator rightens the moral relation between him and us» (ICG, 194). As the choice of God «was admittedly free» (ICG, 193) when he created the world as the best in his eyes (ICG, 194), this natural world which, according to Santayana's interpretation

of *Thy Will be done*, is the kingdom of God in which «God's will is done everywhere» (ICG, 116), so we must also create by a free choice the kingdom of God within us. This creation is a rebirth and a change of heart by repentance which is the necessary requirement of the kingdom of God. And this is the other, the regular meaning, which Santayana mentions besides the meaning that he himself gives, of *Thy Will be done* in relation to *Thy kingdom come* in the Lord's prayer, for «the kingdom of God is within you» (Luke 17:21).

Now, as in the case of the establishment of a material kingdom its partisans battle against and conquer their enemies, so we must also do for the establishment of the kingdom of God within us. «Because not all psychic movements are favourable to spirit, and many a dark passion crosses the inspiration that seem to come by the grace of God... we must battle against all the forces of our own nature that impede the perfect union of spirit in us with the will of our Creator and Father» (ICG, 252). The perfect union with the will of God can be attained by the spirit in us. «When conflicting movements divide the psyche and would destroy each other, the spirit, being hostile to nothing, feels the suasion of both and triumphs if they manage to unite in a relative euphoria and harmony» (ICG, 253). So, this harmony and union with God which is a submission of our will to his will or to the will in nature (RS, 80) is something which comes through the battle and the «conflict between Will in the spirit and Will in the rest of the psyche and of the world» (RS, 80). In other words, to submit our will to God's will we must first want it, for the change of ourselves, which is the necessary condition of our union and assimilation with God, is something which concerns our free will. In this sense, therefore, *Thy will be done* is the same with *our will be done*.

Such is the case, for example, with Christ who, «in choosing an earthly life, as in first choosing a world to be created», submitted *voluntarily* to his Father's will, for though his person was «divine and native to heaven», he «assumed a human body». Santayana says:

By a free act and prompting of God's will within him he has submitted, as in a dream, to live also in a human body, to suffer and to die; and then, with true sympathy and tenderness towards his assumed human body, he raises it from the grave, and will henceforth live in it in heaven (ICG, 211). [For this reason] submit; submit even to suffering and death in your innocence, as Christ, who was God himself made man, voluntarily submitted; and you will thereby be raised to heroic partnership with your master. You will learn to wish what he wishes, and to see things

as he sees them; and as he begins to dominate in you, you will begin to dominate with him (ICG, 188).

This domination, therefore, is attained by the union with Christ who «lives in perfect harmony with the universal order of things and with the will of God» (ICG, 214). «Moreover, the union of God in his case was congenital and perfect; while for us union with God can only be ideal, partial and attained by an imperfect assimilation of our will and our vision to those of God» (ICG, 167-168).

(To be continued)