

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 V

THE MEANING OF THE PARABLES AND THE MIRACLES OF CHRIST (WISDOM AND LOVE AND THEIR REFERENCE TO INTUITION AND UNION)

The idea of God as Lord and Lawgiver represents dramatically the contact of spirit with all external powers. Respect for these powers is wisdom, and Christ in his parables continually teaches us what are the ways of God in the government of the world (ICC, 250). — Miracles belong to the natural sphere, and manifest the hidden sympathies and harmonies between its parts (RS, 204). Miracles may therefore transform the object of religion from an object of prudent attention into an object of love (ICG, 80).

33. Of the Parables and Miracles in General as Two Aspects of Christ's Public Life: Teaching and Acts.

This chapter about the parables and the miracles of Christ is related to the previous chapters in this way: The parables as products of art are characterized, according to Santayana, by «dramatic imagination» which is the faculty that creates «genius in natures». Such a genius is Christ as one can see, besides other ways from his parables, too. In

* Continuation from *Theologia*, No 48, April-June 1977, p. 367.

this sense, therefore, as Santayana explains, «it is not necessary to prove that the author of the parables could not have lacked dramatic imagination» (ICG, 132). Now, as Santayana remarks, «one of the richest endowments of the human psyche is the dramatic imagination» (ICG, 132). In consideration of this we can understand that the parables have to do rather with Christ's humanity, his complete human psyche.

In opposition to the parables, the miracles, on the other hand, concern the divinity of Christ. All the miracles in the Gospels, and especially «the Resurrection, which is the central miracle of the whole history of Christ» (ICG, 159) «are set forth as signs of Christ's power: they, not any superiority in his life or doctrine, are the proofs that he himself offers of his divine commission» (ICG, 81). For this reason, «the Evangelists recount all these miracles for the sake of proving that Jesus was the Christ and the Son of God» (ICG, 84). In this sense, therefore, «all the miracles in the Gospels come to reward and confirm faith in Christ»¹.

This reference of the miracles to the divinity of Christ and of the parables to his humanity can show the relation of this chapter about the miracles and the parables to the previous chapters treating the two natures of Christ, the divine and the human. But, concerning this chapter, the fifth chapter of the second part, there is also a correspondence to fifth chapter of the first part: the correspondance which exists in general between the two parts of this essay in their parallel chapters as concerns the symbolism of the life of spirit by the idea of Christ or God in man. And it is this correspondance that interests us especially in this chapter, for it can explain the symbolic meaning of the parables and the miracles of Christ.

The parables and the miracles represent the two main aspects of the public life of Christ, his teaching on the one hand, and his acts on the other hand. As a teacher Christ is the Logos of God, as he is characterized in the beginning of the Gospel according to St. John. But, besides this term, as Santayana remarks, «we find in *John* a number of other terms, the Light, the Way, the Truth, that fall in well with the mediating office of Christ, as teacher and redeemer» (ICG, 32; cp. John 1:4, 8:12, 14:6). But, Christ «had taken the human form so that he might be not only a teacher or a ruler but also an example» (ICG, 49). «He had given in his life and maxims a perfect example of that consecration,

1. ICG, 83. The name of «Christ» is usually distinguished by Santayana from that of «Jesus», the former as referred to the divine nature of Christ, the latter to his human nature. In this passage, therefore, «faith in Christ» means faith in his divinity.

humility, chastity, and charity...» (ICG, 52). So, there are still other terms that seem to fit better the intimate essence of his person, such terms, for example, as Life and Love (ICG, 32; cp. John 14:6, 1 John 4:8,16). This love and charity, of course, is not «sentimental or romantic» (RS, 206) but practical, not the emotion of love but love of actions (RS, 239), such as we find this kind of love in the person of Christ in the Gospels and, besides him, in St. Paul, too, who «was a miracle of activity» (ICG, 50); for, «like creative love, this Christian charity is centrifugal: it must have real, not merely ideal, objects» (ICG, 216). To talk in the language of Kant, «this is *practical love*, and not *pathological*— a love which is seated in the will, and not in the propensions of sense — in principles of action and not of tender sympathy»². Especially in the case of Christ love is related to action. It was the work of love. «Christ's love», as Kierkegaard says, «was not an inner feeling, a full heart and what not, it was the work of love which was his life»³. Love, therefore, in the case of Christ is identical with his own life. For this reason, in *John*, according to Santayana, we find Christ characterized in terms of «Life and Love» (ICG, 32). Now, considering that the miracles are an expression of God's love for man (ICG, 80), and the parables, on the other hand, a teaching of wisdom expressed as a respect for the ways of God in the government of the world (ICG, 252), we can understand how the parables concern the teaching of Christ in the way that this teaching makes a man more wise and how the miracles concern the life or acts of Christ in the sense that Christian love is expressed in the works of love.

34. The Meaning of the Parables

a. *The Kingdom of Heaven as the General Theme of the Parables.*

This section, as referred to the teaching of Christ in general (and especially to his parables as a part only of his teaching), must also include

2. *Fundamental Principles of the Metaphysic of Morals* (Kant, *Selections*, op. cit., p. 278). See also *Critique of Practical Reason* Kant's *Selections*, p. 329.

3. *The Journals* (*A Kierkegaard Anthology*; ed. by R. Bretall, The Modern Library, New York, Random House [w. d.], p. 281). As we can see, then, Kierkegaard, like Kant, distinguishes love into sentimental (pathological) and practical. In the same passage we quoted from his *Journals* he says also: «... To the Christian love is the works of love. To say that love is a feeling or anything of that kind is an unchristian conception of love. That is the aesthetic definition and therefore fits the erotic and everything of that nature...» (*A Kierkegaard Anthology*, p. 281).

what Santayana treats in the chapter entitled «The Prophecies and the Precepts» (ICG, Pt. I, ch. viii). In other words, among the three offices that the theologians usually ascribe to Christ as a Prophet (Matt. 21:11) for his teaching, as a Great High Priest (Hebrews, 4:14), being at the same time the sacrificer and the victim on the altar of the Cross, and as a King for his reign in heaven and earth (Rev. 19:16), the first one, that is, the prophetic office of Christ, is that which this section concerns.

Now, about Christ as a Prophet Santayana says that «the characteristic of Christ among the prophets is that he was more than a prophet. He did more than interpret and vivify the given law; he was himself a new legislator, speaking with an authority superior to that of Moses» (ICG, 107). Christ's prophecies are connected with his precepts for «the precepts of Christ rest logically on the prophecies». «The precepts in the Gospels rest on questionable predictions for their compulsory force; but the predictions in turn spring from a profound change of allegiance in the heart, which also dictates the character of those precepts» (ICG, 107). Thus, «with this transformation [of the soul] the prophecies and precepts of Christ are exclusively concerned» (ICG, 125).

Concerning this, we can understand why Christ begins his public appearance as a teacher with the preaching of repentance: «Repent ye; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand». This prophecy, as we have seen, was also the message of John the Baptist. «Now after that John was put in prison, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God, and saying, The time is fulfilled, and the Kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe the gospel» (Mark 1:14-15). As J. B. Phillips remarks, «to accept this teaching by mind and heart does indeed require a *metanoia* (Gr. *μετάνοια*, repentance), a revolution in the outlook of both mind and heart»⁴. *Metanoia* means «a fundamental change of outlook»⁵, «a change of heart and mind»⁶. As such, therefore, *metanoia* or repentance is consciousness of one's sins and awareness of entering into a new life, as for example, in the case of the Prodigal Son who «came to himself» (Luke 15:17) and «arose, and came to his father» (Luke 15:20). In other words, repentance is a kind of self-knowledge which is the basis for the establishment of the Kingdom of God within us, that

4. J. B. Phillips, *New Testament Christianity*, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1956, p. 36.

5. *Ibid.*, p. 33.

6. *Ibid.*, p. 81.

is, the «salvation and bliss» as they «appear to be a purely mystical state of the soul, to be attained anywhere by anybody at any time». For this reason, as Santayana remarks concerning the Kingdom of God, the notion at first of the «personal conversion is indeed essential» «until at last we reach the notion of a transfigured life among the angels in heaven» (ICG, 92). Such is exactly the case with the Prodigal Son who after the consciousness of his sins leaves the «far country» where he «wasted his substance with riotous living» (Luke 15:13) and comes back to his father's house and land which in the parable allegorizes the Kingdom of God where «there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth» (Luke 15:10).

The special theme of this parable⁷, is, of course, repentance, but its general theme, as of all other parables, is the Kingdom of Heaven. Santayana says:

The general theme of the parables is the Kingdom of Heaven and its economy. But what is this Kingdom of Heaven or, as more properly rendered, this reign of God? The meaning is far from clear. It seems to pass from the actual government of God in nature and history, through prophecies of a better and more direct moral order to be established in the world at large, or perhaps only in a Church Militant subsisting painfully within that world; until at last we reach the notion of a transfigured life among the angels in heaven (ICG, 92). All the parables that illustrate the ways of nature, or the moral economy of society, encourage us to turn away from this world; not frivolously or in despair, but in the earnest hope of finding a better world. And in fact most of the parables prefigure the Kingdom of Heaven, and show us the way to reach it, if we have ears to hear and courage to follow. Though worldly wisdom will be well enough in its place here worldly wisdom is not exhibited for its own sake, as in ordinary proverbs and fables. It is set forth only as a hint, or a similitude, to suggest figuratively another order, revealed to us now only in religion, but in fact deeper, more primitive (ICG, 96).

This better world, as such the Kingdom of Heaven is considered in the parables, a world in which we find another order, more primitive and higher order, is illustrated by all the parables whose theme is this King-

7. In his book *The Idea of Christ in the Gospels* Santayana refers again and again to the Parable of the Prodigal Son (see pp. 27, 92, 97, 98, 197) as one of the best, if not the best, examples of all parables. In the first of the above mentioned pages, for example, speaking of Saint Luke as «a pious artist», he says the following about this parable: «The Parable of the Prodigal Son, for instance, is a little masterpiece, as noble and affecting as the best episodes in the New Testament».

dom. All these parables, then, were said by Christ to remind us that we belong to that Kingdom towards which we must always turn our eyes. In other words, in this world we have no independent existence, but we belong in reality to a different world.

b. The Meaning of the Parables as a Teaching of Wisdom. Such, as it was given above, is the real meaning of the Kingdom of Heaven in the parables as a different world, which concerns also the demand in the Lord's Prayer: «Thy kingdom come» and «Thy will be done on earth, as it is in heaven», meant by the will of God here «that which ought to happen» (RS, 244). But, from the point of view of Santayana, who understands God as a symbolic name for matter on which we depend and his Kingdom of Heaven as an illustration of the natural world to which we belong, this Kingdom, «monarchically and morally governed», is not a different world but this world, «the actual government of God in nature and history» (ICG, 92), in which the will of God, as «done everywhere» (ICG, 116) and as identical with «the economy of nature» and «the universal order of things» means «whatsoever happens» (RS, 244).

In view of this we can understand now Santayana's symbolic interpretation of God as an absolute monarch, which «is obviously mythical» (ICG, 101) or as a lawgiver in his Kingdom. He says:

In representing God as a monarch we symbolize the relation of mankind to the external conditions of life, and quicken our respect for the powers of nature. By representing God as a lawgiver and judge we fortify and sanction the lessons of the arts and the voice of wisdom and conscience (ICG, 183; also 188). [Thus] the idea of God as Lord and Lawgiver represents dramatically the contact of spirit with all external powers. Respect for these powers is wisdom, and Christ in his parables continually teaches us what are the ways of God in the government of the world. Earthly wisdom and virtue will establish our political covenant with God, and will suffice to save us materially (ICG, 252).

As we can see from Santayana's above interpretation of the parables, Christ in them teaches us the real wisdom which is expressed as a respect for the ways of God in the government of the world. These ways of God in nature are on his part a manifestation of his wisdom, for «a God who *makes* the world,... manifests his wisdom by fashioning it in ways that it could never have fallen into of its own accord» (ICG, 189). This wisdom of God was also manifested in Christ (ICG, 31) who in the beginning of the Gospel of St. John is characterized as the Word or Logos, a notion whose immediate source, according to Santayana, is Philo

Judaesus and the Alexandrian Jewish school of Wisdom or Sophia (ICG, 30). Christ, therefore, as the Logos of God, is the manifestation of the divine wisdom. «His wisdom spoke in parables and precepts» (ICG, 31). For this reason, the parables as figures of speech, characterized by truth to nature in the image, teach us wisdom in the respect for the ways of God which are identified by Santayana with the ways of nature, for «the Father' represents the realm of matter,... where the lilies of the field flourish...» (RS, 204).

This short parable or rather fable of the lilies of the field to which Santayana refers again and again (ICG, 91, 93, 103, 115, 198) is a characteristic example of the wisdom of God as it is manifested in nature. *Consider the lilies of the field, how they toil not neither do they spin; and yet I say unto you that even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these* (ICG, 19; see Matt. 6:28-29; Luke 12:27). Here, as Santayana remarks, «we have set before us a short fable, contrasting the untroubled life in nature with the hectic life of the human world» (ICG, 91). «So in the appeal to the lilies of the field, no one can fail to feel how trustfully they come to perfection; and how, in contrast to ourselves, they live without care» (ICG, 93). «The picture serves to persuade us that in this respect the animal is less perfect than the vegetable» (ICG, 91).

The comparison of the lilies with Solomon concerns, of course, their array. But this comparison could be made also regarding their wisdom, for the name of Solomon as «wiser than all men» (I Kings 4:34) reminds us of the wisdom that «God gave Solomon» (I Kings 4:29, 5:12; 2 Chronicles 1:12). And he is Solomon that said: «The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom» (Proverbs 9:10). This wisdom for Santayana is identical with the study of God's ways in nature. Commenting on this proverb, he says: «The fear of the Lord was the beginning of wisdom, and the study of his ways, observable in nature and history, was wisdom itself» (ICG, 94; also RS, 60). «The fear of the Lord would still seem to be the end as well as the beginning of wisdom, and wisdom to be the crown of life, rather than vision or love» (ICG, 108).

c. The Relation of Wisdom to the Truth and Intuition. The wisdom whose beginning, according to Solomon, is the fear of the Lord is characterized by Plato as the philosopher's love of «the highest of human things»⁸. For this reason, the pleasures which are approved by the lov-

8. *Protagoras*, 352d.

er of wisdom and reason are the truest⁹. The name «philosopher» (Gr. φιλόσοφος) itself means the lover of wisdom¹⁰. And, since the aim of the philosopher, according to Plato, is the truth, we can understand how this truth is akin to wisdom¹¹. But, if the philosopher as the lover of wisdom has as his aim the truth, God is wisdom itself and also the truth itself. «*The Truth*», Santayana says, «is one of the names of God, and one of the most philosophical» (ICG, 243). In this sense, therefore, «the truth is perfectly well known to God, and so to the Word, who is the very utterance of that truth in God; but the truth is not open to investigation by a reasoning mind; it is only in God, and by union with God, that it can be discovered» (ICG, 101). And it is in many of the parables that this absolute prerogative of God appears, which places him and his decrees beyond the reach of our reason (ICG, 101). But, truth as beyond reason is something which concerns intuition in the field of which we find ourselves now. Let us see, then, this relation of the truth to intuition in Santayana.

According to him, the truth is «a segment of the realm of essence» (ICG, 243). But, since essence is the theme of intuition (ICG, 247), then the relation of truth to intuition is evident. In this sense, therefore, the spirit from the beginning looks out upon the realm of truth, where all things are eternally pictured (ICG, 253), in the same manner as the spirit in its outlook rests in essences (RS, 49), too. This address of the spirit to qualitative being, the eternal essence, as well, as to the realm of truth (ICG, 253), which is a segment of the realm of essence, is realized by intuition, for «the perfect function of spirit is pure intuition», whether of «a breath of morning air or the sum total of possible knowledge» (RS, 92).

Such moments of intuition at its top are characterized by Santayana as «the wisest moments of life» (RS, 93), as such is the case with the saints, «who only by their intelligence and intuition would know that he [Christ] was identical with the son of God, and that God dwelt in him» (ICG, 137). In this sense, the idea of Christ is that of God in man, «the presence of God in man» as «the complete triumph of spirit over the other elements of human nature» (ICG, 253), «the victory of the Lamb in the Apocalypse over the Beast and over Babylon» (ICG, 153), the perfection of holiness (ICG, 253) we attain as free care under the reign of God (ICG,

9. *Republic*, IX, 582a-583a.

10. *Ibid.*, VI, 484a-486e; see also IX, 581a-b.

11. *Ibid.*, VI, 485c.

93; cp. 167). «In such supreme moments the mind and heart turn from the pursuit and cares of life to the understanding of it, from personal preoccupations to the intuition of truth, with a purified joy in the beauty of that truth» (ICG, 153).

35. The Meaning of the Miracles.

The other aspect of the public life of Christ, besides that of his teaching (parables), is his acts, that is, his miracles. If the parables in their general theme concern the Kingdom of Heaven in another, different world, the miracles concern this Kingdom in this world, for «they are parts of one great visitation, the coming of God to earth, the Kingdom of Heaven realized» (ICG, 61).

a. Miracles as an Expression of Love (God's Love of Man and Man's Love of God). As Santayana remarks, «the Gospels are a tissue of miracles, and so are the inner lives of the saints. We perfectly understand *why* they occur, something never to be understood regarding ordinary events» (ICG, 81). For this reason, «many people would like to eliminate the miracles from the Gospels. Nothing is easier than to disbelieve them: they may be illusions founded on ignorance of the secret workings of nature» (ICG, 79). Considering that «the miracles in the Gospels are set forth as signs of Christ's power... and proofs of his divine commission» (ICG, 81) and «of divine authority, and not mere inexplicable facts» (ICG, 80), we can understand that «to eliminate them from Christ's life would be to take the soul out of it» (ICG, 81). However, though for Santayana himself «logically *everything is possible*» (ICG, 79), he does not wish to discuss their validity from the metaphysical point of view; for, as in the person of Christ in general, so in his miracles, Santayana is not interested in them as real and historical events and therefore in their literal interpretation, but in their moral meaning and therefore in their symbolic interpretation. But, what is the moral meaning of the miracles and what is the symbolic idea hidden by them?

As in the parables, according to Santayana's interpretation, the power of nature is symbolized by the name of God whom the wise man fears and respects, studying and learning his ways in the government of the world, so in the case of the miracles we have also a symbolism by the name of God. This symbolism is that of the *Good* or the divine love of our good that every heart loves. But, let us see how Santayana explains this by his own words:

The essence of a miracle is that, in breaking through the superficial routine of events, it manifests the real power that brings them about, and proves that this power is profoundly human. It is the power of *The Good* or divine love of our good. It is the power of God, which nature cannot control, but which faith and prayer may prevail upon to succour us. Miracles may therefore transform the object of religion from an object of prudent attention into an object of love. So long as God personifies only the power of nature, the wise man will fear him, respect him, learn his ways, and thriftily profit by them in all the arts. But when God personifies *The Good*, the heart loves him already without having named him, and the new revelation comes only in the miracle that *The Good* should prove to be also the power that ultimately governs everything. Such is the atavistic message, the glad tidings, brought by Christ. The Gospels are a tissue of miracles... They happen for our sake, to help and to save us; and that is the wonder (ICG, 80-84).

As we can see then from the above interpretation of Santayana in the miracles the power of God that ultimately governs everything personifies *The Good* or divine love of our good. In this sense, therefore, the miracles transform the object of religion into an object of love. They are expressions of divine love, «miraculous manifestations of divine charity» (ICG, 67). And such manifestations are all the miracles of Christ though «there are some miracles reported in the Gospels that are not works of mercy dictated by compassion for human ills, but rather breaks in those clouds, glimpses of the other world and its mysteries» (ICG, 85). Such a miracle is, for example, the Transfiguration, granted only to chosen disciples and «up into a high mountain apart by themselves» (Mark 9:2), or like that miracle he made in the night when he walked upon the sea (Matt. 14-23-33). «But in public, if a miracle is imposed upon him, it is almost always by the power of his secret pity and kindness, which he cannot bear to resist» (ICG, 84).

This power of pity and kindness, this magic virtue in Christ, personifies, according to Santayana's symbolic interpretation of the idea of Christ, the sympathetic texture of nature. Speaking of this power or virtue going out of Christ in such cases, Santayana remarks:

Such magic virtue, like the healing power of the air in certain places, or of certain herbs and waters, belongs to the sympathetic texture of nature, and is surprising only when we come upon it unexpectedly or in an exceptional case (ICG, 84). The sympathetic texture of nature conjoins these phenomena in a way we have

not traced; and custom leads us to expect the conjunction in the sphere where it is familiar, while in any other sphere it seems miraculous or impossible (ICG, 82).

In view of this interpretation of Santayana we can understand that «miracles belong to that natural sphere, and manifest the hidden sympathies and harmonies between its parts» (RS, 204).

What Santayana means by sympathy and harmony between the parts of nature is «the notion of a love that creates or animates all nature», «the inner vitality in matter generating ever fresh transformations», the love which looks «towards the world's life» (ICG, 213). In other words, this sympathy or love as a «vital aspiration» is «Eros, which is its ancient poetic name» (RS, 242), «like the Eros of the ancient poets Hesiod and Empedocles»¹². «Eros in the Greek poets and philosophers», as Santayana explains, «represented *natura naturans*, the potentiality in matter working as in a seed and unfolding itself in every form of life» (ICG, 213). So, «it is only by poetic license that the unfolding of *natura naturans* in evolution can be called love» (ICG, 213). Miracles, therefore, are manifestations of this creative love, of Eros of the Greek poets and philosophers, of the *natura naturans*.

This last, that is, the representations of Eros as *natura naturans* reminds us also of Spinoza's God, for this *natura naturans* in him is God himself since it refers to his attributes in opposition to *natura naturata* which refers to his modes¹³. However, God in Santayana is understood in a different sense from that in Spinoza, for in the former God is a mythical name for matter. This symbolism of matter by the name of God in Santayana is very important in order to understand his interpretation of miracles as manifestations of the sympathetic texture of nature, that is, the love that creates all nature. Since this nature or matter,

12. «A Long Way Round to Nirvanæ» in *The Works of George Santayana*, New York, Ch. Scribner's Sons, 1937, Vol. X, pp. 219-220. Eros (Gr. ἔρως) means love. In Empedocles' system, for example, as M. Nahm remarks, «Love [*φιλότης*] and Strife [*νεῖκος*] are transferred [from the observation of man] to the universe at large and are the causes of change and motion. Love causes the mixture, of the elements, Strife causes their separation» (*Selections from Early Greek Philosophy*; ed. by M. C. Nahm, *op. cit.*, p. 128). See also what Empedocles himself says in his *Fragments*, Bk. I, 66-70, 79-81, 102-104, 110, 171-179, 190-195; Bk. II, 247-250 (*Selections from Early Greek Philosophy*, pp. 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 136).

13. Spinoza talks of the distinction between *natura naturans*, which refers to the attributes of God, from *natura naturata*, which refers to the modes of God, in his essay *God, man, and His Well-Being*, chs. VIII, IX (Spinoza, *Selections*, *op. cit.*, pp. 80-82) and in his *Ethics*, Pt. I, Schol. of Prop. XXIX (*Selections*, p. 126).

according to Santayana, must be understood under the symbolic name of God, it is evident that the miracles, as manifestations of the creative love of nature, are in a symbolic sense expressions of God's love. And this is what he means when he says that the essence of a miracle is that it manifests the power of God which is the power of *The Good* or divine love of our good. In this sense, therefore, God personifies *The Good* and the heart loves him without having named him (ICG, 80).

An important thing, therefore, to remember is the correspondence of God to the realm of matter on which Santayana bases his interpretation of the miracles as an expression of the Good or divine love. «The Father», he says, «represents the realm of matter, where the sun shines on the just and on the unjust...» (RS, 204). What Santayana means by «the sun shines on the unjust no less than on the just» is the «fatherly impartiality by which all things are perpetually fostered and renewed» (ICG, 115). So, following this lead, the spirit in us in «its essence is to see and to love all things impartially, as does God who created them» (ICG, 120), «to love nature, and ourselves who are parts of nature, as God loves us, without exclusiveness or injustice» (ICG, 217).

b. Charity or Love for Our Neighbour. In the idea of Christ God's love for us and for the world in general is the «motive for the incarnation of Christ and for his mission and Passion » (ICG, 213). «It was God's love for the world that sent his son into it» (ICG, 100; also 140,147-148). Like God, Christ, who submitted to his Father's will and became a man to save men, loved the world in the same sense, too. In reality, since Christ is the Son of God his love for the world is not radically different from the fatherly love of it in the Creator (ICG, 215) who loves the world he created (ICG, 214). «It is such love as God in man can feel for the world. The incarnation is subtly involved in the existence of charity» (ICG, 216). For it is this incarnation «that moved God, in the person of his Son, to a new Christian love for the world, which is called charity» (ICG, 215). Thus the love that moved the Creator to make the world, moved him also in the incarnation of Christ; only with this difference that this new love for the world takes the Christian name of charity. In both types of love, therefore, the object is the world which is «real, not merely ideal» (ICG, 216). In this sense, therefore, Santayana gives two «possible meanings of 'God is love'» (RS, 239; 1 John 4:8,16). In one sense God is power (Will of the Father) involving love as a selection and preference of what it shall do. «The Book of Genesis represents God as an artist, loving the world in idea before he had brought it into existence... yet

the artist, even if disappointed in his work, remembers the Platonic Idea (the Word or the Son) that first inspired him, and still feels its magic» (RS, 239). God is love, on the other hand, in the sense that he «has resumed his labours, this time not to create the world but to redeem it. The absolute artist has been softened into a forgiving father, a miraculous physician, a patient teacher, even a propitiatory victim. God's love of the world has become charity» (RS, 239). It is «in the person of his Son» that this love of God takes the Christian name of charity: «no longer the artist's love of self-expression or of the fascinating variety of possible forms, but rather love of something missed, of something defeated and unexpressed» (ICG, 215).

We said that the sympathetic texture of nature or the love that creates all nature is something similar to Eros of the ancient Greek poets and philosophers. Now, according to Santayana, «we may say that charity is a form of Eros». Eros, of course, is characterized by its blindness. But, if we remove this blindness from Eros, then «Eros is charity itself». In other words, «what turns Eros into charity is reason, recollection, comparison, justice» (RS, 242). Charity, therefore in opposition to Eros, is characterized by «rationality» (RS, 230). Eros is a kind of natural love and as such concerns rather the psyche, while charity is a spiritual love which has to do with the spirit. According to this distinction in the human soul in general between psyche and spirit and their level of moral life, here natural, there spiritual (RS, 229), Santayana distinguishes also love in general into vital sympathy and charity. When «the vital dependence of spirit on nature involves responsive affection towards nature on the part of spirit» (RS, 228), then this love is vital sympathy. And when this «sympathy with the world reaches the spiritual level it receives a Christian name and is called charity» (RS, 229). In view of this distinction we can say that the Old Testament is characterized rather by vital sympathy and the New Testament by charity. The representative type of the former kind of love is David and of the latter Christ. Santayana asks:

Who was the rational hero of the Jews in their palmy days? David, a comely bold shepherd, ready with his sling and his harp, faithful in friendship, adulterous in love, chieftain of a marauding band, become king by popular acclamation... That is the sort of man that men spontaneously love, and that they would love to be. Compare that figure with Christ, that life with Christ's life, and you see that the Christian love of mankind is not natural love at all, but something else, charity. It is divine compassion, based on perfect unprejudiced insight into the helplessness of man, his

weakness, his childish passions, his horrible sufferings and his pitiful end (ICG, 124-125).

Christ had given in his life a perfect example of charity (ICG, 52). His incarnation is the personification of charity itself. It is a charity for the humanity and the human nature that he assumed by his incarnation and birth. In this sense, therefore, this charity which shines from the first pages of the New Testament is a fulfilment of the vital sympathy which characterizes the Old Testament. So, «we may say of Christ's human nature what he said about the Mosaic law, that he came not to destroy but to fulfil it. And this was singular charity and lack of prejudice on his part, when he was naturally the Son of God» (ICG, 121). «When he became man, he did not, as God, adopt our distinctions, yet he did not abolish them in us as man. Hence the compassion in Christ for our necessities, and his scorn of our pretensions. His love is not craving but sympathy, not admiration but pity. And this pity and sympathy are the more profound in that he understands our nature and possibilities far better than we do» (ICG, 100; also 112).

Christ expresses his divine compassion for our necessities, both corporal and spiritual, by miracles in reference to the body and by a profound understanding in reference to the spirit, by corporal works of mercy and by spiritual charities. At first he «healed all that were sick: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Isaiah the prophet, saying, Himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses» (Isaiah 53:4 Matt. 8:16 17;). In this sense, therefore, Christ is the Good Samaritan who «is really more a man of the world» (ICG, 97). For his «kindness to a stranger» the Samaritan «is more spiritual than the Pharisee» (RS, 205) who «is formal and self-righteous, and not animated by a genuine love of God and of man» (ICG, 49; also 97). Like the Samaritan and unlike the Pharisee, Christ was inspired by this genuine love which «prompted those continual acts of mercy which broke through the disguise of his divinity» (ICG, 46). He, as a supreme Spirit incarnate, «being at once vital and disinterested, cannot but be merciful. Wounds, weakness, conflicts are the immediate evils; when these are healed, we may turn to higher things» (RS, 205). So, «to corporal works of mercy Christ adds spiritual charities: patience, forgiveness, understanding, defence of the heart against cant, hypocrisy, isolation, and the insanities of conscience» (RS, 206). The parting word between the corporal works of mercy and the spiritual charities rather is: «Sin no more»¹⁴.

14. RS, 205. «Sin no more» are the words that Christ addressed to the para-

In the case of Christ «we see his charity especially going out to outcasts and to sinners» (ICG, 140) «...in spite of his absolute holiness, or because of it, she shows a spontaneous sympathy... with sinners, with sufferers of all sorts, even with devils» (ICG, 251). He expresses his kindness towards the sinners by healing both their body and their soul. «He is full of compassion for physical trials, especially for the sort of madness which is a physical derangement or possession by a devil. The sins of the flesh, too, he forgives as readily as he heals its miseries; neither can disgust him with being a man» (ICG, 122). Christ, inspired by a superhuman sense of the true good, «is not merciless to the alien; he is gentle to the sinner» (ICG, 107). Christ's love for sinner does not mean, of course, that he loves their passions; «only to forgive them» (ICG, 216). But, there is also an unpardonable sin. «Christ tells us of a sin that shall never be forgiven, the sin against the Holy Ghost» (ICG, 124; Matt. 12:31). But, «what is the Holy Ghost? Is it not perhaps the very spirit of love and understanding that forgives every sin?... The unpardonable sin is the refusal to pardon»¹⁵.

Christ, moved by charity, forgives all sinners, even his executioners. «He is aware of his mission and in the midst of his sufferings renews his charity, understands the circumstances of his brutal executioners, forgets his wrongs, and forgives: *Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do*» (ICG, 136; Luke 23:34). Doing this, Christ gives us the best example of love for our enemies, and sinners generally. For all men, like him, «should forgive, tolerate, and love one another, even their enemies» (ICG, 123). For this reason, Christ taught us to pray by saying: «*Forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors*» (ICG, 117; Matt. 6:12). So, «forgive us, we must say, as we forgive» (ICG, 129). Our broth-

lytic of Bethesda after his healing (John 5: 14). Because sometimes the cause of a disease is the sin, Christ heals in this case the sick man by the forgiveness of his sins. Such is the case, for example, of the healing of the paralytic to whom Christ said: «Thy sins be forgiven thee» (Matt. 9:2, 5-6; Mark 2:5,10). In this sense, Santayana says, «a spiritual man may say: 'Take up thy bed and walk'. That is the psyche speaking to the psyche. But when he says, 'Thy sins are forgiven thee', the spirit is speaking to the spirit» (RS, 283).

15. Very interesting indeed is this interpretation of Santayana as concerns «the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost» which is interpreted by others as «unrepentance» such as is the case, for example, of the Scribes and the Pharisees who, though they saw by their eyes so many miracles of Christ as signs and proofs of his divinity, never believed in him as the Son of God, never converted their heart in order to be saved by him (Matt. 13:14-15). However, what Christ means exactly by the unpardonable sin against the Holy Ghost is doubtful.

erly love, therefore, must be extended to our enemies, as Christ exhorts us: «*Love your enemies, bless them that hate you, pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you. In a word, resist not evil*»¹⁶.

Concerning this kind of love we find especially in the Gospel according to Saint Luke «a tendency to conciliate enemies and diffuse an atmosphere of prosperity and peace » (ICG, 27), for it is this love for our enemies that «brings peace, if not always materially, at least ideally» (ICG, 216). In this sense, «charity also brings peace in regard to ourselves» (ICG, 217). And this peace is the best gift that Christ can leave to his followers (ICG, 217). So, the «one blessing is complete peace within oneself; the other blessing is ready understanding and sympathy towards all other beings» (ICG, 119). This latter, sympathy towards all other beings, which are «God's creatures» includes also «sympathy with created things», and «natural beings», and therefore «sympathy with the

16. ICG, 119; see also Matt. 5:39,44. Especially Tolstoy, in whom love is the real good, «the greatest good to man» (L. N. Tolstovo, *O Zhizni*, Ch. XXII. See *On Life and Other Essays on Religion* by Leo Tolstoy; tr. by Aylmer Mande, The World's Classics, London, Oxford University Press, 1959, p. 91), puts his emphasis on the love for our enemies, after the teaching of Christ. Referring to this kind of love, he says in *War and Peace* the following by the mouth of Prince Andrew: «What love! Not the egotistic love, but the love as I felt it for the first time in my life when I saw at my side my enemy dying, and I loved him... This is the essence of love...» (L. N. Tolstovo, *Voina i mir*, Bk. III, Pt. III, § 32. A. Maude's translation). It is by the same «look which goes straight into the soul» that Tolstoy sees «God in each soul» through the eyes of another of his heroes, too, Prince Nekhlyudov, in *Resurrection* which book, for this reason, was regarded by Romain Rolland, as «one of the most beautiful poems of human compassion, — maybe the most beautiful» (R. Rolland, *Viè de Tolstoï*, Paris, Librairie Hachette, 1921, p. 154). How in this book, says R. Rolland «all are seen, basenesses and virtues, without weakness, with an intellectual calm and brotherly compassion... Not any severity, even for the executioners. 'My Lord, forgive them; for they know not what they do'...» (*Ibid.*, pp. 150, 151). This love, extended even to enemies, is related to what Christ said: «Ye resist not evil» (Matt. 5: 39, 44) which in a fresh interpretation Tolstoy's *Resurrection* especially concerns. In this non-resistance to evil is to be found the basis of Tolstoy's moral doctrine. As O- Lourié remarks, «all the moral philosophy, all the high virtue of the real Christianity consists, for Tolstoy, in the formula: Resist not evil by violence. This is the pivot of his theory» (Ossip-Lourie, *La Philosophie de Tolstoï*, Paris, Librairie Félix Alcan, 1931, p. 102). «The great moral 'commandment' which is at the basis of Tolstoy's concrete ethics [is] non-resistance to evil» (B. Zenkovsky, *Histoire de la Philosophie russe*, traduit par C. Andronikoff, Paris, Gallimard, 1953, Tome I, p. 435; see also p. 432). «'Do not resist evil by violence but overcome it by kindness', was the foundation stone of Tolstoy's social creed» (*On Socialism by Tolstoy*; tr. from the Russian by Ludvig Perno, London, W. C., 1936, pp. 8-9).

will of God» (ICG, 103), for God is a symbolic name for nature. Thus, this blessing concerns in general the love of nature and the world, while the other blessing, that is, peace with ourselves concerns the love for «ourselves who are parts of nature» (ICG, 217).

c. Love for Ourselves. Speaking of love for ourselves, Santayana does not mean, of course, as we said in the corresponding chapter of the first part¹⁷, the selfish love of ourselves, that is, egotism, which is blind; nor does he mean what the psychologists call the instinct of self-preservation. There is not any doubt that everybody has such love for himself because this love is something natural and inevitable, and therefore to love in such a manner «we do not anything more than the others» (Matt. 5:47). This kind of love is like the love of the publicans. But «to love your enemies», as Christ says, this is something more than the brothers to their brothers do, something more than natural human love does. This kind of love is divine love; it is imitation of the love of God who «maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust» (Matt. 5:45).

Christ, referring in general to the love of our neighbour, talks of the love of man's enemies, in the same manner. Treating of the love of ourselves, we can talk also about our soul's enemies. But, has our soul enemies? And if it has, must we also love them as in the case of one man for another? When the soul loses its unity and is divested of itself by the brutal desires and the violent passions which roar like wild animals and burst like destructive storms threatening to ruin everything good and beautiful within us, are not these desires and passions our worst enemies, and is not this contrary condition which they bring in our interior world called anarchy? This is that of which St. Paul complains about himself when he says: «What I would, that do I not; but what I hate, that do I... The good that I would I do not; but the evil which I would not, that I do». What St. Paul hates is «another law in his members, warring against the law of his mind, and bringing him into captivity to the law of sin which is in his members» (Rom. 7:15,19,23). These members are, as he explains generally in another epistle, «the members which are upon the earth; fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affection, evil concupiscence, and covetousness, which is idolatry» (Colos. 3:5).

These are the desires and passions which are also for Santayana the enemies of the spirit, the enemies which make spirit «to oppose or

17. See Pt. I, Ch. V of this essay (p. 45-46).

contradict its own nature » (RS, 165), in one word, the *devil* by whose personage Santayana understands «any enemy of spirit that is internal to spirit» (RS, 165). But, what? Must we love our desires and passions which bring this contradiction in our soul and which, for this reason, are the worst enemies of our spirit? Of course not! In this case, in opposition to that of one man's love for another, we must hate these enemies which spread hatred among the elements of our soul. And, here, the true love of ourselves can be proved, that is, the love which protects our soul from its enemies and reconciles its two contradictory components, the spirit and the psyche. In other words, real and objective love for ourselves is what Santayana means by «inner integrity» which is «the first condition of unity with anything else» (RS, 224).

This real love for ourselves with the love for God and the love for our neighbour constitute the three aspects of love. According to Christ the two great commandments on which all the law and the prophets hang are these: «Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself» (Matt. 22:37-40; Mark 12:30-31; Luke 10:27; also ICG, 108). This latter, «as thyself», means that a necessary presupposition of the love for our neighbour is the love for ourselves because we cannot love our neighbour without loving, at first, ourselves. Thus this love for ourselves is the third love besides love for God and love for our neighbour¹⁸.

Now, concerning these three kinds of love, Santayana agrees in general with Christianity on the love for ourselves and our neighbour (charity), but not on the love for God. In Christianity the love for our neighbour is a natural consequence of the love for God who is the common father of all men; therefore, according to St. John, « he who loveth God loves his brothers also» (I John 4:21). And this is what we mean by charity in the Christian sense. It is the «divine love for man or the act of loving all men as brothers because they are sons of God».¹⁹ «For this reason», as Santayana remarks, «the theologians teach that the first and ultimate object of charity is God himself» (ICG, 215). But, charity

18. Similarly to these aspects of love is also the division of duties in the several moralists. Tolstoy, for example, divides his «duties into three kinds—duties to myself, to my neighbours. and to God» (L. N. Tolstovo, *Ynost*, Ch. V. See *Childhood, Boyhood and Youth* by Leo Tolstoy; tr. by L. and A. Maude, World's Classics, London, Oxford University Press, 1957, p. 236).

19. This is the definition of charity as we find it in *Webster's Dictionary*.

in Santayana is without love for God, for he rejects this kind of love of the «false erotic symbols» (RS, 202) as he characterizes it in the case, for example, of the Mystics. And this is understood, since God in Santayana's materialistic system is a symbolic name for matter or nature. The love for God in his system is replaced by the love for nature. It is a love for the world in both its meanings, that is, love for the universe and for mankind.

As we can see, then, the real Christian love is mutilated by Santayana to form his love which is essentially different from that of the New Testament. It is not charity in the Christian sense, that is, love for our neighbour in connection with love for God. His love is cut off from the divine love which is the essence of Christianity. His love is not also that of God, that is, the love of the first great commandment, but the love only for our neighbour, the love of the second commandment. It is charity, but charity as he understands it.

d. Love as the Great Bond of Union (Union in Prayer). Charity in Santayana, as in Christianity, too, is very important in the life of spirit since «its own perfection consists in charity, in the perception and love of possible perfections in all other things» (RS, 205). The double work of mercy proper to Christian charity refers to «natural disease» and to «guiltiness», that is, its double work is «to extricate spirit from inner madness as well as from outward oppression» by recovery of «health and morality» on which «spirit is based» (RS, 206). In the Gospels this extrication of spirit from outward oppression or natural disease and inner madness or sense of guilt is realized by the miracles of Christ and by his forgiveness of sins. «The body is to be accepted and preserved... He [Christ] was tender towards the body, cured all its diseases, brought it to life again, fed it in multitudes by repeated miracles...» (ICG, 75). And in those miracles of the paralytics, for example, Christ heals, besides the body, the souls, too. In such cases, then, addressing the sick man, he says: «Thy sins be forgiven thee» (Matt. 9:2,5-6; Mark 2:5,10). His advice is: «Sin no more» (RS, 205; John 5:14) which is «the parting word» between the health of the body and the health or morality of the soul. This latter, the forgiveness of sins and the beginning of a new life, is what we call in the Christian sense redemption or regeneration which naturally is connected with «the miracles worked by Christ during his mission; for it is a humane characteristic of Christianity that it begins with works of corporal mercy and then, if possible, proceeds towards a spiritual regeneration (ICG, 153).

This spiritual regeneration or salvation of our souls is something which has to do with the unity of ourselves, our «intergrated self» (ICG, 145-146). «Man», as R. Bretall remarks on Kierkegaard's work, *The Sickness unto Death*, «is not a unity, but a disunity; he is not his true self, which means that he is not a *self* at all»²⁰. This disunity of the self is indebted to the corruption of human nature by what the Church calls *sin* or what Kierkegaard prefers to call *despair*²¹. In Santayana this sin, however, is the consent of spirit to «the Flesh, the World, and Devil» (RS, 119), these three, which are the «chief agencies» in its distraction. So, liberation of the spirit from this distraction has as a result «inner integrity» which is «the first condition of unity with anything else» (RS, 224). We must first become united with ourselves and then with the world. But, how can we attain this union? Santayana says that «the great bond of union is love» (ICG, 141). So, the unity within the spirit itself and with other spirits and the world in general is realized by love. In this sense, therefore, we must love ourselves and the world.

We can see, then, that, as in the case of love for ourselves, for our neighbour, and for God, so in the case of union we can also talk of three aspects of union, that is, union within ourselves, union with the world, and union with God. «But what is God, and what are we, and how is union possible between him and us, and what sort of union? The idea of Christ in the Gospels is an answer to these questions» (ICG, 167).

In the Gospels, as we have seen, the idea of Christ or God in man signifies the unity of the divine with the human nature in Christ, the unity of God with man. Since Christ is the Son of God, «he is one with his Father» (ICG, 145). «The Father and the Son are one; the Father lives in the Son and the Son in the Father» (ICG, 37; John 10:38, 14:10). Christ himself says: «I and the Father are one» (ICG, 141; John 10:30). However, in the case of Christ this «union with God is something mysterious» (ICG, 141); for, since Christ says also: «*The Father is greater than I*» (ICG, 141; John 14:28), then, as Santayana remarks, we must conclude that «that union or oneness is not meant to be identity, and that it has degrees. For the degree of oneness between Christ and his Father is surely much greater than that possible between them and merely hu-

20. *A Kierkegaard Anthology*; ed. by R. Bretall, *op. cit.*, p. 340.

21. Kierkegaard's *Sickness unto Death* is entirely devoted to the idea of «despair» which is for the writer identical with «sin». In the beginning of the second part entitled, «Despair Is Sin», Kierkegaard says: «Sin is the potentiation of despair» (*The Sickness unto Death*; tr. by Walter Lowrie, New York, Doubleday Anchor Books, 1954, p. 208).

man souls» (ICG, 141). For this unity of the human souls with God Christ prays to his Father: «*I come to thee, Holy Father, that they may be one, as we are one*» (ICG, 140; John 17:22). This union with God is brought to those who receive the Holy Ghost, the spirit of truth (ICG, 140). It is a union attained in the supreme moments of the spirit. Santayana says:

In such supreme moments the mind and the heart turn from the pursuit and cares of life to the understanding of it, from personal preoccupations to the intuition of truth, with a purified joy in the beauty of that truth. This is no passage from one world to another or from this life to the next; it is the infusion of the Creator's vision into the created mind. Such is the only possible union of man with God, in which God remains God and man remains man (ICG, 153-154).

This union is in a symbolic sense «the victory of the Lamb in the Apocalypse over the Beast» (ICG, 153) or in a real sense «the complete triumph of the spirit over the other elements of human nature», the triumph of the spirit which unites «in a relative euphoria and harmony» the conflicting movements which «divide the psyche» (ICG, 253). It is a union, therefore, which comes after the conflict between Will in the Spirit and Will in the rest of the psyche and the world (RS, 80), after the conflict between matter and spirit (RE 11-12); a union in which «matter and spirit move in harmony» and «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, then, the divine spirit in man becomes one with his human psyche similarly to the oneness of God with Christ, of the unity of the divine Christ with the human Jesus, of God with man.

This union with God which, according to Santayana, is «the true good of man» is in a symbolic sense «the evangelical Kingdom of Heaven or reign of God» (ICG, 167). In the Lord's Prayer we pray «Thy kingdom come» and «Thy will be done». This Kingdom of God arrives «by prayer and fasting, by an absolute passivity, a perfect purity taking possession of the inner man» (ICG, 145). Prayer which «requires the persistent physical separateness of the two beings united» (RS, 219) is «the inner dialogue between man and God» (ICG, 142). But, in the case of Christ, being God himself, prayer is «the inner dialogue of the spirit with itself» (ICG, 142); «for, being God in man he would be praying to himself, or to a part of himself» (ICG, 130), that is, to his divinity. And, since «prayer is at once the most childlike element in religion and the most spiritual,... there is nothing, therefore, in which the two natures in Christ

might be expected to reveal themselves in clearer contrast and union than in his prayer» (ICG, 126).

In the rational life of man, however, in which God, according to Santayana, is a mythical name, prayer must be also understood in a symbolic sense, for «the language of prayer is poetical» (RS, 245). In such a sense, therefore, prayer in man, as in the case of Christ, is the inner communication of the spirit with itself. Spirit in man as divine (RS, 208) is symbolized by the divinity of Christ. So, from the point of view of the idea of Christ or God in man spirit, being God in man, would be praying to itself. In other words, prayer as an inner dialogue within man is something which stands for self-knowledge. «Thus», Santayana says, «strange as it may sound to the rationalist who thinks prayer ridiculous, the only perfectly rational form of life for a spirit that has attained self-knowledge is the life of prayer» (RS, 247). Self-knowledge is the basis of inner integrity, that is, of the unity within the spirit, which is the first condition of unity with other spirits, with anything else, with all good. In this sense, then, «union with all good is possible only in prayer» (RS, 243),

This union with all good in prayer concerns in Santayana's moral doctrine the union with God. But, since God in him is a mythical or symbolic name for matter or nature, we can understand that this union is essentially the same with that union of the Will in the spirit with the Will in the rest of the psyche and of the world.

Now, from what we said in general about union in relation to love and through love to the miracles, we must accept that there is a correspondence of this chapter concerning the miracles to the fifth chapter of the first part concerning Union. It is the same general correspondence of the idea of Christ to the life of spirit that we found also before between these two parallel chapters as concerns the relation of intuition to the parables through wisdom. This intuition, then, with its reference to the parables as a teaching of wisdom and this union with its reference to the miracles as an expression of love are what Santayana characterizes as «disinterested intelligence and disinterested love» which in their acme constitute «the intrinsic ideal of spirit» as is represented by the idea of Christ (ICG, 253). But, about this ideal of spirit we shall talk in detail in the last chapter of this part, after the next chapter to which we come now to find the symbolic meaning of the Passion and Resurrection of Christ.

(To be continued)