Overheard in Seville

Bulletin of the Santayana Society

No. 29
Fall 2011

Bulletin of the George Santayana Society

No. 29 FALL 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Overheard in Seville, which appears annually, is formatted and composed for typesetting by the Santayana Edition and is published by Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The George Santayana Society
2011
ANNUAL MEETING

The Society's annual meeting will be held in conjunction with the December meetings of the American Philosophical Association (Eastern Division) in Washington, DC.

Speakers

Jude P. Dougherty
Catholic University of America
"The Amphibolous Character of Existence:
Matter and its Negation in the Thought of George Santayana"

Diana Heney
University of Toronto
"Santayana on Value"

Chair

Glenn Tiller
Texas A&M University at Corpus Christi

9:00–11:00 A.M., Wednesday 28 December
Rooms to be assigned at the conference
Marriott Wardman Park
Washington, DC

This issue of

Overheard in Seville: Bulletin of the Santayana Society

is dedicated to

Angus Carmichael Kerr-Lawson (1932–2011),

who co-founded and named the journal

and served as editor since 1983.

Santayana: Genius of the Closet

This paper is a work in progress. I have just written a book about the expressive history of the American gay closet which borrows from and features George Santayana. He was homosexual and closeted, but it has not been clear how this affected his writings, especially his philosophical books. Finding out is my project, and I am sketching here how far I've gotten and what I think will be my direction; therefore I must say at the start that the paper ends but does not conclude. My being a historian has certain advantages, but it does not figure much in reading Santayana's philosophical writings and in deciphering his theory of essences. Even experienced, philosophically trained readers have stumbled trying to define the doctrine and "realm" as Santayana understood them. I do suggest some analogies between closet and essence but they are still suggestions.

According to his protegé Daniel Cory, Santayana observed, during a 1929 discussion of A. E. Housman's poetry:

> "I suppose Housman was really what people nowadays call 'homosexual.'"
> "Why do you say that?" I protested at once.
> "Oh, the sentiment of his poems is unmistakable," Santayana replied.
> There was a pause, and then he added, as if he were primarily speaking to himself:
> "I think I must have been that way in my Harvard days — although I was unconscious of it at the time."[1]

Santayana's biographer, John McCormick, rightly dismisses the notion that he was clueless about his own sexuality:

> Santayana may have consciously misled the young man who might become his Boswell; or Cory, always at pains to present his subject in the best light, may have edited Santayana's words. It is hardly credible that a man of Santayana's education, urbanity, and circle of acquaintance could have remained unconscious of his own tendencies until sixty-five.

He knew the Greeks and the homoeroticism which flourished in that and many succeeding civilizations.[2] The colloquy with Cory allows the possibility of a writer being "read" as gay, a statement that is more specific than Santayana's occasional philosophical inclusions of homosexuality among the ancients. One wonders if he thought his own writing could be read as Houseman's was, but must conclude that he was consciously circumspect and concerned about scandal; the Oscar Wilde trial remained a caution. Cory certainly knew the old man's orientation; he had been trading on his attraction to bright and good-looking young men to make his own way, sincerely but also ambitiously. Santayana would have expected no less, given his detachment that tips into cynicism. Cory tells this story as if it exonerated him

[1] John McCormick (*George Santayana: A Biography* [New York: Knopf, 1987], 51) actually redacts the excerpt from Cory's book, leaving out Santayana's "reading" of the poet and omitting Cory's protest, which says more about Cory than about GS. Daniel Cory, *Santayana: The Later Years: A Portrait With Letters* (New York: Braziller, 1963), 41.

[2] Louis Crompton (*Homosexuality and Civilization* [Cambridge: Belknap Harvard University Press, 2003]) gives a good account of this truth. I do not discuss the debates about the nature of sexuality, especially the dispute between social constructionists and essentialists. I know that sexuality is socially constructed. I also think it is essential: limited in time and essential across time.

of knowledge and suspect intimacy with the old man. It sounds like Santayana was fooling with Cory. It may also be a story about Santayana applying a neologism of the time, homosexual, to himself, the labeling he had spent a lifetime avoiding, wondering in half earnest.

McCormick cites Santayana's letters and love poems to establish that George Santayana was sexually attracted to men rather than to women, and his was an exclusive preference. His Harvard years were his salad days in this respect. He had experienced love and sex, although we don't know the details; but he seems to have given up the chase relatively early. Like most historical gay men and lesbians, Santayana constructed a closet to disguise and facilitate his bent. The closet metaphorically expressed the enforced bargain society struck with gay men, the new subject position gay men's expression required, and how the closet served both oppressor and oppressed, although the bargain never returned certain or consistent protection and was never fair or voluntary. Santayana's closet shaped his life in some respects and palpably influenced his writing, especially his Americanist writings, his poetry and his novel, *The Last Puritan*.

We are used to "the closet" as a metaphor for keeping the gay (or any) secret and to "coming out of the closet" as the shedding of that secret before the world. For American history from the late nineteenth century through the late twentieth, however, one came out *into* the closet, not into society at large. Historian George Chauncey has debunked the three myths that historical gays were all invisible, solitary, and ashamed, and he and others have written about the vital if vulnerable social world of the gay sub-culture. It existed in various forms, degrees of openness, and social milieux.[3]

The metaphor of the closet that we use gained currency in the 1960s, although "coming out" was an earlier example of coded gay speech. The 1960s gay liberation movement called on homosexuals "to come out of the closets and into the streets" and meant by "closet" the metaphor of the storage closet, in which a personal secret is hidden. That is what coming out of the closet now means and that meaning has spurred the adoption of the metaphor to describe shedding other secrets. If you think about it, however, the actual gay male closet resembled the pre-nineteenthth-century room called a closet, which evolved from the "study" in the Renaissance and became, in the *ancien régime,* a seat of style, hospitable to women and men, a semi-public private space which might host the devotions of a queen, adultery, high-toned conversations, social rituals, and adventurous personal style, where everybody knows things they don't say, invisible to ordinary folk, a place where secrets could be ventured. Discrete revelation perfumed the old aristocratic closet. This closet was socially and architecturally replaced during the nineteenth century by the smaller storage rooms we still use. The pre-liberation homosexual closet comprised semi-protected social, sexual, and cultural spaces that enabled gay men to find tricks, lovers, friends, the awareness of not being singular with some safety and, significantly, expressive work. Like the *ancien régime* room and unlike the modern storage closet, this gay closet served many purposes, hosted many functions, and was the scene of a varied, adventurous, stylish and quick-witted interaction, invisible and even secret, but there for homosexuals to come out into and also in

[3] George Chauncey, *Gay New York* (New York: The Free Press, 1994), 1–7.

which discreet heterosexuals participated at times. The closet was a destination, not a stage in public avowal.[4]

The modern metaphor posits a public world into which the gay man might come out, but no such world really existed before the 1970s and only exceptional men, like Paul Goodman and Bayard Rustin, did not resort to the strategies and relative protection of the social subcultural closets. The closet differed for different men. There is no evidence that Santayana, for one, explored the gay *demi-monde* or identified with its random patrons. His closet was restricted to his elite acquaintance: the close circle, many from his Harvard days, that he maintained.

The most interesting expressive function of the closet was to require creative gay men to find translated or alternative subject positions for their work and lives. The subject could not be homosexuality but the closet offered alternative, tenacious subjectivity. The closet was not just a shared social and sexual sometimes open secret; it represented a bargain gays in effect could not refuse with the society that permitted semi-protected gay lives, in return for which homosexuals had to abandon their native subject positions, to acquiesce in being hidden from view. Closeted gay men had to translate their concerns as expressed into heterosexually acceptable terms and subjects. Thus, Henry James characteristically wrote from what one may call the American woman's subject position. He didn't translate male characters into female or use heterosexuality as a cover for homosexuality, but imagined women like Daisy Miller, Isabel Archer, and Maggie Verver as his subjects. He could not write about homosexuality or from a homosexual perspective and hope to succeed. No more could Santayana. He left the United States because it had become impossible to live a satisfying life there, and this had principally to do with the prevailing American intellectual trends that he despised and the impossibility of living a homosexually oriented life. The incisive criticism his "genteel tradition" essays made of American middlebrow thought and the disappearance of its attractive young athletes into business-minded philistinism dismayed him. The widely kept secret reflects discretion, self-protection, and understanding in the worlds in which he lived.

The closet was helped by a general American failure of "gaydar"; that a man might be homosexual was an uncommon thought. The closet's illusions and disguises found a receptive audience. Persecution was intermittent, random, occasional, and personal, discouraging but not fatal to a shared secret gay life. The cost of this alienation of creative labor (in the case of gay men for whom expression was not central, there was a similar bargain to be made and a less protected one) to gay men was real, as was the influential expression and art and culture they created, sponsored, or collaborated in despite it. The resilience and strategy of the closeted are to be wondered at; they made a sometime good bargain out of an inherently bad one.

Santayana struck Harvard as queer. President Eliot observed:

> "I agree with you that Dr. Santayana's qualities give a useful variety to the Philosophical Department, and that he is an original writer of proved capacity. I suppose the fact to be that I have doubts and fears about a man so abnormal as Dr. Santayana. The withdrawn, contemplative man who takes no part in the everyday work of the institution, or of the world, seems to me to be a person of very uncertain future value. He does not dig ditches,

[4] Robert Dawidoff, *The Bargain: An American History of the Gay Male Closet*, forthcoming.

> or lay bricks, or write school-books; his product is not of the ordinary useful, though humble, kind. What will it be? It may be something of the highest utility; but on the other hand, it may be something futile, or even harmful, because unnatural and untimely."[5]

"Abnormal" should be read here as homosexual, as should "unnatural." Eliot put into cultural code the closest he could come to recognizing Santayana and, once you remove the condemnatory tone and the belief in utility, characterized him correctly. Daniel Cory recounts,

> Santayana then told me that various people at Harvard (he did not mention any names) must have suspected something unusual in his makeup: he felt acutely at times their silent disapproval, and it was one of the things that made him determined to retire from teaching there as soon as he could afford to do so.
> "I couldn't stick it any longer than I did — my position was becoming to me intolerable."[6]

Harvard, in Santayana's late-nineteenth and early-twentieth-century time there, was notable for its evolved homosexual culture. Douglass Shand-Tucci has written a book, *The Crimson Letter,* about the gay ambience and many homosexuals in and around Harvard.[7] Santayana was a figure in those Harvard circles that included others like him. As an undergraduate he was engaged in all manner of clubs and intense friendships; he even played women in Hasty Pudding shows. He liked his own sort but had an enthused interest in upper class, manly, athletic, American young men. Like Walt Whitman before him, Santayana had to learn that intimate friendship did not indicate reciprocated love, and his devoted friendships did not usually translate into romantic or sexual intimacy.

Santayana was careful to observe the codes of the day and usually expressed his affections to another man indirectly. Ward Thoron did not return Santayana's sexual love, as his unpublished poem (1884–5) to Ward suggests, and their friendship subsequently cooled:

> Pale friends you wish us ever to remain:
> The thriftless seasons no new hope must bring
> To tempt our thoughts on more adventurous wing?
> Must we the pulses of a heart restrain
> Or rob the prelude of its sweet refrain,—
> That subtle music each entrancèd spring
> Hath heard anew its captive lovers sing
> And in the buzz of summer lost again?
>
> I have been guileless long: angels and you
> And beauty in my dreams together played.
> The sunshine and your smile my heaven made
> Laden with some great joy that I half knew.

[5] Quoted in McCormick, 97.

[6] Cory, 42.

[7] Douglas Shand-Tucci, *The Crimson Letter: Harvard, Homosexuality and the Shaping of American Culture* (New York: St. Martin's, 2003), passim. Kim Townsend's *Manhood at Harvard: William James and Others* (New York: Norton, 1986) covers some of the same terrain and discusses Santayana, but in unsatisfactory ways where homosexuality is concerned.

That holy happiness did mortal prove;
A wind blew, and dim worship flamed to love.[8]

"A Dedication: written once for these sonnets but never sent with them" is telling:

When Shakespeare sent his sonnets to a friend,
Although they breathed immortal scorn of time,
Abashed he wrote, lest something might offend,
'Reserve them for my love, not for their rhyme.'
But I, who bring this meagre gift indeed,
Unused to bare my bosom to men's eyes,
What love shall I invoke, that you should read,
When all my love you know not, or despise?
Despise the verse, for I will make it new,
Rich with your beauty and this gift of tears,
Till but by telling what I saw in you
I lift my head among my laurelled peers.
Then late, when in all hearts your praises dwell,
Remembering you shall say, He loved me well.[9]

His untitled, uncollected sonnets have such phrases as "I who in secret love thee"[10] and express his moods of love:

If jealousy be proof of love indeed
I have one comfort in my bitter pang:
At least my love is true love, if I hang
Wide-eyed upon thy beauty, fain to feed.
Let not they soft soul other voices heed
Since it was all thy music that I sang
Let thy speech flow to me, since no heart rang
Thus at the rumour of thine every deed.
And yet I am not jealous; for they say
That jealousy is mad and full of hate,
Suspicious, wilful, tortured, quick to slay.
But I in utter adoration lay
All in thy sacred hands, and bless the fate
That made me love ere I was cast away.[11]

Santayana's poetry resembled that of William Vaughn Moody, George Cabot Lodge, and Trumbull Stickney (with whom he may have had shared some intimacy), but it has little of the distinction of his prose. He wrote less poetry as the years passed. His published love sequence, "assumed to have been written to a woman," recapitulates his homosexual verse, and McCormick concludes:

To my reading, all the love poems, published or unpublished, indicate an origin in genuine homosexual emotion usually veiled in Christian imagery and allusion, or by the pretense

[8] William G. Holzberger, *The Complete Poems of George Santayana* (Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses, 1979), 396.

[9] Holzberger, 397.

[10] Holzberger, 398, line 9.

[11] Holzberger, 397.

> that the object of the published verses was of the opposite sex. As in Shakespeare's erotic sonnets, the diction addressed to the beloved is deliberately ambiguous.[12]

The poetry reveals the intense feelings Santayana experienced when he was young and fell in love easily. It also reveals his prudent closeting of his loves. He did not risk being identified as homosexual except by the men he thought might share his inclination and passion. He wrote less poetry and stopped when his muse did not reciprocate.

Santayana wanted a lasting love, as he came close to telling Guy Murchie in an 1896 letter discouraging Murchie's plan to marry, despite the excellence of the match, until Murchie had more worldly experience. Then, Santayana wrote,

> [Y]ou could go to the woman you would be proudest to call your own, and say, 'I love you with my whole soul and my whole mind; I have chosen you from all the world.' That is a man's love, which is a better and safer thing than a boy's, and a kind you could offer, very likely, to this same girl when you came back to her with your character formed and your resolution made. **It is the kind of love I should now feel for the woman of my choice, and the kind I feel for you too, dear Guy, who are a great deal more to me than any of my friends could be when I was a young fellow, and could not really know either myself or other men**. There is resolution in this sort of love, it is the expression of character and not of chance. And I should wish you to come to it some day; it is worth waiting for.[13]

Santayana's surprising expression of his own "man's" love for Murchie did not lead to anything, but it is a striking admission of his own orientation and feelings.

Through the years, Santayana also became known to the European gay elite. He was a familiar, partly by kinship, at Queen's Acre, the Windsor, England, establishment of the homosexual Howard Sturgis, his companion "the Babe" (Willie Haines Smith), and a constant stream of visitors that included many upper-class and literary homosexuals.[14] Sturgis wrote a novel, *Belchamber,* which is one source for Santayana's *The Last Puritan*. Being a regular visitor to Queen's Acre is evidence that Santayana led a social life in closeted settings, and that he preferred upper class closeted circles, where everyone "knew" but didn't say.

The great love of Santayana's life was Lord Frank Russell, Bertrand's older brother, a brilliant, dissolute, and destructive man of unbridled desires and unconventional, even scandalous, adventures. Russell took Santayana up and seems to have involved him in some kind of sexual spree, which Santayana was at pains to disguise, especially from his friends who knew or knew of Russell. Santayana denied going on sprees with Russell. He describes their relationship in a startling way to Henry Ward Abbott:

> "My running after Russell" means "my thoughts running after him" . . . . He has taken me up because he has chosen to do so, and after his fashion has been overwhelmingly kind. But the trouble, from my point of view, what I call my "fall from grace and self-control" . . . is simply this. Russell has a way of treating people which is insufferably insolent and insulting. Never for a moment did I imagine I could allow anyone to treat me in such a

---

[12] McCormick, 51.

[13] Letter to Guy Murchie, March 12, 1896 (*The Letters of George Santayana, 1868–1909* [Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2001], 150). Boldfacing is mine.

[14] George Santayana, *Persons and Places* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1986), 360; 508–9.

> way. But I find that instead of caring for my own dignity and independence — instead of subordinating to my interest in myself and to my ways of doing things, all other interests and ways of doing things — instead of this old habit of mine, I find that I don't care a rap for my interest in myself or my ways of doing things, but that I am quite willing to stand anything, however outrageous, that comes from a certain quarter — this is what has happened to me. I am a fool to say a word about it — especially when people think I am talking about trifles."[15]

Santayana was in love and it made him anything but detached or like his usual self, subdued by passion even to masochism. Their intense relation cooled, but for Santayana, Russell remained especially interesting.

Years after, in 1924, Santayana wrote to Henry Ward Abbot about love:

> Love has never made me long unhappy, nor sexual impulse uncomfortable: on the contrary in the comparatively manageable form in which they have visited me, they have been great fun, because they have given me an interest in people and (by a natural extension of emotion) in things, places, and stories, such as religion, which otherwise would have failed me altogether; because in itself, apart from the golden light of diffused erotic feeling falling upon it, the world I have been condemned to live in most of my life would have been simply deadly. I have never been anything but utterly bored and disgusted with the public world, the world of business, politics, family, and society. It was only the glimmer of sport, humour, friendship, or love falling over it that made it tolerable.[16]

The brief sexual and long emotional relationship with Russell did trouble the detached philosopher and probably spurred his retreat from romantic love. Love was the one element of his character that disturbed his calm, philosophical life. In discussing kinds of love, Santayana identifies pederasty as positive except for the common negative opinion of homosexuality.[17]

Santayana insisted on his singularity and made common cause with no movements. He resisted attempts to "place" his thinking and refused to consider the academy his home. Santayana's character was aloof except to intimates or to intellectual visitors who interested him. He refused institutional and national emotion. He had also begun to nourish his proud detachment from the concerns of the moment, from allegiance except to himself, and from passion. Santayana's outsider status, as Spanish, expressive, and homosexual, combined to keep him always somewhat detached. He did not play a serious role in the professionalization of university philosophy. He did not conduct disputes and make arguments, but rather wrote for a reading public as well as for philosophers. His books do not resemble most philosophy books. He read the history of philosophy and made his own choices about what issues mattered and presented his views not as arguments but as suppositions and conclusions. Santayana was a brilliant critic (although he despised criticism as a vocation) and frequently an original and acute thinker, who wrote exceptionally well.

---

[15] Letter to Henry Ward Abbot, May 27, 1887 (*Letters, 1868–1909,* 77–78). Quoted in McCormick, 68.

[16] Letter to Henry Ward Abbot, January 16, 1924 (*Letters, 1921–1927,* 179). Quoted in McCormick, 106.

[17] Letter to William Morton Fullerton, December 28, 1887 (*Letters, 1868–1909,* 91–93). Quoted in McCormick, 71.

Santayana reserved his most erotic writing for his 1936 novel *The Last Puritan*. Oliver Alden is the exemplary young Puritan: smart, handsome, good, dutiful, and athletic. His father lives apart from his mother on a luxurious junk boat with his captain Jim Darnley, called Lord Jim. Early in his visit, Lord Jim invites Oliver for a swim, strips and dives in. Oliver is shy but eventually joins him. The celebration of Jim's beautiful strong body and Oliver's ingenuous response to him, possibly based indirectly on his affair with Lord Russell, is a clear homoerotic moment. The book might be better than the gorgeously written but lifeless novel it is, had it been possible for him to write it as a homosexual story. Properly located and ventured passion would give *The Last Puritan* some real eventfulness and make it less didactic. The book was a great success, selling well and earning a Pulitzer Prize nomination. It is the last time Santayana permitted homoerotic feelings to emerge freely in his writing. The novel doesn't take them up except as a powerful reason for Oliver's attachment to the scapegrace Lord Jim, but it is there repressed tactfully.

Santayana's books have many virtues, but it is his writing and observations rather than any system that attracted a large and admiring public, including philosophers who did not accept his methods. Santayana resisted identification, insisted on his independence, and was almost blithe in his assertions. He was a private person, calm and productive. He lived alone but maintained close relations with a selected few from a great number of friends and acquaintances. He prized the company of young writers and thinkers, kept up with contemporary thought and literature, and became someone whom Americans like Edmund Wilson and Robert Lowell (and even an unwelcome Ezra Pound) sought out. The modern did not persuade him. Tradition made the space he needed and encouraged the values he prized, tradition without belief. Santayana did not believe in G-d and deplored religion, except for religions like Catholicism which preserved traditional context, ritual, and culture. He disliked the austerity of Protestantism and was, partly because of his competitive anti-semitism, especially harsh on the Hebrew religion.

Santayana was conservative socially but adventurous intellectually. He expressed his learning in beautifully written books that did not impose consistent system or even method, but rather appealed to reason and to the reader who valued the traditional he no longer believed in. Santayana did not see that his contrary doctrines needed to be argued out with, say, materialism victorious. He did not worry about contrary positions in the philosopher's way. Contradictory positions are not unusual in philosophy; that is what discourse and argument are there to resolve. Santayana did not dispute, he dissolved the contradictions in his idea, theory, notion of essences. Essences resolved for Santayana and his readers the problems his philosophical writings presented to other philosophers. Santayana's amazing confidence coincided with his need to resolve his materialism with the remnants of idealism he still adhered to.

Santayana's chosen subjectivity was being a philosopher and he was proudest of his theory of essences, which elides the subjectivity of philosophy with that of the closet. Society required a homosexual person to have two self-presentations, hidden homosexual and disingenuous heterosexual. The closet is not only who you know from where but also the expression that exchanges native subjectivity or subject matter for a different one that evades, avoids, elides the question of homosexuality. How did his closet affect Santayana's philosophical works? Its role

in his Americanist writings and some letters is clear. Did this private strategy surface in his works? It is difficult to answer this question. I can only broach what will be the subject of further work. Santayana's materialism, like all his views, was not pure. He retained aspects of the transcendentalist romantic idealism he denounced.

The gap between his positions was not one that he was willing to argue or reconcile in philosophical dispute. He developed his signature theory of essences, a reception theory and an overarching way to see things together that had seemed distinct. *Scepticism and Animal Faith* and *The Realm of Essence* contain his views of essence and its centrality. It was an evolving concept and served as the loose binding for Santayana's many views. The principal irresolution in Santayana's thought was his simultaneous belief in materialism and in non-material imagination and intellect. The different poles of his assertion required, he said, reconciliation, some means of appearing settled. I say "appears" because he did not argue his idea philosophically and elaborated rather than defended it. There are those, unlike me, who understand the path of essences as it presents itself. I think Santayana elided and erased doctrine to create the appearance of resolution. I suspect that the discourse of essence proves supple, defended, and convenient, but I recognize that *Scepticism and Animal Faith* was one of Santayana's very best books.

Essences rearrange the appearances of contradiction into paradoxical resolution, although appearances are part illusory. The essence of a thing is marked by its appearance and can be grasped but may dissolve if held too tightly. One apprehends essence with intuitive rationality. The point of the closet was to protect one's sexual difference with the appearance of conforming to majority sexuality. The closet advanced a reception theory which disguised a person's homosexuality and seemed to resolve any doubt. The function of the essences was analogous. Essences make genuine contradictions appear to reconcile by advancing a notion that belies rather than works them out. The essence of a thing may seem like a claim about its nature but for Santayana the essence of a thing resolved its contradictions by manipulating its surface. It is not a method and has never gained currency, because it does not settle matters but creates a higher plane which appears to supplant and hence resolve the problem. This was how the closet disguised contradiction: by supplanting truth with appearances that take on the gravity of the facts. Essence enabled Santayana to claim a philosophical advance just as his closet distracted any naming by creating an essence (in this case a sexual personality) to elide the difficulty. That is not all there was to his closet or theory of essences but they do employ like strategies to create the appearance of resolution Santayana required in each sphere.

It is always a risk, in concentrating on a subject's personality and experience, that the full range and elements of his creativity will be seen to reduce the figure to his urges. Santayana does not merit that treatment. His detachment was no pose, although he cultivated it. It was the distance he put between himself and any allegiance or categorization. He became the philosopher and writer he wanted to be: admired, read, and taught. He knew his homosexuality might be assumed or suggested and he was too proud to make believe. He also thought that love needed control, especially homosexual love.

Santayana's closet included his celibacy, his philosophical stance, his being difficult to pin down on essences, and many other things. He was not preoccupied

with his own homosexuality and appears to have accepted it and to have enjoyed it for many years. He did keep it secret, however, because he was accustomed to the world suspecting it but not thinking about it. This was just one (perhaps slight) element in his thought, but I think one that accounts for some of his resistance to definition, his tendency to elaborate rather than argue, and the difficulties of the theory of essences. Santayana was a philosophical writer of immense interest. His private life may have been a model for some of his philosophical solutions. He made sure we cannot reduce him to one element of his many-sided talent, and good sense reminds us that Santayana's genius owes little to his reaction formation, his closet. His life did take place in the closet and his public expressions were pointedly not homosexual. His closet contributed to the evolution of the man and, I have come to believe, in some ways to the matter and method of his work. Santayana's essences may explain what appears to be a dilemma or may complicate a simpler method to keep its results murky or free from categorization. It may swirl so because it catches the motion of the world to man or because Santayana made it to "shine us on." Neither is really true, but it is my tentative view that the probing of Santayana's closet will enhance our knowledge of this remarkable man and most importantly his philosophical work.

ROBERT DAWIDOFF

Claremont Graduate University.

Santayana and the Avant-garde: Visual Arts in the Context of Democracy, Norms, Liberty, and Social Progress

George Santayana (1863–1952) defined, at the very beginning of his philosophical career, the basic traits of his lifelong interests. Some of them clearly show him as *an artistic philosopher having a profound political sensitivity*. Hence, Santayana (in his letters to William James) admitted (in 1888) that the reason why he started philosophizing was his interest "in seeing what pictures of the world and of human nature men had succeeded in sketching" (LGS 1:97), and, at more or less the same time (1887) he stated that "my vocation is toward the human, political problems" (LGS 1:41). He confirmed the latter even more tersely (in 1905): "I am a Latin, and nothing seems serious to me except politics" (LGS 1:330). Simultaneously, he had been able to use this political sensitivity to, among other things, easily recognize the influences of extra-artistic factors and non-aesthetic impacts, such as various kinds of powers, upon various kinds of the fine arts and aesthetic doctrines. For example, while studying the Christian arts in Berlin's museums as a graduate student, he noticed that they (the Christian arts), "in the service of religion, express the thwarting of the natural tendency of the soul, the crushing of spontaneous life by the pressure of overwhelming external power" (LGS 1:38). His leaning towards seeing the arts as, more often than not, closely related to various arrangements of social and political powers was life long; in his last book published during his life, *Dominations and Powers* (1950), he not only expressed a pessimistic reflection on whether it is "a gain in dignity" that the contemporary art (excluding, perhaps, architecture) has become "bohemian," but also put this pessimistic reflection in the context of expanding democracy;

> Perhaps it is incidental to democracy to eschew patronage of any sort, and rely only on what the average loose individual can discover in his insulated self-consciousness. And certainly the democratic public respects the self-advertising artist and gives him free rein, as an ancient city or an aristocratic society would never have done. The artist now belongs to the Intelligentsia, which feels itself to be a sort of aristocracy; whereas formerly he passed for a worthy artisan, perhaps a singular genius, but never for a lord of life (DP 276).

This takes me to the main purpose of the present paper, that is, taking a look, through Santayana's eyes, at some trends of the visual arts within the artistic avant-garde at the turn of the 19th and 20th century — especially cubism, expressionism, fauvism, and also abstractionism and surrealism. Santayana himself was by no means a member or a sympathizer of the avant-garde movement; yet, he developed his philosophical and aesthetic concepts at the same time as the avant-garde gained impetus. Although his output is full of references to classical arts and aesthetics, especially the Greek, he does not fail to recognize the meaning of some of the avant-garde movements, especially cubism; and yet, he criticizes them as such.

1. Democratic, Although Not Liberal, Character of Modern Artistic Institutions and the Avant-garde "Soviets"

The avant-gardists (especially the expressionists, the cubists, the Dadaists, the futurists, and the surrealists) referred openly to political ideas and expressed, directly or indirectly, strong social engagements. Almost all produced manifestoes in which they tried to assume a role as providers of political criticisms and proponents of social reforms, if not cultural revolutions, and they used the philosophical concepts of F. Nietzsche, S. Freud, and H. Bersgon to better vindicate their own visions of a just world and the new man. Sometimes, it was in the very name of these political ideas that their artistic works were to be made and promoted. Even those who were politically least engaged, like the expressionists at the beginning of their public existence, referred to political notions, freedom in the first instance; for example, Franz Marc, in "The 'Savages' of Germany," declared:

> In this time of the great struggle for a new art we fight like disorganized "savages" against an old, established power. The battle seems to be unequal, but spiritual matters are never decided by numbers, only by the power of ideas. The dreaded weapons of the "savages" are their new ideas. New ideas kill better than steel and destroy what was thought to be indestructible.[1]

The interrelationship between the social life and its institutionalized manifestations is, obviously, many-sided and many-dimensional. At this point, I should like to pay attention to Santayana's view, according to which modern institutions became more and more democratic, which does not mean at all that they became more and more liberal. If I read Santayana's intentions well, the avant-garde movements were a part of the democratization of cultural and political life; however, they did not contribute — against their declarations — to making life more liberal at all. Be it noted, that Santayana uses the term "liberal" in a specific meaning; in a note, "Liberalism and Democracy," he explains that the former is individualistic, pluralistic, "respectful towards things alien, new, or unknown; it welcomes diversity; it abhors compulsion; it distrusts custom." Whereas democracy necessarily provides some more or less definite limits to singularity: "It would be a violent tyranny to make majorities absolute if, in a democracy the majority and the minority were not much alike" (POML 260).

If we assume this viewpoint, we could better understand Santayana's suggestion that, despite the huge variety of the avant-garde groups, they all proposed a very similar attitude towards tradition, towards the universe, towards human life, and towards destiny. Indeed, the process of the proliferation of short-lived artistic groups as well as their sudden disappearance deserves attention. Santayana writes about the "sovietization" of the artistic community, although his remarks do not refer exclusively to the avant-garde groups that popped up at the beginning of the 20th century; Santayana's characteristic has a more general application. Yet, I will use them in the conviction that, if applied in the context of the avant-gardists, these opinions shed much light on what Santayana had in mind when distancing himself from them. Hence, in "An Aesthetic Soviet" (1927), he criticized the tendency of the

[1] Franz Mark, "The 'Savages' of Germany," in *The Blue Rider Almanac,* 1912. Available at http://www.mariabuszek.com/kcai/Expressionism/Readings/MarcBRA.pdf.

proliferation of small artistic groups who rejected the previous hierarchy of artistic life. Santayana's metaphor for the artistic groups reads in the following way:

> A Soviet is a caucus of comrades, such as the sailors in a ship or the teachers in a college, who after hanging the captain or kicking out the president and trustees, assume joint control of the fabric in which they find themselves lodged, and declare it to be their property by right of eminent domain and of actual possession. In theory theirs is spontaneous union and a spiritual bond. An unquestioning unanimity, childlike and brotherly, animates everybody; and it is no accident that the Soviet bears a Russian name, for there could hardly be elsewhere such a casual and affectionate way of superposing, as in children's games, a spiritual harmony upon spiritual chaos (OS 249).

The possibility to launch, freely if not whimsically, an artistic group at any moment in order to exercise some influence upon society is, for Santayana, a manifestation of a democratic spirit. Yet, this democratic spirit is something contemptible in his eyes, as it manifests the weakening of the previously established institutions and traditional concepts that had made the status quo of the artistic life flabby. The vacuum that emerged after the decrease in the meaning of the previously significant artistic concepts, aesthetic values, and cultural institutions made room for the ephemeral ideas and day-long concepts to flare and die away. According to Santayana's epiphenomenalism, spiritual and cultural life is a result of the material conditions, and this also concerns institutions: "Institutions do not originate in the sentiments which they produce; these sentiments, whether pious, aesthetic, or rebellious, always presuppose these very institutions" (OS 258). Small wonder that he saw the epoch as partially responsible for giving birth to the avant-garde; a chaotic and unorganized public life found its expression in no less chaotic and unorganized arts. Like many representatives of fin-de-siècle, Santayana did realize that it was a special moment for the arts or, as he put it in "Penitent Art (1922)," the time of "a lenten mood" (OS 151-152), at which a large part of the arts have lost its charm and its meaning in social life. Santayana, like the avant-gardists, was well aware of the dramatic change at that time. For example, he wrote that "we moderns, in all our thoughts and tastes, live among ruins. Our grand houses are museums; and (…) we cannot take our ease amid our treasures nor enjoy the present smothered in crowded relics, but we glide among them like ghosts" (AFSL 426). Yet, he was convinced that the avant-garde went in the wrong direction to heal the situation. More importantly, he accused the avant-gardists of escaping into childish whimsicalities instead of taking on a responsibility to contribute to heal the crisis. The avant-gardists, despite their manifestoes and their call for freedom, were trapped in impotence and futile manifestations. Santayana did not see them as fighters for freedom, liberty, and for a better social order; rather he saw them as those whose attempts, made with such noble aims and values, are vacuous and futile at the start. Even more, the artistic programs were doomed to be abortive, since they wanted to curb something that is, naturally, spontaneous and free: "A Soviet requires that the spontaneous impulses of its members should be specific and that they should be unanimous. But how did these impulses ever come to be unanimous or to be specific? Evidently by force of animal necessity and of natural circumstances" (OS 257).

2. Vital Liberty and the "Penitent" Arts (Cubism, Expressionism, Fauvism)

Although Santayana must have appreciated some particular avant-garde movements, for example Cubism — describing it as "by no means an inexpert or meaningless thing" (OS 155) — he criticized them and labeled their art as "Penitent Art." A major reason why Santayana did not applaud the emergence of the avant-garde groups was that they, despite their cognitive and humanistic ambitions, did not contribute to humans' "vital liberties," as Santayana put it; rather they manifested their incapability to face the cultural crisis and propose a new cultural project. In his thought, the arts were ascribed a significant role in communal life and individual happiness; a decrease in the understanding of the world and the decrease in the understanding life were caused by the neglect of the naturalistic roots of aesthetic experience. These tendencies in the arts, that ignore the naturalistic background and focus upon "pure colour," "caricature," and "deformation," show their helplessness in a full and penetrating vision dealing with real life and a profound experience of the world:

> I call pure colour and caricature penitent art, because it is only disappointment in other directions that drives artists back to these primary effects. By an austere and deliberate abstinence from everything that naturally tempts them, they achieve in this way a certain peace; but they would far rather have found it by genuinely recovering their naïveté. Sensuous splendour and caricature would then have seemed to them not the acme of abstract art, but the obvious truth of things; they would have doted on puppets and pantomime as a child dotes on dolls, without ever noticing how remote they are from reality (OS 153).

If I could briefly contrast Santayana's stance as opposed to the avant-gardists I should suggest the following pairs of opposition: 1) *completion* vs. *deformation* of the presented forms (especially in Cubism and Expressionism); 2) *perfection* vs. *fragmentation* (esp. in Analytical Cubism); 3) critique of Primitivism and Caricature (esp. in Cubism and Expressionism); 4) Criticism of the Elevation of Colour Medium onto the Level of Artistic Expression (in Fauvism); 5) *harmony* understood as a union with natural force vs. *harmony* understood as an internal order of a given work of art, without any connection with the external reality (esp. in Abstractionism).

3. From the Standpoint of a Theory of Work of Art

Santayana did not work out a theory of a visual work of art; however, he provided us with an outline of a poetic work of art. I should like to take a brief look at the idea of a work of art, such as given us by the avant-gardists, through Santayana's theory of poetic work of art. This way, it will be easier to understand Santayana's criticism of the avant-gardists and see the main bone of contention. Very briefly, Santayana writes, in various places, about three levels of poetry. The first one, the lowest and most superficial, is constituted mainly by sounds; here, the phonetic, metric, and lexical elements should be "subjected to a measure, and endowed with a form" (IPR 252). The second layer, higher, is constituted by words and phrases made out of observation, perception, feeling, and passion. It seems to me that we can talk either about a still higher level within the second layer or about a third level, that is, one that deals with the imagination; all these levels taken altogether make for the style,

images, and symbols and their adequacy as well as excellence of a given work of art. The highest level manifests an outlook on the world, a wisdom of life, and creates ideals that speak though the particular work of art.[2]

If we carry this scheme into the visual arts as provided us by the avant-gardists, we can speculate that Santayana might have included them surely into the first level and, occasionally into the second; he would have refused them any place on the highest level and accused them of failing to construct a reasonable worldview. At this level, poetry is close to philosophy and religion, because it gives us a vision of a sensible life and destiny. The task of the multidimensional work of art is "to build new structures, richer, finer, fitter to the primary tendencies of our nature, truer to the ultimate possibilities of the soul" (IPR 270). As regards the visual arts in the avant-garde movement, we can suppose that, from the Santayanian viewpoint, these works of art do not give us a positive vision of the universe and say hardly anything constructive about human destiny and individual happiness. Santayana's desire — also expressed by his theory of works of art — to take a look at the whole universe and to be ready for heroism in face of the whole of life excludes the appreciation of such movements and trends, which want to focus on some isolated parts of life, as he understood it. The avant-garde movement was not just another way of rendering the *real* reality, according to the theory of mimesis or a mirroring of the ontological reality, but rather an attempt to distance oneself from it and, then, construct autonomous or semi-autonomous realities (works of art) with their own languages, their own harmonies, their own standards of excellence, their own messages, and internal way of moving "within the picture," rather than looking at it from the outside — all hardly possible to accept for Santayana. Language, for Santayana, should refer to the truth about life and the universe, harmony should deal with the true exigencies of living, particular norms and standards should be compatible with the universal ones, and the messages of works of art should articulate wisdom rather than whimsicalities. Internal regularities are vapid when not in reference to the external rules that govern the flux of life, and the autonomy of a work of art means nothing when not in reference to the genuine place the work can have in life. So, I suppose, Santayana might have appreciated the (successful) attempt to create a new artistic language by the avant-gardists; however, he would have asked whether this new language is a better means to tell us the truth about human life and about the universe. If the answer would have been negative, the whole initiative would have been seen by Santayana as abortive. It would have been even worse than abortive, if the answer would have been — as in the case of abstractionist painting — that this new language does not pretend nor aspire at all to be a means to a better understanding of the world as it is.

4. Politicization of the "Foreground" and Social Progress

In his criticism of pragmatism, Santayana accused John Dewey of concerning himself too much about the down-to-earth, daily, and common affairs, something he called "domination of the foreground." Additionally, he claimed that by paying too much attention to the foreground, Dewey (and the pragmatists), willy-nilly got

[2] Cf. Krzysztof Piotr Skowroński, *Values and Powers: Re-reading the Philosophical Tradition of American Pragmatism*. Amsterdam-New York: Rodopi, 2009, 174–75.

involved in politics; attention paid to social affairs — or as Santayana puts it: "the prevalent absorption in business life and in home affections" (OS 224) — is itself a sort of political life. In my view, Santayana could direct a similar type of accusation at the avant-gardists; this time, however, the greatest thing at stake would have been the emphasizing by them of the role of the medium, focusing on fragments of life and the rejection of ontology and cosmology as crucial for the understanding of life and the place of the human being. As a consequence, the avant-gardists got involved in political life by becoming reactive to current events and lost sight of the general meaning of the arts. They became partisan and biased instead of giving us a well-balanced vision of a good life, wisdom, and a general perspective as regards destiny. They also failed to offer a sensible understanding of social progress, and, I think, the surrealists could serve as an example of this failure. Namely, the surrealists' vision of social progress and the revitalization of individual life was, as Andre Breton put it in his *Manifesto,* getting into the psyche and having more poetry, that is submerging oneself in one's private day-dreaming rather than using the power of the imagination. This way the surrealists got politicized by reacting to the particular situation at the particular time: they reacted to positivism, industrialism, and scientism by using a particular method, that is Freudianism.

In contrast to then contemporary understandings of social progress — such as democratic, pragmatic, and surrealist, for example — Santayana refers to Aristotelian inspiration and claims that progress means a more and more complete, full, and comprehensive life. This means, among many other things, approaching life universally; that is trying to understand it in its complexity, diversity, profoundness, and variety. However, these should not be just scattered fragments of life, here and there, as well as its accidental effusions that should be looked at. Rather, this is an attempt to look for the truth of life and the universe in their complexity and variety, overcoming such handicaps as anthropocentrism, nationalism, and dedication to one's own religion, and mode of philosophizing. This attempt involves also the arts and aesthetics, because they should help make a life that is fuller, more understandable, and wiser, one that is more civilized; for Santayana, ancient Greece is the exemplar for this: "Among the Greeks the idea of happiness was aesthetic and that of beauty moral; and this not because the Greeks were confused but because they were civilized" (AFSL 420). This link between the ethic and the aesthetic was fully articulated by the Greek arts. They avoided the partial expression of fragments of life and particular situations; rather, they aimed at embracing the completeness of life, destination, and wisdom. Obviously, it is not only the Greeks who were able to embrace life in the arts and by the arts. There are many other examples of authors that, by their arts, would inspire experience in its complexity and would be ready "to face reality, whatever it may turn out to be" (LGS 1:355).

KRZYSZTOF (CHRIS) PIOTR SKOWROŃSKI

Opole University, Poland

Spirituality and Moral Struggle

So much of Josiah Royce's philosophy is concerned with transcendence that I am inclined to believe that religion, and spirituality in particular, was the greatest interest of his life. One can hardly read *The World and the Individual* or *The Problem of Christianity* without becoming aware of spirituality as a profound human need: a fervid longing for what lies beyond. But the word "spirituality" is rarely used by Royce, even when spirituality is under implicit discussion and the use of the word would enlighten the reader. The word "spirit" appears a number of times like a signal flare, but its meaning is never expounded and we are left in the dark. Let us see what clarifying light can be shed on Royce's conception of spirituality.

That this conception is vague and not explicitly developed is most unfortunate, yet Royce is not entirely to blame. What spirituality means is vague in the literature of the great spiritual traditions; but if it means anything special at all, it must mean the opposite of worldliness. Spiritual gifts must be such as the world cannot give.

Peace is one of these gifts. The world may give us wealth and power, pleasure and happiness, on rare occasions even love, but it cannot give us peace. *Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you: not as the world giveth, give I unto you.*[1] Spirit does not give as the world gives because the world is not its home, and even when it appears in the world it prefers not to dwell there. Its primary gift is neither wealth nor power nor any mundane treasure, but rather liberation from the cares of living.

Travail is inseparable from worldly life, but whoever lives in the spirit, though he may appear to die in the sight of the unwise, is at peace. Spirituality is therefore at least compensatory; it offers an alternative satisfaction in exchange for desires which cannot be satisfied in the course of existence: if the world leaves our desires unfulfilled, spirituality yields the peace of surrendering desire. Here the major religions of the East are in agreement with the New Testament. "The Tao is always at ease."[2] It is serene. Shunryu Suzuki describes Nirvana as "perfect composure."[3] Yet peace, serenity, and perfect composure can be understood negatively to mean the mere absence of suffering. Spirituality needs a positive dimension if the peace of Christ is to mean more than the nihilism of bodily death.

The New Testament and Catholic theology suggest a second spiritual gift which is not compensatory. Those who are liberated from the cares of the world are not only at peace: they are supremely happy. *These things I have spoken unto you, that my joy might remain in you, and that your joy might be full*.[4] According to St. Thomas, the blessed in heaven are filled with rapture at the immediate knowledge of God which

[1] John 14:27.

[2] Lao-tzu, *Tao Te Ching*, trans. Stephen Mitchell (New York: HarperCollins, 1992), 73.

[3] Shunryu Suzuki, *Zen Mind, Beginner's Mind* (Boston: Weatherhill, 2005), 94.

[4] John 15:11.

is given to them.[5] The world may satisfy our needs and make us happy from time to time, but worldly happiness is inevitably undercut. Spirituality renounces the world, in which happiness and loss are one, in exchange for the boundless joy of eternity.

For Royce, all human suffering is a consequence of sin, and by sin we should understand a defect in a will. We suffer because we ourselves have sinned, or because our neighbors have sinned and their sins are finally indistinguishable from ours. And since even the natural world is supposed to be an expression of intelligent agency — "all Nature is an expression of Mind"[6] — evil is also explainable as the result of some defect in the will of nature. Thus, when suffering cannot be traced to the sins of a human agent, it can be traced as readily to the agency of nature and its explanation called sin rather than misfortune or absurdity. Royce's conclusion is that all evil is moral evil.

The idea that nature as a whole is an expression of mind and can be held accountable for sin is *prima facie* implausible, but some plausibility can be given to it by considering the argument from which it supposedly flows. Mind and matter seem to be very different: the first is unquestionably conscious, the second apparently unconscious; but there are pervasive similarities between them. Matter seems to display purposiveness, as does mind. Flowers seem to reach intentionally for the sunlight and rivers appear to flow for the sake of reaching the ocean. Material systems tend to repeat the same highly organized patterns with predictable regularity: what we sometimes call tendencies or rhythms in matter we call habits in mind. The emergence of mind out of matter is unintelligible and it is absurd to reduce mind to the motions of matter. Therefore, we may conclude, with Peirce, that "physical events are but degraded or undeveloped forms of psychical events."[7] From here it is not completely unfounded to maintain that there is a kind of willfulness in nature or resistance to order which amounts to sin.

This account of evil as in every case deriving from a moral problem has the advantage of making all evil seem tractable. We can atone for sin, and presumably a defective will can be repaired and made to distinguish properly between right and wrong. But this view has a disadvantage also. It makes us responsible not only for ourselves and others but for nature as well. When a hurricane devastates a city or wildfires raze hundreds of acres of valuable forest, we should feel guilty and redouble our atonement, as if we had wrought the destruction with our own hands. On this view, we ought to accept an infinite moral task that only God could reasonably be expected to complete.

---

[5] Knowledge of God is possible only after the last judgment, when the souls of the blessed have been joined to glorified bodies. The terrestrial body impedes the operation of the soul, which is the seat of intelligence; but in heaven our souls will function perfectly: we will see God in his essence and enjoy the highest bliss. See the discussion of the happiness of the saints in St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, trans. Fathers of the English Dominican Province, vol. 21 (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne Ltd., 1922), 100. George Santayana gives a similar account: joy derives from the free activity of consciousness, or spirit, undistracted by will, which arises from spirit's attachment to matter.

[6] Josiah Royce, *The World and the Individual*, vol. 2 (New York: Macmillan, 1908), 158.

[7] Charles Sanders Peirce, *Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce*, ed. Charles Hartshorne and Paul Weiss, vol. 6 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1974), 173.

Royce's account of spirituality is a response to moral evil. In our finitude, which means our moral imperfection, we are disunited with God; spirituality means uniting ourselves with Him by working to defeat moral evil. This account has two markedly different outcomes: one compensatory because it means to be, the other compensatory in spite of hoping to be more.

Traditional Christian theology maintains a sharp contrast between God and the world. God's perfection would be sullied by contact with mundane affairs, so He is said to exist in a realm apart. But according to Royce, the infinite order and the finite order, the eternal order and the temporal order, "are not divided in their Being."[8] Their being is ideal and they are related dialectically, as all ideal objects are related. They are names for the same reality viewed under two different aspects.

What follows from the dialectical identity of God and the world is that God suffers with us as we suffer, and strives with us as we strive to improve ourselves and the world by atoning for sin. On the one hand, because He is infinite and eternal, God is complete. Nothing can be added to God and nothing taken away. There is no past or future in Him, which means no striving, no loss, and no gain. On the other hand, as finite and temporal, God is incomplete forever, suffering and striving endlessly on behalf of everything good.

The difference between human beings and God is both a difference of degree and an absolute difference. The difference is absolute because finitude is different in kind from infinity; it is one of degree because the movement from a finite to an infinite quantity is continuous. Royce plays on the dialectic of the finite and the infinite: human beings are finite and limited; God is infinite and unlimited. God strives as we strive, but His striving is infinite. We grow old eventually and retire from the fray, but God is never weary and never ceases to fight evil. God suffers as we suffer, but with the benefit of infinite understanding. He sees the far-off good our pain is working, the good which, if only we could see it, might at least help us accept our plight.

In one sense, union with God is a *fait accompli*: "In him you are even now at home."[9] But union in this basic sense is imperfect and not particularly spiritual. Spirituality means exchanging our finitude for the infinity of God by deliberately identifying our narrow selves with the Absolute Self. In Royce, as in Emerson, limitation is the only sin. We transcend our limitations and shed our finitude by broadening our span of moral attention to infinity, and by working for the broadest possible loyalty. This means recognizing that I ought to atone not only for the sins I can trace directly to my narrow self, but for all sin. The sins of my neighbor and even the sins of nature are mine also, and salvation means atoning for all the sins of the world.

Atonement is noble enough to be called spirituality, but is it properly spiritual? Uniting ourselves with God would not end our suffering but multiply it, since God suffers with us and His suffering is infinitely greater than ours. The more we identify ourselves with God, the more we undertake to atone for all the sins of the world. The magnitude of our struggle and in turn of our suffering approaches infinity. The best

[8] Josiah Royce, *The World and the Individual*, vol. 2 (New York: Macmillan, 1908), 386.

[9] Ibid., 427–28.

we can hope for is to fight bravely and to be honored as heroes. We cannot ask for peace, and to do so would be sinful: we would be asking God for a moral holiday.

Atonement is an affair of the world, and it has already been said that spirituality cannot be another name for involvement in the affairs of the world. If spirituality would deliver us from suffering, it must teach us to transcend not only our narrow selves, but self altogether, redirecting our gaze away from the world in the direction of something beyond. Otherwise, there can be no escape from the demands of living, no perfection other than moral perfection, and no peace for the Children of Adam.

Recognizing the insufficiency of the first outcome, here and there Royce approaches another one. A second outcome begins to appear when Royce considers what else it can mean to identify ourselves with God. To identify with God is not only to undertake an infinite moral task; it is also to adopt a God's-eye view of human history. The final sentence of *The World and the Individual* has us discovering at last "the homeland of Eternity." God sees the world from eternity, and we may see it that way also, insofar as we identify ourselves with Him. We are parts of God simply by virtue of being human. "Close is our touch with the eternal."[10] In a sense, the view from eternity is our birthright.

Such a grand vision might be a source of joy, as it is in Catholic theology, and Royce's prose is full of asseverations wherever eternity is mentioned, as if he hoped it would be. But in Royce's system the object of God's eternal vision is framed in infinite struggle and pain. Whether finite or infinite, a self is always hemmed in by enemies, and spirituality for Royce consists in trading our finite selves for an infinite self, so that anxiety about the future of a particular being with particular values is multiplied to infinity. Peace and joy cannot be had while a finite self, much less an infinite one, remains to take thought for the evil of tomorrow. On Royce's account, spirituality can only mean accelerated and enhanced worldliness. The second outcome is as unsatisfactory as the first, because even in union with God we cannot be happy: there is no beatific vision in which to rejoice.

Royce was a great moralist, and that is why he counsels us against peace: "Woe unto them that are at ease in Zion."[11] Righteousness demands hard work. Virtues require endless practice to be approximated, and they are never quite mastered: we may always succumb to temptation, if only by being lazy. In the eyes of a moralist, the longing for peace looks like weakness of will or flimsiness of commitment, like the childish desire to skip school on Friday; but it is weakness or flimsiness only in her eyes. Children often know better than adults how to bask in the simple enjoyments of the moment, and they may have a keener sense of how little everything matters in the end.

Royce understood the yearning for peace as an outcome of spirituality and wrote about it with solemnity: "The only way to give our view of Being rationality is to see that we long for the Absolute only in so far as in us the Absolute also longs, and seeks, through our very temporal striving, the peace that is nowhere in Time, but only, and yet absolutely, in Eternity."[12] But Royce's official view is that spirituality always has a moral structure and a moral outcome, so that peace is ever out of reach.

[10] Ibid., 452.

[11] Ibid., 407.

[12] Ibid., 386.

Royce's student George Santayana was at odds with his teacher in many particulars, but the two shared a deep interest in spirituality. Much of Santayana's theory of spirituality can be read as a continuation of Royce's work on the subject, yet Santayana makes progress where Royce does not by distinguishing carefully between spirituality and morals. Santayana knew better than Royce that when spirituality mingles with values it becomes ensnared and turns into worldliness.

According to Santayana, "spirit" is another name for intuition, which means consciousness or attention of every kind; it must not be confused with "psyche", which is Santayana's word for the structure and the activities of an animal body in which spirit arises. One is content to be absorbed in the moment while the other is constantly striving to improve the conditions of its existence. Animals have no choice but to concern themselves with good and bad, since for them life is not possible except under the right circumstances. But spirit is free to flourish in all conditions as long as the animal on which it supervenes remains alive. Ugliness or depravity would be as fascinating to a pure spirit as goodness or beauty. On this view, spiritual life is the opposite of moral life, and spirituality has nothing to do with values: "it is *disintoxication* from their influence."[13]

The difference between spirit and psyche does not imply a dualism, as some critics of Santayana have suggested. Psyche and spirit, like matter, essence, and truth, are convenient categories of thought; they call attention to particular traits of being, distinguished by the light of human intelligence as it plays across the scene of creation. Intelligence is naturally selective. Its beam is narrow and must shine on this collection of objects and not that one, but its ultimate object is the totality of being: heaven and earth, the sea, and everything in them. Spirit is a child of physical nature; its immateriality and virtual omniscience give it the appearance of something separate and independent, but spirit did not create itself, and it must live by the rules of its father's house. From spirit's point of view, its incarnation was an injustice. Why should it be tethered to some poor creature and distracted by its cares? Why should it suffer and die with the beasts? Yet this rebellion of spirit against the flesh is a domestic disturbance; spirit is disciplined by life in the world and made to respect its father's will, and it may learn to appreciate the strange perfection of its native province.

Considered apart from its inevitable connection with an animal host, spirit is purely contemplative, dispassionate, and unbiased. It has no stake in external circumstances because it has no desires of its own. The future is of no concern to spirit, because the present is perfectly satisfying. Spirit is like the birds of the air that neither sow nor reap nor gather into barns, yet their Father in heaven feeds them. Its whole life consists in contemplating forms, all of them equally engrossing. In a way, spirit is a poet and spiritual life a kind of poetry. Wallace Stevens seems to be speaking for spirit in his "Nomad Exquisite", which is written from the perspective of an almost impersonal "beholder" whose simple attention to the world is rewarded by "flinging / Forms, flames, and the flakes of flames." For psyche, forms are useful signs of things past and things to come; but spirit would appreciate forms for their own sakes and each so completely that it would behold the same one forever if the

[13] George Santayana, *Platonism and the Spiritual Life* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1927), 30.

animal underneath did not become tired of standing in the same position, or begin to worry about catching cold, finding love, or making dinner.

Spirituality is consciousness undisturbed by belief. It requires self-transcendence, but not of the kind which eventuates in a larger, more burdensome self. By self-transcendence, we should rather understand self-forgetfulness or the temporary annihilation of self, as in the famous passage of Emerson's where he becomes transparent to the world: "all mean egotism vanishes."[14] The meaning of self is ambiguous in Royce but very clear in Santayana: a self is a material psyche, a struggling animal determined to preserve its existence and thus vitally concerned with the uses of objects and the outcomes of events. In self-forgetfulness, one identifies for the moment with spirit, for which the accidents of existence, whether beautiful or terrible, make a delightful show. "Self, so turned into a mere pedestal, ceases to intercept intuition, yet continues to make intuition a possible temporal and local fact, and determines its point of view, language, and perspectives."[15] Objects of intuition are contemplated apart from beliefs or expectations about the material events they might be forecasting, and spirit in the beleaguered animal is temporarily emancipated from all concerns about the conditions of existence; confusion and fear yield to a kind of serenity.

Absorption in objects of intuition is sometimes called aesthetic experience. A beautiful object may transfix our attention for a time, causing us to surrender the question of its usefulness and to forget that we ourselves perceive it. This experience is fairly commonplace: a view to the horizon or a few bars of Mozart is enough to induce a pleasant trance in a sensitive soul; but the enchantment is predominantly sensuous and requires a beautiful object: a withered flower or a sour note would break the spell. Spirit everywhere is wedded to animal preferences and tends to ignore whatever its host dislikes; hence what is lovely to the psyche is at first irresistibly attractive to spirit, and all else remains in the background. Yet spirit is different in kind from its source in material nature: it is essentially intellectual and not willful. A spirit enhanced by training and purified by discipline would be drawn with as much fascination to any object of intuition, whether it appealed to the psyche or not.

John Dewey has suggested that aesthetic experience need not be limited to beautiful objects. All sorts of objects may attract our attention and reward contemplation with enjoyment: "the fire-engine rushing by; the machines excavating enormous holes in the earth; the human-fly climbing the steeple-side; the men perched high in air on girders, throwing and catching red-hot bolts."[16] Contemplation in these cases might be perfectly spiritual, but it might not be. The proposed objects are not beautiful, but they are not decidedly ugly; they were selected because they appealed to the senses and stimulated animal curiosity. Whatever the value of its object, aesthetic experience is largely emotional. A vague and diffused excitement in the senses is gradually focused and becomes a positive enjoyment or consummation.

---

[14] Ralph Waldo Emerson, *The Complete Works of Ralph Waldo Emerson*, vol. 1 (Cambridge: Riverside Press, 1903–04), 16.

[15] George Santayana, *The Realm of Spirit* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1940), 210.

[16] John Dewey, *Art as Experience* (New York: Minton, Balch and Company, 1934), 5.

Such experience may be intensely gratifying and even ecstatic, but it will be spiritual only inasmuch as understanding prevails over sensuous indulgence.

Aesthetic experience is tightly bound to the flux of matter; it is temporal and transient essentially: it may please the soul but it cannot satisfy the spirit. As animals, we are born into the restless machinery of nature in which everything is both end and means. "The time of consummation is also one of beginning anew."[17] Consummations are fleeting and in that sense they are vain and distracting to spirit, which would sooner understand the world than derive pleasure from it. In the eyes of pure spirit, lovers waste time chasing their loves, and successful people struggle in vain to defend their accomplishments and secure new prizes. In the end, aesthetic experience and the consummations engendered by it are worldly and unspiritual; they betray animal interests and shortsightedness. What the world gives today it will probably take back tomorrow. Rather than striving after earthly goods which moths and rust consume, spirit prefers to transcend its material station by appreciating the world without judging it and by viewing all things under the aspect of eternity.

In Royce, spirituality is an answer to suffering; it is compensatory even when it would be joyous. We seek it because the world makes us unhappy. But Santayana asks us to take seriously a kind of spirituality which is more than compensatory, one that animates the highest reaches of our consciousness. From the standpoint of physical nature, nothing is ever completed: new patterns of action eventually replace old ones, but development is open-ended and proceeds in capricious directions. Yet spirit, in its own eyes, is the flower of material life. If nature was drifting blindly before spirit awakened, on reflection it was a pregnant source; once alive, spirit had to see itself as the completion of its natural ground. To mere existence was added knowledge of existence. Spirit's awareness of itself as the perfection of physical nature is unspiritual: it draws the light of attention away from the present and directs it to remote objects; but spirit may train itself not to look into the past and to regard the future with indifference. By turning away from its source and renouncing its destiny, spirit perfects its function and clarifies its vision. Objects of intuition become occasions of wonder for spirit, not reminders or portents for psyche; the world of material things is raised and transfigured into the image of that world.

In advanced age or in grave illness, we may retreat inward, forget the afflicted psyche, and identify instead with spirit, which if crushed here springs to life again somewhere else. In doing so, even the instruments of our suffering may seem oddly perfect or funny. Why should *these* devils be tormenting us and not some others? This kind of spirituality will seem impossible as long as objects of intuition are treated as signs of material events which may hasten or postpone the hour of suffering and death. In due time our foot shall slide; meanwhile, the objects of our attention can be treated as mere images, and spirit, if allowed, will come to rest peacefully in them. Physical events are irrelevant distractions to a free spirit, which hastens to forgive them because they know not what they do; its treasure is in a world of pure forms and its heart is there also.

Shortly before the battle of Antietam, Union and Confederate regiments fought courageously at Fox's Gap in Maryland. As the soldiers of the 9th New York climbed the Old Sharpsburg Road to join the fray, Private David Thompson paused

[17] Ibid., 17.

to observe the progress of the whole First Corps that followed them. He described what he saw as "a monstrous, crawling, blue-black snake, miles long, quilled with the silver slant of muskets at a 'shoulder,' its sluggish tail writhing slowly up over the distant eastern ridge, its bruised head weltering in the roar and smoke upon the crest above."[18] Confederate general D. H. Hill observed the same scene from the summit of the mountain. He knew the fighting would soon engulf him, but the sight of the Union advance, he later wrote, was "grand and sublime."[19]

Yet, we do not need to be in trouble before we can identify with spirit and live for a while in its peace. The most ordinary forms can be delightful and absorbing if we are not too distracted to attend to them. Red lights at the top of a crane blinking against a black sky, loud voices shouting angrily in the street, the far-off sound of an aria being sung, the fragrance of the breeze along the shore, or the odor of garbage decomposing in a dump may take us outside of ourselves for a moment and give us a perspective on eternity. These satisfactions are spontaneous, not compensatory; they are the natural fruits of conscious life when that life is liberated from the cares of the animal that sustains it and free to contemplate a world of objects as they are in themselves.

The Christian tradition confuses spirituality with morals and politics, and they are no less confused in Royce's philosophy. As inheritors of both, we may be tempted to look for salvation in the wrong places. Santayana guards against this temptation by driving home the difference between spirituality and morals. Salvation, he tells us, is nowhere to be found in the affairs of the world, no matter how heroically we conduct ourselves in them. The more we attend to them, the more distracted and bedeviled our lives will be. Yet, if we can loosen the ties that bind us to the world, if we can forget ourselves and follow instead the promptings of form, surely we will dwell in the house of the Lord a little while. In the view from a hilltop or in the colors of a sunset we may find the peace of God that surpasses understanding.

MICHAEL BRODRICK

Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis

[18] Stephen W. Sears, *Landscape Turned Red: The Battle of Antietam* (New Haven: Ticknor and Fields, 1983), 136.

[19] Ibid.

Prefatory Notes to *The Life of Reason*

This was originally published in *The Journal of Philosophy, Psychology and Scientific Methods*, 15:3 (31 January 1918), 82–84. In the case of the last item ("Apollo in Love"), the book with the original inscription can be found at James Cummins Bookseller in New York City, so the published version was collated with a photocopy of the original and emended.

The inscription in *Reason in Common Sense* was revised and partially used in the 1922 "Preface to the Second Edition" (x.22–xi.6). The poem "Paganism Inevitable" was otherwise unpublished until William Holzberger's *Complete Poems of George Santayana* (350). The poem "Apollo in Love" was revised and appeared as Apollo's love song to Venus in *The Marriage of Venus*, published in *The Poet's Testament* in 1953 (49–50). —D.E.S.

NOTES AND NEWS

The Brick Row Book and Print Shop of New Haven was offering recently for sale a copy of the Life of Reason by George Santayana, in the volumes of which the author had written various prefatory notes, dated Cambridge, April 18, 1907. Through the courtesy of Mr. Hackett, the Journal of Philosophy is able to publish some of these.

Reason in Common Sense

A Short Preface

The first impulse to write this book came to me in 1889, on reading Hegel's *Phaenomenologie des Geistes*. There, it seemed to me, was a great idea spoiled by the sophistry and mythology that encumbered it. The great idea was to review the history of the human mind, picking out certain crucial episodes in it, and showing how the insights and habits then gained had contributed to our present moral constitution. The sophistry and mythology lay in supposing that such selected episodes must form a necessary dialectical chain, must make up the whole evolution of the world, and must be governed miraculously by their ultimate issue.

It occurred to me, then, that a more honest criticism of progress might be based on a frankly human ideal, applied to experience conceived in its natural historical setting. The project, however, took shape slowly, and it was not until 1896, under the influence of my first Platonic studies, that I made a beginning in actual composition.

This is not, therefore, a work of metaphysics, nor of history, nor even of psychology. It is a work of criticism. Its object is not to trace the connection or define the nature of all things, but merely to estimate the value of some of them — those that chiefly concern civilization. Yet, in order to criticize, it is necessary to understand and to be sympathetic; and for this reason I have been often led to reconstruct and to analyze the historical or psychological episodes of which I wished to estimate the value. The work of criticism has consequently become, in method, a work of imagination. It is as such only that, in its turn, it ought to be judged.

Reason in Religion

Paganism Inevitable.

A rejected passage written for "Lucifer"

(Athena addresses Hermes)

Brainsick men
Need brainsick gods. Some spirits crave our forms;
Others are dark with their intestine storms
And can not relish beauty. Even then,
When wise men honoured us, the vulgar heart
Worshipped itself. In vain the temple stood
Aloof in the dim silence of some wood
Oracular to mortals, far apart
From hot disquiet; in vain the god, well-wrought
By hands I guided, smiled superbly down.
What might a Zeus be to a tyrant's thought?
An Aphrodite to a sluttish clown?
They sacrificed for gain: one lamb they brought
To save a thousand, hallowing meat and wine
Vainly with words, and lightening not their cares.
Men pray for many things, and still they pine,
But to grow better is the best of prayers
When in our presence mortals unawares
Wax to our stature and become divine.
Therefore I mark not closely how the blind
Picture our nature. It is not their mind
That gave us being. They invoke us still
For in their bosoms stirs unquenchable will,
And brooding silent at Jehovah's shrine,
Empty and imageless, the warm heart paints,
Beyond invisible gods and haggard saints,
The likeness of thy beauty, or of mine.

Reason in Art

Reply to a Criticism.

Some of my friends have kindly observed that when I was younger I used to be more idealistic and more a friend of the arts. To explain this deterioration in my genius I transcribe the following verses, addressed by Apollo to Venus in an unpublished play of mine called The Marriage of Aphrodite:

Apollo in Love
or the poet lost in the Platonist

The stern palaestra moulded well my youth,
That I might wring from the taut-corded lyre
Music and truth,
To lighten souls, and move to holy ruth.

Much did I wander through the Delphic glen
Where the rapt Sibyl strained to catch my song
Through field and fen
Eurotas watered, nurse of perfect men.

And through all lovely lands, where beauty fed
The eyes with joy, and left the heart secure,
Which only bled
When my sweet boy, my Hyacinth, was dead.

Till, goddess, seeing thee, my soul was fired
With might of all the beauties ever seen,
For all conspired
In thy one form, divine and all-desired.

In thee I found all friends, all gifts, all power
Of music, and all harmonies — in thee,
With richer dower,
My Hyacinth came back, immortal flower.

But that, alas, which should my psalm inspire
Confounds me quite, and leaves me dumb, abashed;
So great desire
Chokes my faint voice, and snaps the pulsing lyre.

Angus Kerr-Lawson: 1932–2011

Angus Carmichael Kerr-Lawson, founder and editor of *Overheard in Seville*, died on June 20, 2011, from multiple myeloma. He is survived by his wife Margaret, daughters Leslie (and her husband, Steven Brooks) and Kate (and her husband, Stephen Bate), sister Jessie, grandchildren Andrea and Matt Brooks, Jamie and Charlotte Bate, sister-in-law Barbara (and her husband, Ralph Hall), and children, Doug, David, and Heather. Along with the family he loved, he also leaves behind many friends, former students, and professional colleagues. All mourn the loss of a dedicated professor of mathematics, first-rate scholar, and one of the few masters of the philosophy of George Santayana.

Angus was born in the rural mining community of Swastika, Ontario, Canada, in 1932. His parents were both geologists — his mother was the first woman to receive a master's degree in geology from the University of Toronto. Angus left his hometown in 1954 to attend the University of Toronto, where he studied mathematics. In 1955 he went to the University of Chicago, where he earned a Master's in mathematics. In 1956 he was awarded a substantial scholarship to study at the Sorbonne. It was while in Paris that he first read Santayana and thereupon developed a life-long passion for philosophy. Disillusioned with his program of study at the Sorbonne and increasingly intrigued by philosophy, he left Paris and began attending philosophy classes at the London School of Economics. However, he was not sympathetic to the philosophy of logical positivism that was in vogue there at the time, and he eventually left England to join the newly founded University of Waterloo in 1958 as an instructor of mathematics. While teaching at Waterloo he earned his doctorate from McMaster University in 1963. Although his initial appointment was with the Department of Pure Mathematics, a position that twice took him to Kyoto, Japan, for teaching assignments (he was pleased to conduct his final lecture in Japanese), the passion he felt for philosophy only grew stronger over time. In 1976 he went to Oxford University for the fall term on sabbatical. It was while at Oxford that he read Timothy Sprigge's book *Santayana: An Examination of his Philosophy*. Greatly impressed by the book, he called Sprigge on the telephone and the two became lifelong friends. Upon return to Canada, Angus began attending philosophy colloquia at Waterloo and also began attending professional philosophy conferences. In the late 1970s, he helped found the George Santayana Society and in 1983 he started and co-edited *Overheard in Seville*, becoming the sole editor in 1988. In the early eighties, he joined the Department of Philosophy, where he held a cross-appointment until his retirement in 1996. Angus's retirement was nominal only; like Santayana, he continued to read and write philosophy until just a few weeks before his death.

Angus's proficiencies as teacher, scholar, and editor are well recognized. Over the years I've encountered several of his former students (I luckily count myself amongst them) and all have shared reports of his many virtues: focused intelligence, sympathy, kindness, patience — all complemented by a delightfully wry sense of humor. His contributions to both teaching and philosophy were recently celebrated when he was given the Distinguished Professor Emeritus Award at the 2011 spring convocation at the University of Waterloo; and in 2008 when the Society for the

Advancement of American Philosophy awarded him the prestigious Herbert Schneider Award for his career-long achievement of "distinguished contributions to the understanding of American Philosophy."

It is difficult not to think that Santayana would have been especially pleased that it was a professor of pure mathematics who, for the last thirty years, has been the most faithful expositor of his philosophical system. This is not because Santayana stated in the introduction to *Scepticism and Animal Faith* that if he were a mathematician he would "no doubt regale myself, if not the reader, with an electric or logistic system of the universe expressed in algebraic symbols." As readers of this journal know well, such was not Angus's style, despite his proficiency in mathematics and logic. What Santayana would have liked is that Angus was a self-described outsider in philosophy who nevertheless wrote penetrating essays, without appeal to logical notation, in prose that was invariably neatly polished, unadorned, and lucid. He demonstrated the truth in Santayana's claim that his naturalistic system of philosophy is open to all who value reason and honesty and that no special training in philosophy is required to appreciate it. Any reader who finds Santayana's system of philosophy obscured by his literary style would do well to turn first to Angus's writings for a precise restatement and clarification of Santayana's views. And, although Santayana famously warned of commentaries on philosophers being the "fifth dilution" of the tea (that is, five steps removed from the reality the philosopher aims to describe), Angus's distillation of Santayana's philosophy was an unusually strong brew. As I noted in a contribution to a recent *festschrift* on Angus's work published by *The Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society*, if Santayana is one of the sublime interpreters of commonsense and naturalism, then Angus is the most orthodox interpreter of Santayana's orthodox categories. No one has better explained Santayana's philosophy while at the same time holding fast to the essentials of his system.

For a follower of Santayana's philosophy, there is no erasing or eliding the irremediably sad truth that Angus's life is over. But a follower of Santayana may also say that this truth is contrasted with a brighter, larger eternal truth that is Angus's life and work. He once told me the work he was most proud of was the creation of this journal and the many years he oversaw its publication. It is in recognition of this fact and with gratitude for his efforts that this edition of *Overheard in Seville* is dedicated to Angus Carmichael Kerr-Lawson.

GLENN TILLER

Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi

Henry Levinson: 1948–2010

Henry Samuel Levinson died on January 4, 2010, at age 61, from complications stemming from multiple sclerosis. He battled this disease for more than twenty years with grace, humor, and dignity. He was much beloved by his colleagues and students.

Henry Levinson was a noted scholar of Santayana's work, as well as the work of William James. He was the author of *Santayana, Pragmatism, and the Spiritual Life* (1992), *Science, Metaphysics and the Chance of Salvation: An Interpretation of the Thought of William James* (1978), and *The Religious Investigations of William James* (1981), as well as numerous articles. He received his bachelor's degree from Stanford University and his doctorate from Princeton. Levinson served as a Professor of Religious Studies at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro for over 25 years. He also taught at Stanford and Harvard before joining the faculty at UNCG. He taught courses in American religious thought, modern Judaism, and the philosophy of religion — and kept teaching right up until the end.

For Levinson, Santayana's status as a philosopher on the peripheries of American Protestant culture was key to his ability to offer useful immanent criticism of American culture. Levinson's Santayana displayed a variety of religious naturalism that emphasized the role chance and contingency played in the course of human events, even as it promoted the adjustment of human powers to human ideals. Santayana, in Levinson's treatment, was as appreciative of the world "of unheard melodies and uncreated worlds" as he was tough-minded about illusory religious thinking. The spiritual and moral center of Levinson's academic work involved shedding light upon "the innocence of things … hated" and "the clearness of the things … frowned upon or denied."

Henry was a playful and imaginative scholar of religion, interpreting the religious visions of others to his students with delight. Henry's own work showed a reverent attachment to the democratic and traditional Jewish "sources of his being." His wit served as a tool for coping with physical challenge; he will be much missed.

BETHEL L. EDDY

Worcester Polytechnic Institute

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL CHECKLIST
TWENTY-SEVENTH UPDATE

The items below will supplement the references given in *George Santayana: A Bibliographical Checklist, 1880–1980* (Bowling Green: Philosophy Documentation Center, 1982), prepared by Herman J. Saatkamp Jr. and John Jones. These references are divided into primary and secondary sources. Except for the book reviews and dissertations, the following articles and books are classified according to their years of publication. Readers with additions or corrections are invited to send these to Kristine Frost, Santayana Edition, Institute for American Thought, School of Liberal Arts, IUPUI, INDIANAPOLIS IN 46202-5157, or by email to santedit@iupui.edu.

A special thank you to Daniel Moreno for his time and effort in researching and compiling the majority of entries in this year's update.

CHRONOLOGICAL LISTING OF PRIMARY SOURCES

2010

Personas y lugares. Fragmentos de autobiografía. [Excerpts.] Translated by Pedro García Martín. *Debats* 108 (2010): 32–35.

"Las mansiones de Helena." [Soliloquy number 52 from *Soliloquies in England.*] Translated by Daniel Moreno Moreno. *Debats* 108 (2010): 36–39.

"La piedad." [Essay number 36 from *Little Essays.*] Translated by José Beltrán and Daniel Moreno. *Debats* 108 (2010): 40–41.

2009

The Genteel Tradition in American Philosophy and Character and Opinion in the United States. Edited and with an Introduction by James Seaton. With essays by Wilfred M. McClay, John Lachs, James Seaton, and Roger Kimball. New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press, 2009, 200p.

2006

"La ironía del liberalismo." [Soliloquy number 43 from *Soliloquies in England*.] Translated by Javier Alcoriza and Antonio Lastra. *Archipiélago* 70 (2006): 108–17.

"¿Qué es la estética?" ("What Is Aesthetics?) Translated by Ignacio Rodríguez de Guzmán. *Fedro. Revista de estética y teoría de las artes* 4 (2006): 70–76. [Available at: http://institucional.us.es/fedro/uploads/pdf/n4/santayana.pdf]

"Tom Sawyer y don Quijote." Translated by Javier Alcoriza and Antonio Lastra. *Archipiélago* 70 (2006): 119–22.

CHRONOLOGICAL LISTING OF SECONDARY SOURCES

2011

Madigan, Tim. "Singer & Santayana on Love." "Philosophy & Love" issue of *Philosophy Now* 85 (July/August 2011): 18–20.

Santayana: un pensador universal. Edited by José Beltrán, Manuel Garrido, and Sergio Sevilla. Biblioteca Javier Coy d'estudis nord-americans. València: Universitat de València, 2011, 273p. (Papers presented at the Santayana conference in Valencia in November 2009.) This work includes the following essays:

"Introducción," José Beltrán, 13–17

"George Santayana: ciudadano del mundo" ("George Santayana: World Citizen"), Herman J. Saatkamp Jr., 21–35

"George Santayana y su España," Pedro García, 37–48

"Santayana y América" ("Santayana and America"), Krzysztof P. Skowroński, 49–54

"Santayana y su idea de Europa," José Beltrán, 55–68

"El *Sur* de Santayana," Vicente Cervera, 69–91

"Un Santayana posible: *detachment*/desasimiento," Daniel Moreno, 95–105

"El moralismo pragmático y la politización de la filosofía" ("Pragmatic Moralism and the Politicization of Philosophy"), Matthew C. Flamm, 107–17

"Sobre *Escepticismo y fe animal*. El método de la fe animal" ("The Method of Animal Faith"), John Lachs, 119–24

"Santayana, o la ilusión de la mirada," Ángel Manuel Faerna, 125–38

"Espectros del idealismo: Santayana y Dewey," Ramón del Castillo, 139–65

"Sobre la impotencia del espíritu" ("On the Impotence of Spirit"), Angus Kerr-Lawson, 167–76

"El significado de los juegos de palabras en el pensamiento de Santayana" ("The Significance of the Pun in the Thought of George Santayana"), Martin A. Coleman, 177–87

"El legado literario de Santayana," Cayetano Estébanez, 191–222

"Interpretaciones de poesía en la correspondencia entre George Santayana y Robert Lowell," Graziella Fantini, 223–31

"Santayana y la estética como teoría del valor" ("Santayana e l'estética come teoria del valore"), Giuseppe Patella, 233–43

"Interpretaciones de *poiesis* y religión: Santayana sobre Goethe y Emerson con la guía del romanticismo tardío postmoderno de Stevens" ("Interpretations of *Poiesis* and Religion: Santayana on Goethe and Emerson with Stevens' Postmodern High Romanticism as Guide"), David Dilworth, 245–59

"Santayana, Unamumo y Ortega: tres referentes del pensamiento español de la Edad de Plata," Manuel Garrido, 261–73

The book also includes a CD that contains additional essays not printed in the published volume:

"La importancia de la religión en la obra filosófica de Jorge Santayana," Manuel Bermúdez, Encarnación Castilla, José Martínez, Julia Molina, and Agustín Sánchez

"Reflections on Living Well," Michael Brodrick

"El valor de la belleza en Santayana," Sixto J. Castro

"Una Gioconda filosófica: ideología y escepticismo," Rafael Cejudo y Ramón Román

"Soledad de soledades … todo es soledad: Psique y sociedad en Santayana y Castoriadis," Maria Aurelia Di Berardino

"Poesía y desilusión," Camen González

"El otoño romano de George Santayana," Belén Hernández

"The Phenomenological Character of Santayana's Philosophy of the Spirit," Edward E. Lovely

"Santayana y la poesía primera," Ricardo Mena

"What Kind of Religion is Ultimate Religion?" Daniel Pinkas

"Santayana and Dewey Meet," Richard M. Rubin

"A propósito de *El Reino de la Verdad,*" José Miguel Sabater Rillo

"El talante moralista de la obra de Santayana," Julio Seoane

"The Concept of Dramatic Sympathy in Santayana's Philosophy," Leonarda Vaiana

2010

Beltrán Llavador, José. "Santayana y la música de las esferas: una *promenade*." *Debats* 108 (2010): 66–73.

Coleman, Martin. "'It doesn't … matter where you begin': Pound and Santayana on Education." *The Journal of Aesthetic Education* 44 (Winter 2010): 1–17.

_____ "Reflections on Santayana's Letters." *Limbo* 30 (2010): 5–18.

Estébanez Estébanez, Cayetano. "Los poemas del mar de Santayana." *Debats* 108 (2010): 58–65.

Garagalza, Luis. "El ser humano como ser paradójico y simbólico." In *Homo sum. El ser humano en la filosofía española contemporánea*, edited by Diego Bermejo, 61–82. Logroño, España: Perla, 2010.

García Martin, Pedro. "La España de Santayana a través de su autobiografía y de sus cartas." *Limbo* 30 (2010): 53–68.

Garrett, Brian. "Santayana's Treatment of Teleology." *Overheard in Seville: Bulletin of the Santayana Society* 28 (Fall 2010): 1–10.

Garrido, Manuel, Ángel M. Faerna, Giuseppe Patella, and Krzysztof P. Skowroński. "Actualidad de Santayana." *Debats* 108 (2010): 74–83.

Heney, Diana. "The Genteel Tradition Revisited." *Overheard in Seville: Bulletin of the Santayana Society* 28 (Fall 2010): 35–38.

Hoyo Juliá, Miriam. "Bach, Schubert y el Congreso Internacional sobre Jorge Santayana." *Debats* 108 (2010): 84–86.

Kerr-Lawson, Angus. "Help from George Santayana for John Searle against Richard Rorty." *Overheard in Seville: Bulletin of the Santayana Society* 28 (Fall 2010): 25–34.

Moreno Moreno, Daniel. "La filosofía de Santayana: una forma de vida." *Debats* 108 (2010): 48–57.

Resler, Johanna E. "Bibliographical Checklist: Twenty-Sixth Update." *Overheard in Seville: Bulletin of the Santayana Society* 28 (Fall 2010): 41–45.

Rubin, Richard. "George Santayana and John Dewey Meet." *Limbo* 30 (2010): 31–52.

_____ "How John Dewey and George Santayana help us look at John Searle and Daniel Dennett." *Overheard in Seville: Bulletin of the Santayana Society* 28 (Fall 2010): 11–23.

Sevilla, Sergio, Manuel Garrido, and José Beltrán. "Introducción." *Debats* 108 (2010): 44–47.

Tutor de Ureta, Andrés. "Informe del Congreso Internacional sobre Jorge Santayana (Muvim, Valencia, 16–18 noviembre 2009)." *Limbo* 30 (2010): 155–59.

Vaiana, Leonarda. "Santayana's Concept of Sympathy and Literary Tradition." *Limbo* 30 (2010): 19–29.

2009

Coleman, Martin. "Is George Santayana an American Philosopher?" ("George Santayana é um Filósofo Americano?") *Cognitio: Revista de Filosofia* 10 (January–June 2009): 29–41.

Ruiz Zamora, Manuel. "El Cervantes de Santayana." *Revista de Occidente* 336 (2009): 102–12.

Kimball, Roger. "Mental Hygiene and Good Manners: The Contribution of George Santayana." In *The Genteel Tradition in American Philosophy and Character and Opinion in the United States,* edited by James Seaton. New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press, 2009, 175–92.

Lachs, John. "Understanding America." In *The Genteel Tradition in American Philosophy and Character and Opinion in the United States,* edited by James Seaton. New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press, 2009, 148–59.

McClay, Wilfred M. "The Unclaimed Legacy of George Santayana." In *The Genteel Tradition in American Philosophy and Character and Opinion in the United States,* edited by James Seaton. New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press, 2009, 124–47.

Seaton, James. "The Genteel Tradition and English Liberty." In *The Genteel Tradition in American Philosophy and Character and Opinion in the United States,* edited by James Seaton. New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press, 2009, 160–74.

_____. "Introduction: George Santayana — The Philosopher as Cultural Critic." In *The Genteel Tradition in American Philosophy and Character and Opinion in the United States,* edited by James Seaton. New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press, 2009, xi–xxxviii.

2008

Del Castillo, Ramón. "Fuego pálido." *Revista de libros* 138 (2008): 9–11.

Savater, Fernando. "George Santayana, un español en América." In his *La aventura de pensar*. Barcelona: Debate, 2008, 217–26.

Valdés Villanueva, Luis M. "Santayana and Wittgenstein on Scepticism." In *Wittgenstein and the Philosophy of Information*. Edited by Alois Pichler and Herbert Hrachovec. Frankfurt: Ontos Verlag, 2008, 105–24.

2007

Eyres, Harry. "A life worth living for." *Financial Times* (18 August 2007). [Article no longer available at www.ft.com.]

2005

Jenner, Paul. "The Criticism of Philosophy: Santayana, Rorty, Cavell." A paper presented at the 7th Annual Comparative Literature Conference, "Thinking on the Boundaries: The Availability of Philosophy in Film and Literature," at the University of South Carolina, Columbia, 10–12 February, 2005.

Epstein, Joseph. "Santayana's Chair." *The Weekly Standard* (3 October 2005): 4.

1995

Novas, Himilce. "George Santayana." In his *The Hispanic 100*. New York: Carol Publishing Group, 1995.

1988

Spiegler, Charles G. "Santayana Might Have Flunked the Exam." *The New York Times* (3 January 1988): E14 [letter to the editor].

1980

Jansen, Sue Curry. "The Stranger as Seer or Voyeur: A Dilemma of the Peep-Show Theory of Knowledge." *Qualitative Sociology* 2 (17 January 1980): 22–55.

1951

Russell, Bertrand. "George Santayana," in *Portraits from Memory and Other Essays*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1951, 92–98.

REVIEWS OF SANTAYANA'S BOOKS

Dominations and Powers

"Santayana Ponders Man and Politics." *The Dallas Morning News* (6 May 1951): 8. (Lon Tinkle)

The Genteel Tradition in American Philosophy and Character and Opinion in the United States. Edited and with an Introduction by James Seaton. With essays by Wilfred M. McClay, John Lachs, James Seaton, and Roger Kimball. New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press, 2009.

"Santayana's Liberty." *The University Bookman* (Spring 2011) (David A. Dilworth)

[Available at: http://www.kirkcenter.org/index.php/bookman/article/santayana-liberty/]

"The Tragedy of Happiness." *The Wall Street Journal* (11 December 2009): W10 (Thomas Meaney)

The Letters of George Santayana. Edited and with an Introduction by William G. Holzberger.

"Alive in the Mind: Santayana's world is a reasonable place." *The Weekly Standard* 14 (6 April 2009) (James Seaton) [Available at: http://www.weeklystandard.com/Content/Protected/Articles/000/000/016/327bmelm.asp]

REVIEWS OF BOOKS ABOUT SANTAYANA

Skowroński, Krzysztof P. *Santayana and America: Values, Liberties, Responsibility Under Any Sky: Contemporary Readings of George Santayana*. Edited by Matthew C. Flamm and Krzysztof P. Skowroński.

"Reviews." *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 44 (Fall 2008): 728–34 (Michael Brodrick)

DISSERTATIONS/THESES

Cleveland, Basil H. "Open-mouthedness: World, Poetry, and Liberation in the Philosophy of George Santayana." Ph.D., Boston University, 2009.

Cranfill, Elmira P. "George Santayana's Influence on Eliot, Pound, and Stevens: The Tradition of Lucretius, Dante, and Goethe." Ph.D., The University of Texas at Dallas, 2009.

Eddy, Bethel Louise. "The Rites of Identity: The Religious Naturalism and Cultural Criticism of Kenneth Burke and Ralph Ellison." Ph.D., Princeton University, 1998.

Lovely, Edward William. "George Santayana's Philosophy of Religion: His Roman Catholic Influences, Phenomenological Method and Significance to Contemporary Religious Studies." Ph.D., Drew University, 2006.

Noble, Mark. "The American Atom: Materiality and Poetic Vocation from Whitman to Stevens." Ph.D., The Johns Hopkins University, 2009.

Ozkar, Mine. "Uncertainties of Reason: Pragmatist Plurality in Basic Design Education." Ph.D., Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2004.

Weller, Dylan. "A Practice of Wonderment: Rethinking Religious Experience through Emerson, James and Santayana." Ph.D., The Johns Hopkins University, 2009.

Overheard in Seville

Overheard in Seville is edited by Glenn Tiller, David Spiech, Kristine Frost, and Martin Coleman. It is published and distributed by the School of Liberal Arts at Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis. Archived issues are available at http://iat.iupui.edu/santayana/content/overheard-seville-bulletin-santayana-society.

Correspondence concerning manuscripts and publications should be sent to Glenn Tiller, Department of Philosophy, College of Liberal Arts, 6300 Ocean Drive, Corpus Christi, TX 78412-5814, USA. Email: glenn.tiller@tamucc.edu

Matters concerning subscriptions, the Santayana Edition, the Santayana Society, and the Bibliographic Update should be sent to Kristine Frost, associate editor of the Santayana Edition, at the Institute for American Thought, 902 West New York Street, ES-0010, Indianapolis, IN 46202-5157, USA. Email: kfrost@iupui.edu

Some Abbreviations for Santayana's Works

Page numbers refer to the critical Santayana Edition, where this exists, or to the Scribner/Constable edition in most other cases.

AFSL	*Animal Faith and Spiritual Life,* ed. John Lachs
BR	*Birth of Reason and Other Essays*
COUS	*Character and Opinion in the United States*
POEMS	*Complete Poems*
DL	*Dialogues in Limbo*
DP	*Dominations and Powers*
EGP	*Egotism in German Philosophy*
ICG	*The Idea of Christ in the Gospels*
IPR	*Interpretations of Poetry and Religion*
LGS	*The Letters of George Santayana*
LP	*The Last Puritan*
LR	*The Life of Reason*
LR1	Bk. 1, *Reason in Common Sense*
LR2	Bk. 2, *Reason in Society*
LR3	Bk. 3, *Reason in Religion*
LR4	Bk. 4, *Reason in Art*
LR5	Bk. 5, *Reason in Science*
OS	*Obiter Scripta*
PGS	*The Philosophy of George Santayana,* ed. P. A. Schilpp
POML	*Physical Order and Moral Liberty,* ed. J. and S. Lachs
PP	*Persons and Places*
PSL	*Platonism and the Spiritual Life*
RB	*Realms of Being* (one-volume edition)
RE	*The Realm of Essence* RB Bk. I
RM	*The Realm of Matter* RB Bk. II
RT	*The Realm of Truth* RB Bk. III
RS	*The Realm of Spirit* RB Bk. IV
SAF	*Scepticism and Animal Faith*
SB	*The Sense of Beauty*
SE	*Soliloquies in England and Later Soliloquies*
TTMP	*Some Turns of Thought in Modern Philosophy*
TPP	*Three Philosophical Poets*
WD	*Winds of Doctrine*