

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

By

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

## CHAPTER VI

### THE PASSION AND THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST AS THE LIBERATION OF THE SPIRIT THROUGH SUFFERING

*Is it too bold an interpretation of Christian dogma to say that [the] inevitable innocence of the spirit, in all it suffers, is symbolised by the passion and death of Christ, and by his resurrection? The possible liberation of the spirit is not a liberation from suffering or death, but through suffering and death. This suffering and death need not be bloody... (RS, 207).*

#### 36. Of the Passion and the Resurrection in General

As the Parables of the previous chapter concern the office of Christ as a Prophet, so the Passion and the Resurrection concern the two other offices of Christ as a Great High Priest and as a King. «The Passion of Christ», says Santayana, «is to be understood as a ritual sacrifice» (ICG, 148). We especially find this idea in the image of the Lamb ('*Agnion*') in the Apocalypse of Saint John (e.g., Revel. 5:6-13; cp. John 1:29,36; Isaiah 53:7). As Santayana explains, «He [Christ] was the Lamb of God, sacrificed willingly» (ICG, 149). He was at the same time the victim and the sacrificer; the Great High Priest who offered on the Cross himself as a Lamb to his Father. He is the «Lamb slain» of the Apocalypse (Revel. 5:6). «Yet this Lamb of the Apocalypse is not weak. Al-

---

\* Continuation from *Theologia*, No 48, July-September 1977, p. 613.

though he appears 'as one slain', he is the Lord of lords and the King of kings, with a hundred and forty-four thousand followers as pure and as miraculously powerful as himself» (ICG, 149; Revel. 14:3, 19:16). The characterization of Christ as the «Lamb slain» refers to his Passion, and the characterization of Christ as the «King of kings» refers to his Resurrection. In this sense, therefore, the Passion of Christ, considered not only as the victim but also as the sacrificer, concerns his office as a Great High Priest, and the Resurrection of Christ, his office as a King. So, this chapter on the Passion and the Resurrection as expressing these two offices of Christ is related to the Parables of the previous chapter as also expressing an office of Christ: that of the Prophet.

There is, however, another, greater relation between these two chapters than that which is based on the three offices of Christ. This relation is greater not only in the sense that it extends to the Miracles, too, including them, besides the Parables, but especially because of its reference to the idea of Christ or God in man, which is the main idea of this part of our essay. This idea, as we have seen in general, concerns the two natures of Christ, the divine and human. In viewing from this standpoint, then, the relation of this chapter to the previous chapter, we can find that the Passion, like the Parables, show forth in a special way the human nature of the divine Christ, while the Resurrection, like the Miracles, manifests to all his divine nature. As the Parables express more obviously the human than the divine nature of Christ in the sense that they are characterized by their author's imagination, which is «one of the richest endowments of human psyche» (ICG, 132), so «some of the words uttered by Christ upon the cross show forth especially this same nature». Thus, Santayana finds Christ in expressing, *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?* «the truer man for doing so»<sup>1</sup>. On the other hand, the Resurrection puts its stress on the divine nature of Christ, for «Jesus could not possibly have been the Christ if he had not risen from the dead»<sup>2</sup>. So, from this point of view the

---

1. ICG, 133. Though in a different sense from that of Santayana, the gnostic Valentine emphasizes also the human nature in the Passion of Christ in believing, like Basilides, that «the Soter [the divine nature], at the passion, left the psychical Messiah [the human nature] to himself» (A. Neander. *General History of the Christian Religion and Church*, Boston: Crocker & Brewster, London: Wiley & Putman, 1849, Vol. I, p. 430). This was a clearly heretical view.

2. ICG, 42. We are reminded here again that by the two different names «Jesus» and «Christ» Santayana usually distinguishes the human nature of Christ from his divine nature.

Resurrection, as «the central miracle of the whole history of Christ» (ICG, 159), is related to the Miracles in general «as signs of Christ's power» and «proofs of his divine commission» (ICG, 81; also 84).

Besides this relation, there is also another one between the Resurrection and the Miracles, a relation based on our treatment of the Miracles, in the previous chapter, as an expression of love. As we explain in that chapter, «miracles», according to Santayana's interpretation, «belong to [the] natural sphere and manifest the hidden sympathies and harmonies between its parts» (RS, 204; also ICG, 80). If this is true for the miracles in general, it is true much more for the Resurrection in particular as «the central miracle». So, like all the miracles, Resurrection, in a higher degree, is an expression of love, too.

But this love, which constitutes the similarity of the Resurrection in this chapter with the Miracles in the previous chapter, constitutes, on the other hand, the contrast of the Resurrection to the Passion within the same chapter. This chapter has as its subject this Resurrection and Passion of Christ. Passion ending at death in Christ's case and Resurrection as a beginning of a post-mortal life, as «the first fruits of them that slept» (1 Corinth. 15:20), are by their nature quite opposite to each other. In Christianity, however, whose main characteristic of love of one for another (John 13:35) is also extended to our enemies (Matt. 5:45), this apparent contrast between death and all kinds of sufferings and resurrection from the dead disappears; for these two contradictory processions are reconciled in Christ's Passion and Resurrection, which in reality are not hostile but allied, as both being necessary for the salvation of man, since Christ's «followers would experience it [salvation] if they shared his passion and his resurrection» (RS, 203). In other words, salvation is attained through suffering, for Christ would not be risen from the dead if he did not die before. So, in our case, too, without this suffering and death, which need not be bloody, we could not participate in his Resurrection and find salvation through him. Salvation, therefore, comes by taking up our cross and following him (Matt. 16:24; Mark 8:34). In this sense, «our sacrifice would be our liberation, because that which we had renounced was only a mass of vices and sorrows» (ICG, 52).

Thus we find here the same thing as in the case of Christ whose Resurrection through his Passion symbolizes in this sense the liberation of the spirit through its suffering. «The spirit, in all it suffers», Santayana says, «is symbolized by the passion and the death of Christ, and by his resurrection». And, as in his case, this resurrection is realized through

his passion, so in the case of the spirit «the possible liberation of the spirit is not a liberation from suffering and death, but through suffering and death. This suffering and death need not be bloody» (RS, 207). But, let us see in more detail in the following pages this symbolism of the Passion and Resurrection of Christ, which is the subject of this chapter.

### 37. The Certain Episodes of the Passion of Christ (The Distraction of the Spirit of Christ by His Passion).

Though «the Passion of Christ, as it passed through his mind, is expressed for us by the Evangelists in his prayers» (ICG, 143), as such among them Santayana reckons the seven words of the cross, too (ICG, 133ff.). «It is expressed dumbly also in his demeanour» by «certain episodes» (ICG, 143). The introductory episode to the Passion is that of the anointing of the head<sup>3</sup> of Jesus by Mary<sup>4</sup> with a very precious ointment in the house of Simon the Leper at Bethany, two days before the Passover<sup>5</sup>. Because «murmurs arise about the waste of money that might have been given to the poor, «Christ says: *Ye have the poor always with you; but me ye have not always. For in that she hath poured this ointment on my body she did it for my burial*» (ICG, 144; Mark 14:6-9, John 12:7-8). In saying these last words «for my burial», Christ, as Santayana remarks, «was already living his coming Passion, his death». In this sense, as he concludes, «this episode was a foreword to the Passion and is introduced, as it were, by chance» (ICG, 144).

But Christ himself expressly introduces a most unexpected action when in the Last Supper he «*laid aside his garments... and began to wash his disciples' feet*» (ICG, 38,144; John 13:4-6). And this action, according to Christ's own words, was an example that his disciples should

3. According to the narration of this scene by Saint John, «Mary... anointed the feet of Jesus» (John 12:3). But, according to Saint Mark, «she brake the box, and poured it on his head» (Mark 14:3). Though Santayana considers both narrations, he follows on this point the latter, for he talks of the alabaster box of very precious ointment poured on his head» (ICG, 143).

4. Santayana is mistaken in identifying this Mary (John 12:3), Mary Magdalene, with the sister of Martha (ICG, 143). According to him, «there is, however, some confusion in the reports». For this reason, as he explains, «never mind whether there were two or three women, or only one» (ICG, 143-144).

5. According to St. Mark this event took place two days before the feast of the passover (Mark 14:1) and, according to St. John «six days before the passover» (John 12:1).



do as he had done to them (John 13:15). But, as Santayana points out, «there was more than an example of humility and service; there was a symbol of purification» (ICG, 144). Of this Christ himself said: «He that is washed needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit; and ye are clean but not all» (John 13:10). Another original, even more mysterious, action was about to follow in the Last Supper: the institution of the Eucharist which, too, is a symbol<sup>6</sup>. Here «his flesh and his blood, that we must eat and drink if we are to have any part in his resurrection», symbolize «the cross that we must take up if we would follow Christ» (ICG, 144).

Essentially the Passion of Christ begins in the same night, when, after his Last Supper, he went with his disciples to the Garden of Gethsemane to give the «Gospel of Testament» (John 13:31-16:33) to them and to pray for himself: «*O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me; nevertheless not as I will, but as thou wilt*» (ICG, 130, 131; Matt. 26:39). «And», as St. Luke narrates, «being in an agony he prayed more earnestly; and his sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground» (Luke 27:44). Santayana remarks on this prayer in the Garden: «it was an agony; there was a sweat of blood» (ICG, 130), and a «terrible struggle. It was division within himself, as all moral struggle must be within oneself. It was the stirrings of his adopted humanity, or rather of its animal part, against his fixed purpose» (ICG, 131). For this purpose, as we know, he had said before to «the good Peter», who had suggested that «Christ's chosen Passion and death must never come to pass». «*Get thee behind me, Satan*» (ICG, 124, 131; Matt. 16:23, Mark 8:33, Luke 4:8). Nothing was easier for him than to let that cup of his Passion pass from him. But, he preferred to submit to his Father's will: «*O my Father, if this cup may not pass away from me, except I drink it, thy will be done*» (ICG, 131; Matt. 26:51). Even at this last moment, when the «great multitude with swords and staves» (Matt. 26:47), led by the betrayer disciple, was approaching the secret place and it seemed to be too late, Christ could save himself from them if, instead of praying as he did in the Garden, he prayed to his Father to give him presently for his protection «*more than twelve legions of angels*» (ICG, 131; Matt. 26:53). But, he leaves himself voluntarily to be arrested by his enemies. And, to «Peter, who draws a sword to defend him» (ICG, 131;

---

6. ICG, 144. Of the symbolic interpretation of the institution of the Eucharist as an illustration of the idea of Christ or God in man (ICG, 144-145), we have already talked in this part of our essay (Pt. II, Ch. III, sec. 9b).

John 18:10) he says: «Peter, put up thy sword into the sheath» (John 18:11); for, as Santayana explains, «it was vain also to resist violence by violence, and so to perpetuate violence and injustice. *All they that take the sword shall perish with the sword*» (ICG, 76; Matt. 26:52; cp. Luke 22:36,38).

Christ was arrested by the «braves» of the chief priests and was led to «Annas first» (John 18:12), then to «Caiaphas the high priest» (John 18:24), and finally to Pontius Pilate, the governor (John 18:28ff.). He accepted the spites, the buffets, the strikes, and the blasphemies of the servants (Matt. 26:67-68, Mark 14:65, Luke 22:63-65); the mockeries of the soldiers, the crown of thorns, and the scourge (Matt. 27:26-31, Mark 15:16-21, John 19:1-3). The sufferings of Christ were raised to their summit by this crucifixion on the Mount of Calvary. There, from the height of the Cross the seven words, uttered by Christ, were heard in the midst of the greatest plights. «They all form integral parts of the drama of the Passion» (ICG, 133). Two of them are: *I thirst* and *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?* (ICG, 133; John 19:28, Matt. 28: 46, Mark. 15:34). The former expresses added physical pain, besides that of the wounds of the nails. The latter, repeated by two of the Evangelists in the original: *Eli, Eli, lama sabachtani*, expresses spiritual pain, «a moral crisis» (ICG, 134), according to Santayana, «a cry of despair» (ICG, 133). And, it is especially in this word among the seven words uttered by Christ upon the Cross that his Passion approached its zenith.

The main characteristic of Christ's moral suffering on Calvary, according to this word, is not struggle within his soul, but loneliness. For this reason, the temptation of Christ on the Cross, compared to that in the Garden, is much stronger; for, as Thomas Wolfe remarks, «the essence of human tragedy is in loneliness, not in conflict»<sup>7</sup>. Like Wolfe, Kierkegaard, too, accepts loneliness as the greatest of sufferings. In his *Gospel of Suffering* he says: «The deepest sorrow and suffering: to walk alone and to walk on one's own»<sup>8</sup>. And he says of Christ on the Cross that he suffered «the extremest suffering of feeling Himself forsaken of God»<sup>9</sup>. The tragedy of Christ is greater than that of every man; even

7. Thomas Wolfe, *Anatomy of Loneliness* (I take this quotation from Horace M. Kallen's essay *The Book of Job as a Greek Tragedy*, New York, Hill and Wang, 1959, p. xiv).

8. Kierkegaard, *The Gospel of Suffering* (Christian Discourses); tr. by A. S. Aldworth and W. S. Ferrie, London, James Clarke & Co., 1955, p. 16.

9. Kierkegaard, *Training in Christianity*; tr. by W. Lowrie, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1944, p. 131.

greater than the tragedy of Job, which Wolfe characterizes as «the most beautiful expression of loneliness»<sup>10</sup> and to which, for this reason, he assimilates the tragedy of Christ<sup>11</sup>. According to Santayana, «the Passion of Christ became the greatest of tragedies and the most sublime: God offering himself in sacrifice for the sins of his creatures» (ICG, 48).

As we can see, then, the Passion of Christ approaches the acme of human suffering both as moral and as physical pain, for his tragedy is also the greatest in the latter sense, too. In this sense not simply because the death by the cross is the most painful and prolonged death but especially because of the exceptional innocence and sensibility of Christ which made his soul and flesh to be more, than any other's, affected by the physical pain.

Now, considering that pain in general in both a physical and moral sense is, according to Santayana, «a first form of distraction» (RS, 125), for «distraction [is] seen pure in pain» (RS, 125), we can understand how the Passion of Christ, as the acme of physical and moral pain, symbolizes the distraction of the spirit of which we talked in the sixth chapter of the first part to which this chapter corresponds. In this sense, therefore, «the spirit in us is... a divine sufferer» (RS, 207), because «of the assimilation of man to the idea of Christ in his Passion» (ICG, 154).

But, «Calvary is not the end; there is the Resurrection» (RS, 209) by which the Cross becomes «a symbol for the true liberation, the ultimate dominion, possible to the spirit in man» (RS, 207), «the symbol for all Christian devotion», and «the emblem of the whole Christian faith» (ICG, 150). This Resurrection, then, as the symbol for the true liberation of the spirit we come now to talk about in the following section.

### 38. The Appearances of Christ with His Earthly Body (Transfiguration of the Risen Christ).

As Santayana remarks in the beginning of the chapter on «The Resurrection», the greatest importance to our theme is what little the Gospels tell us concerning the risen Christ. According to their report, Christ, after his death, was buried in a rock-cut tomb in a garden, very near the place of the crucifixion (ICG, 156). «In the place where he was

10. I take this quotation also from the above mentioned book of H. M. Kalen: *The Book of Job as a Greek Tragedy*, p. xiii.

11. *Ibid.*, p. xiv.

crucified there was a garden; and in the garden a new sepulchre, wherein was never man yet laid. There laid they Jesus therefore» (John 19: 41-42). In this place, then, in the first morning of his Resurrection, Christ made his first appearance to Mary Magdalene.

This pious woman with another one, bearing the same name (Matt. 28:1) came very early in the morning, «when it was yet dark» (John 20:1), to mourn at that place, but «they found the stone rolled away from the entrance and the tomb empty» (ICG, 156). In the place where «the body of Jesus had lain», they saw «two angels in white sitting» (John 20:12). And one of them spoke, saying: *He is arisen. He is not here* (ICG, 156; Matt. 28:6, Luke 24:6). Mary Magdalene, standing and weeping outside the tomb, because the body had been taken away, met someone who asked her: «Woman, why weepest thou?» (John 20:15). He was Jesus, but in the beginning she did not recognise him, «supposing him to be the gardener» (John 20:15; also ICG, 157).

This is the first appearance of Christ after his Resurrection. But, is it a real appearance or rather an apparition? «Is it a ghost? To reassure his bewildered disciples he must exhibit his hands and his side; seeing him and hearing his voice does not suffice» (ICG, 158). So, the evening of the same day, «when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you» (John 20:19). «But they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they had seen a spirit. And he said unto them,... *Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself, handle me, and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have*» (Luke 24:37,30; also ICC, 159). Commenting on these words of Christ, Santayana remarks: «Christ takes pains to convince his disciples that he is no spirit or spectre, but the same bodily person of flesh and bone» (ICG, 159). «It was essential, therefore, to prove that Christ had appeared with his own body; and the one convincing test was that the apparition should be tangible... That would really prove that the body seen was normal, and not a ghost» (ICG, 160). But, what kind of body could be that which Christ brought with him to his disciples «when the doors were shut?» (John 20:19). Santayana gives an interpretation in the light of what Saint Paul calls «spiritual body» (σῶμα πνευματικόν) as distinguished from the «natural body» (σῶμα ψυχικόν) (1 Corinth. 15:44). He says:

That he had raised his dead body to a second life, destined to be everlasting, he had lightened it of some of its material qualities and turned it into what Saint Paul, by a contradiction that I suppose was voluntary, calls a spiritual body. It could pass

through closed doors; it could become at will visible or invisible; it could blind people to its identity; it could transport itself instantaneously from place to place... (ICG, 160).

Another appearance in another place is also that before «two of the disciples, not of the twelve, [who] were on their way to Emmaus»<sup>12</sup>. «He is not recognizable at all on the road to Emmaus» (ICG, 158), for «their eyes were holden that they should not know him» (Luke 24:16). Even, when he began to interpret the prophets in what they had said about himself, their eyes were «holden» until, *«as he sat at meat with them, he took bread and blessed it and brake and gave to them. And their eyes were opened, and they knew him, and he vanished out of their sight»* (Luke 24:30-31; ICG, 161). On this event of Emmaus Santayana remarks:

There is a pathetic, perhaps unintentional, symbolism in the disciples' eyes being «holden» throughout those surprising interpretations of the prophets and opened only at the blessing and breaking of bread, mutely initiating them into a spiritual mystery and a spiritual sacrifice. It required a different kind of intuition, a metaphysical rebirth, to recognise Christ in Jesus (ICG, 162).

Among the many appearances of the risen Christ (1 Corin. 15: 5-8) another one is also that recorded in the last chapter of St. John. This scene took place by the sea of Galilee where seven of the remaining eleven apostles went for fishing. As St. John narrates, it was in the morning twilight when *Jesus stood on the shore; but the disciples knew not that it was Jesus. Then Jesus said unto them, Children, have ye any meat?* (John 21:4-5; ICG, 163). And, because they had not anything though they had worked so hard all night to catch some fishes, he said to them to *cast the net on the right side of the ship* (John 21:6; ICG, 163). They did as he advised them and caught so many fishes that «they were not able to draw it [the net]» (John 21:6). So, as Santayana remarks, by this «miraculous draft of great fishes» (ICG, 163) Jesus blessed their manual labour» (ICG, 164). This miracle opened their eyes so that, when they came to the shore and sat down to eat, *none of the disciples durst ask him, Who art thou? knowing that it was the Lord. Jesus then cometh and taketh the bread and giveth them, and fish likewise* (John 21:12-13; ICG,

12. ICG, 161. The name of the one of these disciples was Cleopas (Luke 24: 18). This appearance of the risen Christ to the two disciples, on their road to Emmaus, which is mentioned in detail by St. Luke only (Luke 24:13-32) and very epigrammatically by St. Mark (Mark 16:12) is recorded as between the first appearance to Mary Magdalene and that to the assembly of the disciples.

163). After they had dined, Jesus addressing to Peter, asked him three times the same question: *Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me?* And to the contrite protestations of Peter that he loves him, Christ appended, also thrice, a new commandment: *Feed my sheep, feed my lambs* (John 21:15-18; ICG, 164). In these words of Christ Santayana finds a symbolic meaning; for, according to his interpretation, «to feed us is to kindle [the] spirit in us» (ICG, 164). This spirit in us as «the spark of divinity within us» (ICG, 154; also RS, 208) is in a symbolic sense God in man, that is, Christ himself who ultimately and essentially is the whole life of the world (ICG, 164-165). So, «if we love Christ in his essence — that he is the divine spirit incarnate and crucified in this world — we shall feed his lambs, feed his sheep» (ICG, 165), that is, the «animal» in us, which is «the emblem and secret seat of a god» (ICG, 144); for «there is no place where spirit arises more sponanteously than in the heart of man, or shines more becomingly than in his face. For spirit is a light that burns, and requires the flesh for its fuel» (ICG, 154). So, to feed us is to kindle the spirit in us, for the «spirit is grafted on the animal psyche and is a continual hypostasis of natural life» (RS, 209); it is «the soul transformed into spirit» (RS, 212).

### 39. The Symbolism of the Double Perfection of Christ

From the point of view of the «Christian faith» in general the Resurrection is of great importance, for «if Christ rose not from the dead, as Saint Paul tells us, our faith is vain, and we are the most miserable of men» (ICG, 160; 1 Corinth. 15:17,19). In this sense, therefore, «all Christian virtues, including that charity which is the crown of them, hang on faith in the Resurrection» (ICG, 160). Because of this importance of Resurrection, «Easter and the spirit of Easter seem, in some parts of Christendom, the crown of the ecclesiastical year» (ICG, 167). Not only from the Christian point of view, but from Santayana's point of view as concerns the theme of his book on Christ, Resurrection is «of the greatest importance» in a symbolic sense, «for it indicates the character that was attributed to Christ when he was fully revealed and appeared in his double perfection» (ICG, 156). What Santayana means by the «double perfection» of Christ through his Resurrection, is the purification of the life of his body and of the life of his spirit, of his human and of his divine nature. This is understood since Resurrection, as every other miracle, as we have seen in the chapter on the miracles, has to do with

«health and morality» (RS, 206), the former (health) concerning the body, the latter (morality) concerning the spirit. But, let us see separately each of these two purifications.

*a. Purification of the Life of Body.* Though Resurrection as a miracle, the greatest of Christ's miracles, puts the stress on the divine nature of Christ in the sense that it is a sign and proof of his divinity, it also concerns his humanity in the sense that this miracle in his case expresses «true sympathy and tenderness towards his assumed human body» by raising it «from the grave» (ICG, 211)<sup>13</sup>. This true sympathy with human nature is expressed by Christ in every one of his miracles, for the first thing in a miracle is to extricate spirit from outward oppression, that is, from every natural disease, even from death itself (RS, 206). Santayana says:

The body is to be accepted and preserved... He [Christ] was tender towards the body, cured all its diseases, brought it to life again, fed it in multitudes by repeated miracles, and when he had taken the dead young girl by the hand and raised her from her sleep his first word was: *Give her something to eat*. He was the word made flesh, and accepted the flesh for himself in all its humble accidents<sup>14</sup>.

We can see this acceptance in the case of Christ, after his Resurrection, when «we are told that he was no disembodied spirit, but possessed the same body, tangible, material, and capable of eating and drinking» (ICG, 159). «When the risen Christ appears, the urgent test is to prove that he is not a 'spirit', that is a ghost, but a material body that can be touched (or ought not yet to be touched) and that can eat and drink» (ICG, 69). Such are all the appearances of Christ after his Resurrection. Consider, for example, those appearances in Emmaus and by the Lake of Galilee where the risen Christ sat at meat with his disciples and gave bread to them (Luke 24:30, John 21:13). Does not this action of Christ in these scenes remind us of what he said in the case of the young girl he had raised from the dead: «Give her something to eat»?

13. This sympathy towards his body is also expressed by Christ a few days before his death by allowing Mary to anoint his head and his feet with very precious ointment (ICG, 143-144). The attitude of Christ to this action of Mary shows, of course, a recognition of her devotion, but at the same time it shows also a respect and sympathy towards his own body.

14. ICG, 75. Concerning the resurrection of the young girl, which Santayana mentions here, see Luke 8:48-56; also Matt. 9:18-19, 23-26.



What he had commanded there he himself did in the two scenes in Emmaus and by the Lake of Galilee, by sitting at meat with his disciples and giving bread to them. Santayana emphasizes both these scenes (ICG, 161-165), and especially the latter, the scene by the lake, in which Christ's feeding of his disciples is related by Santayana to the words he said to Peter: *Feed my sheep, feed my lambs*. As Santayana remarks,

He [Christ] does not now say, *Preach my gospel*... He prefers to think only of fostering and succouring life at its humblest, at its roots... The little lambs and the stupid sheep shall not perish uncared for. In every form life has its appointed perfection, its innocent health and natural joy (ICG, 164).

This behavior of the risen Christ appearing to his disciples with a real body capable of eating and drinking, shows a respect toward earthly life, a sympathy toward his own body, that human body which he raised from the dead. Christ after his Resurrection was not a disembodied spirit, that is, a ghost, but he possessed a real human body, for his humanity had been adopted by him, not feigned (ICG, 38). In other words, his humanity was not a mask or a deception, like that of the gods, for example, in Greek mythology. «In Christ it was a dire reality... And in assuming human nature, instead of mocking it he had sanctified it; and he will carry it back with him to heaven» (ICG, 154). This sanctification was realized by his Resurrection, which is «a bridge from Christ on earth to Christ in heaven. On earth, he is man suppressing his divinity; in heaven, he is a god sublimating his humanity» (ICG, 165). «It was necessary to create [this] bridge between existence and eternity, between man and God; but not by destroying man...» (ICG, 122), for «a divine person who assumes a human soul and body and enacts an earthly life of his free accord... cannot hate or despise matter» (ICG, 74). So, in his case, «the life of the body, in time and in the bosom of nature, is loved, purified, and preserved» (ICG, 76). «It was in view of immortality that he loved and redeemed mortal life» (ICG, 76). «And it is the resurrection of the body, not the immortality of the soul, that figures in the Christian creed» (ICG, 69).

This immortality for the individual man, with an animal body and animal psyche, with a body lightened in some of its material qualities, or what Saint Paul calls a spiritual body, is a glorification in a second life, a bodily immortality, like that of the first man in Paradise, which is restored by the Resurrection of Christ who carried «with him into eternity his earthly body strangely transfigured» (RS, 203). Thus, «all important...



is the fact of the Resurrection of Christ with the same material body yet with changed aspects and powers; for this is the model of the Resurrection that all men may hope for and of their everlasting life» (ICG, 159).

This perfection of the life of the body has, of course, a symbolic meaning for Santayana. It means the possible perfection of this temporal life its innocent health and natural joy (ICG, 164). It is a perfection besides that of the spirit. Thus, the perfection of the bodily life is not destroyed by the perfection of the spirit. Spirit preserves and purifies the life of the body in the bosom of nature. Far from destroying the other elements of human nature, spirit «presupposes them, as it does in Christ, and merely coordinates and purifies them, so that they may be perfect instruments and not impediments for the spirit» (ICG, 253). But, what is this perfection of the spirit?

*b. Purification of the Life of Spirit (The Two Stages of the Liberated Spirit: The Resurrection of the Spirit and Its Identity with Pure Spirit).* Besides the perfection of the life of the body, the other kind of double perfection in the post-mortal life, the life after the Resurrection, is also the perfection of spirit of which Santayana talks in *The Realm of Spirit*, at the end of the eighth chapter entitled «Liberation», where Santayana illustrates the liberation of spirit by the Resurrection of Christ. Thus, the perfection of the spirit concerns its liberation, which in the «post-mortal life has», according to Santayana, «two stages, or two dimensions». «Spirit may be liberated, first historically, by resurrection or reincarnation» (RS, 209), and «in the second place mystically, by identification with pure spirit» (RS, 211).

*The first stage or dimension*, as Santayana explains, «is a rebirth by expansion and reincarnation in all those phases of spirit in which the spirit is free, and therefore self-forgetful» (RS, 209). In a spiritual sense, therefore, resurrection is the same with rebirth, for both concern a new or second life. Such a resurrection into a new life is, for example, that which Tolstoy describes in his novel *Resurrection*, in the person of the main hero, Prince Nekhlyudov, who, when he was conscious of his sin, «the God within him awakened in his consciousness. He felt himself one with Him, and therefore felt not only the freedom, fulness and joy of life, but all the power of righteousness. All, all the best that a man can do, he felt capable of doing»<sup>15</sup>. As such resurrection, like rebirth,

---

15. L. N. Tolstovo, *Voskreseniye*, Pt. I, Ch. XXVIII (See *Resurrection* by Leo

is a salvation by repentance or metanoia (Gr. *μετάνοια*), a thorough change of heart and mind, «a complete new birth of the soul» (ICG, 47). In this sense, by his repentance the Prodigal Son, who «was dead» before «is alive again» (Luke 15:24,32); and besides him, all the other prodigal sons are alive again when by their repentance they «arise from the dead» (Ephes. 5:14).

In view of this we can understand that in this stage of rebirth or resurrection man renounces his old self, and especially pride, among all his vices, which is the source of every evil, and lives in love with others. Selfishness and envy are abolished and we «live in every one who has ever lived». In this stage, therefore, «we are now supposed to have overcome» «distraction» from «the endless evils and sufferings». «The distracted spirit in the world will be succoured with charity, and not hated even in its madness; but only the liberated spirit will be embraced with joy» (RS, 209). In this embrace «as all truths fall together into the truth and are perfectly welcome to the intellect, all errors being understood and rejected, so all sane joys add themselves together uncontaminated in the heart, when the heart is pure; while the sorrows and hatreds, though perceived, cannot be shared» (RS, 209-210). Thus, in this stage of freedom the spirit, in its outlook and virtual attainment, is lifted «into the presence of all good, wherever this good may be realized». In this presence of all good the self «ceases to intercept intuition, yet continues to make intuition a possible temporal and local fact, and determines its point of view, language and perspectives» (RS, 210).

This first stage or dimension of spirit, the stage of spiritual resurrection or rebirth, seems to Santayana to be «symbolized in the risen Christ appearing unannounced, unrecognized, in various disguises; a real body, yet not as it was; the same person, and yet escaped from his trammels, having finished his mission, transmitting his work, without regret or anxiety, into other hands» (RS, 210). Such is the case, for example, in the appearance of the risen Christ to the two disciples on their way to Emmaus, who did not recognize him at all (ICG, 158; also 161), for their eyes were «holden» throughout those surprising interpretations of the prophets and opened only when he sat at meat with them (ICG, 161-162). «It required a different kind of intuition, a metaphysical rebirth, to recognize Christ in Jesus» (ICG, 162).

*The second stage or dimension* is an ideal or mystical liberation by identification with pure spirit. The first stage is a «resurrection of spirit horizontally» or historically, but the second stage is liberation of spirit simultaneously or ideally in the vertical direction. Of this liberation of the second stage, besides that of the first stage, Santayana says:

There is also, and simultaneously, a possible liberation ideally, in the vertical direction, when at any moment, or habitually, the spirit in a man recalls its universality, its merely momentary lodgment here, or preoccupation with this trouble, and expands intuitively into the equilibrium of all moments, and the convergence of all insights, under the intense firmament of truth. Here there is no longer any pang of loss, any dubiousness in re-union, any groping in the twilight of birth and death. Birth and death have become integral to life... (RS, 210-211).

In this stage the emphasis is on the deity, not on the humanity, for it is an initiation into «the mystery of Christ». Santayana says:

In Adam, in the human psyche, the spirit is secondary;... but in Christ, in the spirit that enters into us, the opposite happens. There the centre is divine, and what is put on like a garment or a dramatic mask is human nature... The humanity that can coexist with divinity in the same person must be a singularly chastened, subordinated humanity (RS, 211; cp. 1 Corinth. 15:45-49).

So, in man (in Adam) the center is human, that is, the psyche, but in Christ, being God, the center is divine, that is, the spirit. This means that in opposition to Christ, in whom «the divine nature... is original and persistent», in man «what is original and persistent is the animal psyche» (ICG, 227). The animal psyche, therefore, as the center in man and the divine spirit as the center in Christ must be understood, according to Santayana, «genetically and substantially», that is, in an ontological sense. Now, especially concerning man in reference to his liberation, Santayana says: «Salvation comes by shifting the centre of appreciation from the human psyche to the divine spirit» (RS, 207-208). In the case of man, then, this shift of the center from the psyche to the spirit is «for appreciation» only and not «genetically and substantially» because, as we said, in an ontological sense the psyche as «primary» remains always the center in man (RS, 208), but, if the spirit, being the center for appreciation only, could be the center in an ontological sense, too, then we would have a total disregard and negligence of the psyche. And this is exactly the case with the second stage of the liberation of the spirit; for there is in this stage an endeavor of the spirit to liberate

itself by shifting the center from the psyche to the spirit, not only in an appreciative sense, but also in a substantial and ontological sense.

The union with God, therefore, which is attained by a liberated spirit in the second stage, is not «a union of man with God, in which God remains God and man remains man» (ICG, 154), a union in which «the human soul remains the same soul» (ICG, 247; also RS, 208). In other words, in the mystical stage the union with God is in reality a «fusion with the Absolute» (RS, 219), a dying to the world, a self-mortification by which «liberated spirit accepts life ascetically» (RS, 211). In view of this we can understand why the Kingdom of God in this stage of liberation is not a kingdom to come on earth, a kingdom, like that of Caesar (RS, 212), for example, in which Christ could become a national hero, like Joshua or Solomon or Ezra (RS, 212). No, the Kingdom of God is not such a material kingdom; it is a spiritual kingdom within man, a transformation of the soul. In this kingdom, then, «in the true kingdom to come, in the soul transformed into spirit, there would be no anxiety about place or person, no marriage or giving in marriage, no pride of knowledge or power, no rebellion against suffering» (RS, 212).

It is in this stage especially that Christianity is characterized by Santayana as «a fundamentally new religion, a religion of the spirit» (RS, 212). His understanding of Christianity, therefore, in the second stage of liberation is like that of Kierkegaard's who says also that «Christ is spirit, his religion that of the spirit». But, «what is spirit?» asks Kierkegaard. «Spirit», he says, «is: to live as though dead (dead to the world)»<sup>16</sup>. This definition of spirit in terms of self-mortification reminds us of Plato, who by defining philosophy in his *Phaedo* as «the study of death» (μελέτη θανάτου)<sup>17</sup>, recommends to the phi-

16. *The Journals of Kierkegaard*; ed. by A. Dru, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1959, p. 254. What Kierkegaard means by living «as though dead» is mortification through suffering. He says: «The significance of the religious suffering is that it is a dying away from immediacy» (Kierkegaard, *Concluding Unscientific Postscript*; tr. by D. F. Swenson and W. Lowrie, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1941, p. 446; also p. 445). This religious suffering, then, is identical with «the suffering of the spirit, which in existence is the sure sign that I exist *qua* spirit» (Kierkegaard, *Concluding Unscientific Postscript*, p. 160). Thus, as we can see, Christianity as a religion of spirit (spirit, of course, as is defined by Kierkegaard in terms of mortification) is the same for him as the characterization of Christianity by others as a religion of love, for «to be loved by God and to love God is», according to Kierkegaard, «to suffer», that is, «mortification» (*The Journals of Kierkegaard*, p. 226; see also p. 227).

17. *Phaedo* 81a.

losopher the ascetic discipline of dying to the sensible world<sup>18</sup>, a thought which, according to W. Lowrie, «is prominent also in the New Testament—and not merely in ascetic theology»<sup>19</sup>. Kierkegaard, therefore, in his definition of the spirit in terms of self-mortification, besides the influence of Plato's doctrine of «the philosophical dying to the world»<sup>20</sup>, accepted also the influence of the Christian doctrine itself as he understood it<sup>21</sup>, though he does not ignore the doctrine of the Indians<sup>22</sup>, too.

In view of this characterization of Christianity as a religion of mortification through suffering, we can understand in the case of Santayana why in the second post-mortal stage of the spirit he especially finds Christianity «resembled Neo-Platonism and Buddhism» (RS, 212). The doctrine of mortification in Buddhism is related to the ideal of desirelessness as a means for allaying the will, which so much influenced Schopenhauer<sup>23</sup>. This desirelessness or will-lessness is the «entrance to Nirvana», according to Buddha's saying: «Overcome the will, renounce preference, and you have entered Nirvana»<sup>24</sup>. So, by the mortification of

18. *Ibid.*, 66a. It is Plato's opinion about the body as a source of evil (*Phaedo* 66b, *Gorgias* 493aff.) that makes him recommend the philosophical dying to the world, that is, the mortification of the desires from which liberated, the philosopher is raised into union with the object of his knowledge. This is what Plato teaches also in the legend of the chariot in the *Phaedrus* (246a-249d), which legend was regarded as «the *locus classicus* for the Forms as objects of mystical contemplation» (*Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 1947, Vol. 18, p. 55).

19. See Notes, No 8, p. 150 in Kierkegaard's *The Concept of Dread*; tr. with Introduction and Notes by Walter Lowrie, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1957. As for the New Testament see especially the teaching of St. Paul in his Epistles, e.g. «mortify your members which are upon the earth...» (Colos. 3:5).

20. See Kierkegaard, *The Concept of Dread*, p. 80.

21. Kierkegaard finds that Christianity is «truthfully presented as suffering» (*The Journals of Kierkegaard*, p. 209; see also pp. 225-227).

22. See what Kierkegaard says in his *Journals* about mortification through suffering in his comparison of his own views with those of Schopenhauer (pp. 234-236) and of the latter with Indian Brahmanism (p. 236).

23. *Dictionary of Philosophy*; ed. by D. D. Runes, Littlefield, Ames, Iowa, Adams & Co., 1958, p. 284. As for Schopenhauer himself see what he says of the denial of the will in his principal work, *The World as Will and Idea*; tr. from the German by R. B. Haldane and J. Kemp, London 1896, Vol. I, Bk. 4, pp. 530-532. Santayana, though he does not uphold this Buddhist ideal, accepted in general a great influence from Buddhism through Schopenhauer, who was one of the favourite philosophers of his youth. (About the relation of Santayana to Schopenhauer in general see what we said in this essay Pt I, Ch. IV, sec. 10).

24. RS, xii; see also what Santayana says in the same book about willessness

desires one attains union with Nirvana or with pure Being in general, which is the «ultimate idea» of «pure spirit». In this immortal union «death has no terrors for pure spirit»<sup>25</sup>, for spirit in its deliverance is victorious over death by mortification which, as we can conclude with Dasgupta from the reading of the stories of *Ramayana*, is an expression of the belief that this mortification is itself «a source of great power, and that by it one could gain any desire, be it an immortal life in Heaven»<sup>26</sup>.

Now, the second post-mortal stage of spirit characterized by Santayana as a stage where «birth and death have become intergal to life» (RS, 211), where there is «no rebellion against suffering», for the disciples should voluntarily «take up their cross, and follow him [Christ]» (RS, 212), and where in general «liberated spirit accepts life ascetically» (RS, 211) concerns what we said about mortification in general through suffering by which we gain an immortal life in Heaven. Considering this we can understand that this second stage, may be symbolized by the Ascension, which, as Santayana remarks, «is tragic: a second farewell, almost a second death, rather than a second Resurrection and triumph» (ICG, 165). Though in a real sense for Santayana, the Resurrection itself, like Ascension, is a farewell, too, in a symbolic sense, this Resurrection concerns the first stage in which «spirit may be liberated historically by resurrection» (RS, 209), which is a «resurrection of spirit horizontally» (RS, 210); while the Ascension, on the other hand, concerns the second stage in which spirit may be liberated «ideally, in the vertical direction» (RS, 210), for it is by the Ascension that «Christ, retired to heaven, remains with us only ideally» (ICG, 159).

The treatment of the latter, as the second stage, besides the former as the first stage of post-mortal life, does not mean, of course, that Santayana accepts from his own point of view this stage, too; for he rejects the stage of Ascension in choosing for himself the stage of the Resurrection because he finds this stage to be more proper to his naturalism. In other words, the stage of spiritual rebirth or resurrection symbolized by the appearances of the risen Christ *on earth* is real and exist-

---

in Brahmanism (RS, 104). In this sense, therefore, mortification is also related to the *tapas* of Yoga (S. N. Dasgupta, *Hindu Mysticism*, Chicago-London, Northwestern University, 1927, pp. 96-97).

25. RS, 154; see also what Santayana says in *The Realm of Essence* (pp. 61,65) about this immortal «union or ecstasy of which mystics speak, and which has always been the goal of religious discipline».

26. Dasgupta, *Hindu Mysticism*, p. 94. Santayana in his *Platonism and Spiritual Life* considers also the same writer's *History of Indian Philosophy* (PSL, 300n).

ential, but the other stage symbolized by the Ascension of Christ, who disappeared *in heaven*, is unreal and nonexistential. So, these two stages which in a symbolic sense both concern Christianity, in a real sense, the one, as more natural, refers rather to the Greeks, while the other, as more mystical, to the Indians; for it is the mystical element that characterizes especially the second stage in which spirit may be liberated «mystically, by identification with pure spirit» (RS, 214). But, «pure spirit», as Santayana explains in his *Apologia Pro Mente Sua*, «does not exist» (PS, 569). For this reason, he says: «As for me, I frankly cleave to the Greeks and not to the Indians, and I aspire to be a rational animal rather than a pure spirit...in going into the Indian wilderness to contemplate pure Being... We must honour the poets as poets and the saints as saints, but on occasion [we are] not forbidden to banish them» (RE, 65).

#### 40. The Meaning of Salvation

*a. Salvation in the Christian sense.* As we can see from the previous section in general, the purification of the life of body and of the life of spirit is something which, according to Santayana, concerns the possible perfection of man in a natural and in a moral sense. That perfection must be understood in this double sense is evident from the «double perfection» of the risen Christ, which «is also the character that every Christian would aspire to develop in himself» (ICG, 156). This is also understood from Christ's Resurrection itself as a miracle which symbolizes another miracle, that of the spiritual resurrection of man. Though we have talked before about the double meaning of the miracles in general, we must repeat here once again, for it is very important from Santayana's point of view, that, like every miracle of Christ, the Resurrection, too, which is the greatest of them, regards both the health and the morality of man, that is, the extrication of the spirit from outward oppression or natural disease (in the case of the Resurrection from death itself) and from inner madness or guiltiness (RS, 206). This guiltiness in a religious sense is because of the violation of the law of God, that is, because of the sin. «St. Paul tells us that Christ liberates us from the law, and therefore from sin» (RS, 206), Christ as «God offering himself in sacrifice for the sins of his creatures» (ICG, 48). But, what is the meaning of the liberation from sin in a Christian sense?

According to St. Paul's teaching, physical death is a result of sin, for he says: «As by one man sin entered into the world, and death



by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned» (Rom. 5:12). This sin is that which separates us from the infallible God with whom we are reconciled by the death of his Son. And «if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more being reconciled, we shall be saved by His life» (Rom. 5:20). Christ himself says: «I am the resurrection, and the life; he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live» (John 11:25), but «if ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins» (John 8:24). Here is, therefore, what is meant by salvation in the Christian sense: salvation from death, as a result of sin, by the Resurrection and life of Christ. For this reason, St. Paul thanks «God through Jesus Christ our Lord» who delivers us «from the body of this death» (Rom. 8:24-25)<sup>27</sup>.

This deliverance from both physical and spiritual death does not mean, of course, destruction of the body, for the same St. Paul says also that this body will be raised to a second life as «a spiritual body» (1 Corinth. 15:44) or, according to Santayana's interpretation, a body «lightened of some of its material qualities», as for example, in the case of the risen Christ, who «had raised his dead body to a second life» (ICG, 160). And it is this perfection of his body, besides the perfection of his spirit, «that was attributed to Christ when he was fully revealed and appeared in his double perfection», which is also «the goal of Christian morals and the life to be hoped for by the saints in heaven» (ICG, 156). This double perfection, then, is the meaning of liberation or salvation in the Christian sense. It is a liberation in a double sense; not only a liberation from spiritual death, that is, from sin, but also from physical death, which is the result of original sin.

*b. Salvation in Santayana: «The Soul Redeemed by Grace Remains Human».* The Christian meaning of liberation as a double perfection is also very important for Santayana, but in a symbolic sense, since «suffering and death need not be bloody» (RS, 207). Santayana says: «The Cross is a symbol for the true liberation, the ultimate dominion, possible to the spirit in man. Salvation comes by shifting the centre of appreciation from the human psyche to the divine spirit. It is a shift within the psyche, otherwise it would not enter at all into our lives» (RS, 207-208). By this «shift within the psyche» Santayana wants to empha-

---

27. Because of this deliverance from death, St. Paul also characterizes the Lord as «second man» and «Last Adam» in comparison to «the first man, Adam» by whom death entered into the world (1 Corinth. 15:45-49).



size that the shift must be «for appreciation» only and not a shift in a genetical and substantial sense. In other words, «by shifting the centre of appreciation from the human psyche to the divine spirit» he means that if the spirit in its salvation becomes «the centre of appreciation», then the psyche must «merely become, for appreciation, peripheral»; «for genetical and substantially» the psyche is «not peripheral but primary» (RS, 208). Thus in an ontological sense the case of man is different from that of Christ, «for in Christ», as Santayana explains elsewhere, «it is the divine nature that is original and persistent and that assumes the human nature as an apanage or appendix... In man, on the contrary, what is original and persistent is the animal psyche» (ICG, 227). In this sense, therefore, «in Adam, in the human psyche, the spirit is secondary;... but in Christ, in the spirit... the centre is divine», for in him «the humanity that can coexist with divinity» is a «subordinated humanity» (RS, 211).

It is in the light of this difference, then, that we must understand the shift of the centre of appreciation from the human psyche to the divine spirit *within the psyche*, which psyche genetical and substantially is primary, for «man is irremediably a human person assuming and adopting a divine nature, and not, like the Christ of theology, a divine person assuming a human nature added to and subordinate to his native divinity» (RS, 208). This religious image as «an unattainable limit of aspiration» is «hyperbolic». It is an «idea of heaven» (RS, 208), not realized on earth. As such, therefore, it is something which concerns the Ascension of Christ, that is, the second stage of postmortal life, the stage of deification by the identification with pure spirit (RS, 211ff.), which pure spirit for Santayana does not exist. «For us to wish to become divine persons like Christ would be chimerical and, for the pious Christian, blasphemous; but Christ may come and dwell within us, transfusing our human nature with divine light» (RS, 208). Thus, the important thing in the salvation of man which is realized by the coming of Christ, that is, by «the spirit that enters into us» (RS, 211) is that «the soul redeemed by grace remains human» (RS, 208).

*c. Salvation Not by Change of the World but by Change of the Heart.* Summarizing all we said about salvation which comes by shifting the centre of appreciation from the human psyche to the divine spirit, we can say that this salvation is a «shift within the psyche», that is, a salvation in which, though the psyche merely becomes, for appreciation, peripheral, the centre of appreciation being the spirit, the psyche continues

to remain genetically and substantially primary, for the original in man is not the divine spirit but the human psyche. In other words, the soul in man remains human. Thus, salvation, as Santayana explains, «means a change of heart, a conversion, momentarily real, but relapsing and becoming more of less nominal and merely intended as life goes on» (RS, 208). Of this change of heart, or conversion, which is the true liberation, as it is symbolized by the Cross, Santayana says the following:

The salvation worked by the cross is worked by it essentially, intrinsically, spiritually, not by accident or legal artifice or in the interests of the world itself. It is salvation of the spirit out of the world, not by a change in the world (though some change will incidentally occur in it) but by a change of allegiance in the heart, so that interests of the world will count for less and less in the heart, and the interests of the spirit for more and more. In the synoptic Gospels this spiritual meaning of the redemption remains in the background, as it naturally does in the miracles worked by Christ during his mission; for it is a humane characteristic of Christianity that it begins with works of corporal mercy and then, if possible, proceeds towards a spiritual regeneration. And this recognition of the body and its necessities, and even of its fundamental place in the life of the spirit, is not abolished even in heaven (ICG, 152-153).

What Santayana means by saying in the above passage that salvation is «a change of allegiance in the heart, so that the interests of the world will count for less and less in the heart, and the interests of the spirit for more and more» (ICG, 152) is that which we found before in talking of «salvation [which] comes by shifting the centre of appreciation from the human psyche to the divine spirit» (RS, 207-208). This shift of *appreciation* is the same thing with the change of the *interests*. However, as we explain there, this «shift [is] within the psyche» (RS, 208); or, as we find here, it is «a change of the allegiance in the heart» (ICG, 152) which means a «recognition of the body and its necessities» (ICG, 153).

Salvation, therefore, comes «not by a change in the world» but «by a change of allegiance in the heart». In other words, it is not a salvation from the world, that is, escape from the world, but salvation within and through the world by acceptance of its institutions and circumstances. «Salvation could never come by a change in circumstances. It could come only by a profound transformation of the will and the affections, a new understanding and self-transcending love, such as may fill the soul in its supreme moments» (ICG, 50-51). So, «liberation as a

Christian should desire it, cannot be liberation from fortune or domination over it» (RS, 203), like that, for example, expected by the Jews in the person of a Messiah a century or two before the time of Christ, during which they «had been anxiously looking for him to deliver them from Greek and Roman domination» (ICG, 42-43). In opposition to this expectation, Christ, by accepting a human body, «accepted [also] the larger institutions of society and the state; they were doubtless inevitable and not worth rebelling against, and it was simpler to return their coin to those who had minted it»<sup>28</sup>. Christ accepted these institutions and rendered «unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's» because he had understood that «salvation was not to come by the clash of armies nor by a new Deluge nor by a better government of mankind. It was to come by suffering itself, repentance itself, martyrdom itself» (ICG, 44). Salvation, therefore, comes by the «transformation of the human soul through suffering and love [which] truly and intrinsically redeem it» (ICG, 149), for «our sufferings will chasten and transfigure our attachment to the circumstances and passions that caused those sufferings» (RS, 207).

True salvation, then, lies in change of ourselves by accepting suffering, that is, through suffering, and not in change of the distracted world into a world released from suffering, for escape from suffering is impossible on the natural plane of life. As Santayana remarks:

Christianity has come into a world full of suffering and vice. It neither abets that suffering and vice, as if they were prior conditions for the existence of Christian virtue, nor merely ignores and eludes them, as pagan virtue attempted to do. Christianity recognizes them as data: the question is how to confront them, and how to draw individual souls out of them as far as possible. Christ did not become man in order to enjoy the world nor in order to destroy it, nor even in order to reform it, in the sense of turning it into a perfectly healthy pagan world. He became man in order to save it (ICG, 98).

Christ, being God, became man and «enabled himself to suffer as his creatures inevitably suffered» (ICG, 155), «to suffer the consequences of [the] evil» «that weighs upon the world» (ICG, 122). «He had chosen to suffer and to die before being glorified, because he knew that suffering and death were allotted to the spirit in us also» (ICG, 49). Doing this, he gave us an example (ICG, 49), «for even hereunto were ye called; because Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example, that ye

28. ICG, 75-76. See also Matt. 22:21: «Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's».

should follow his steps» (1 Peter 2:21). It was Christ who said to any man who would like to come after him: *«take up thy cross and follow me»* (ICG, 109; Matt. 16:24, Mark 8:34, Luke 14:27). *«Follow me, the cross that is to be taken up seems light and the death to be suffered seems sweet. With him a complete self-surrender means less an escape from all evil and suffering than a supervening courage that can endure and overwhelm them. There is militant chivalry in the purity of Christ»* (ICG, 109-110). This militant chivalry and heroism must characterize all his followers in order to gain inner peace, for *«the more heroically they accept all manner of suffering, the less that suffering will avail to trouble their inner peace»* (ICG, 45). It is a peace gained by obedience and not by rebellion. *«Obedience can disinfect suffering of all rebellion and dissolve it into ineffable peace»* (ICG, 155). For this reason, obedience to suffering is better than rebellion against suffering. So there should be *«no rebellion against suffering»* (RS, 212), for *«nothing would be gained by rebellion»* (ICG, 118).

*d. The Joy in Salvation through Suffering.* The best attitude in confronting suffering is not rebellion and violence but obedience and love. Since *«suffering and death come from the contrariety of motions in nature»* (RS, 207), *«pain is itself a kind of hatred»* (RS, 210). A pain or suffering, therefore, must be for the soul a kind of enemy. This is, of course, from the point of view of the Jewish law of the old time, according to which, thou shalt *«hate thine enemy»* (Matt. 5:43), repaying to him *«eye for eye, and a tooth for a tooth»* (Matt. 5:38). In this sense, therefore, you can oppose hate against pain which is a kind of hatred, rebellion which is a distraction of the inner peace of man against pain, which is *«a first form of distraction»* (RS, 125). In one word, you can resist violence by violence. Such an attitude, then, from this point of view is very natural. But, from the point of view of the Christian law, *«Love your enemies»* (Matt. 5:44), and *«Ye resist not evil»* (Matt. 5:39; also ICG, 119), the case is different. Here, love, as extended to our enemies, must be also extended to our sufferings which are a kind of enemies, too. In this sense, therefore, we must treat and confront sufferings with love, for *«the distracted spirit in the world will be succoured with charity, and not hated even in its madness»* (RS, 209).

Here, again, men must have as an example Christ himself, who by his suffering *«showed them how love can render suffering voluntary»* (ICG, 155). *«In Christ spirit... was inspired to love and willing to suffer»* (RS, 205). *«It loves, and although it suffers only because it loves, it*

wills to love and to suffer» (RS, 207). «He even becomes jealous of his appointed humanity and appointed sufferings, as if they had been a special privilege. Note the vivacity of his protest when the good Peter suggests that Christ's chosen Passion and death must never come to pass. *Get thee behind me, Satan*, he cries» (ICG, 124). «He hugged his cross with a love that did not wish to escape suffering» (ICG, 122).

By obedience and love Christ subdued his suffering and gained victory through the Cross, for «the spirit in which Christ suffered» is the «secret spirit of victory through sacrifice» (ICG, 147). This is the victory of the Resurrection, the victory against death (1 Corinth. 15: 54-56), the salvation of man. So, «spirit, that suffers distraction by the disorder of its instruments, rejoices in the salvation» (RS, 206), for «only the liberated spirit will be embraced with joy» (RS, 209), the joy of redemption in this world of distraction, «the joy in being saved» (ICG, 98). This joy of salvation is such a joy as that of the innocent children who laugh; it is pure laughter of those who became children again by their rebirth, a laughter which «is a joyous form of union with our defeats, in which the spirit is victorious» (RS, 248).

*e. Santayana Compared to Dostoevsky on Their Doctrine of Salvation through Suffering.* From what we said in general about liberation or salvation in relation to distraction of suffering, we can understand that Santayana's attitude toward this important subject is liberation not *from* suffering but *through* suffering. In reality, this is the attitude of Christ himself, who «was God himself become man in order to endure the trials which he imposed, and in order to become the pattern and model of all endurance; also of such transformation of the human soul through suffering and love as might truly and intrinsically redeem it» (ICG, 149). In this sense, therefore, the «inevitable innocence of the spirit, in all it suffers, is symbolized by the passion and death of Christ and by his resurrection. The possible liberation of the spirit is not a liberation from suffering and death, but through suffering and death» (RS, 207). This attitude of Santayana to the problem of liberation through suffering is expressed by R. Butler as follows: «Spirit in its fight for freedom must suffer, albeit innocently, and that is the true significance of the Cross. Salvation is possible only through suffering, but the goal that beckons is a fresh rising of spirit above all conflicting and divided interests — the Resurrection»<sup>29</sup>.

---

29. R. Butler, *The Mind of Santayana*, p. 122.

The way in which Santayana understands salvation as a transformation of the human soul through suffering reminds us especially of Dostoevsky with whom Santayana presents a great resemblance on this subject, though between them there are in general very important differences, especially in their interpretation of the person of Christ, understood by Dostoevsky in a real and literal sense in opposition to Santayana who interprets Christ in a symbolic sense. But putting aside these differences, let us see here very briefly Dostoevsky's similar doctrine to that of Santayana on the question of salvation through suffering.

According to N. Berdiaev, «no one has felt human suffering more acutely than Dostoevsky, and his heart is ever bleeding»<sup>30</sup>. «The tragedy of Dostoevsky, like all true tragedy, involves purification and release»<sup>31</sup>, for «Dostoevsky believed firmly in the redemptive and regenerative power of suffering»<sup>32</sup>. Because of this, «there is freeing of the spirit and joy to be had from reading Dostoevsky, that joy that one gets from suffering»<sup>33</sup>. The mirror of the author as reflecting his troubled life and the joy that after so many miseries he found finally at the end of his life is to be found in his last novel, *The Brothers Karamazov* (*Bratya Karamazovy*), which for this reason is like the *finale* of Beethoven's *Ninth Symphony*: a «Hymn to Joy».

In this book Dostoevsky showed so obviously with his psychological power «the redemptive and regenerative power of suffering»<sup>34</sup> and the «joy through suffering» in those cases of tuberculous Markel and Ilusha, of the great sinner Mihail, of Father Zosima and of the monk Alyosha, and especially in the case of the main hero, Dmitri Karamazov, who at the end of the book, as E. Simmons remarks, «is willing to take up his cross... 'I want to suffer', he says, 'and by suffering I shall purify myself'»<sup>35</sup>. According to Berdiaev, «Dostoevsky's heroes pass through hell and they reach the outer gates of paradise — which are less easily seen than hell»<sup>36</sup>. «It is from the Karamazov world itself that the new

30. N. Berdiaev, *Dostoevsky*; tr.by D. Attwater, New York, Meridian Books, 1957, p. 107.

31. *Ibid.*, p. 30.

32. *Ibid.*, p. 95.

33. *Ibid.*, p. 30.

34. *Ibid.*, p. 95; see also pp. 92, 109, 203. Compare with Christ's saying in John 12:24, which Dostoevsky chooses as the motto of his book.

35. Ernest J. Simmons, *Dostoevsky, the Making of a Novelist*, London - New York - Toronto, Oxford University Press, 1940, p. 354.

36. N. Berdiaev, *Dostoevsky*, p. 109.

man has to be born... resurrection is victorious over death in the soul of Alyosha and he is born again»<sup>37</sup>. So, Alyosha followed «the path of Christ [which] was from Golgotha to the resurrection and victory over death»<sup>38</sup>. This is the path of the book itself which, passing through the Golgotha of the miserable lives it describes, leads at the end to the light of joy; for, as E. Simmons remarks, «the novel ends on the glad note of resurrection, when [in the funeral of Ilusha] Alyosha informs Kolya and his young playmates that the dead will rise again»<sup>39</sup>.

This hope that the dead will rise again, based on faith in the Resurrection of Christ, is the source from which Alyosha derives his joy when he stands before the coffin of Ilusha. It is the same hope and faith that helps also Dostoevsky himself find at the end of his life joy through his many sufferings<sup>40</sup>. But, Santayana does not believe in the resurrection and the eternal life in a real sense as Dostoevsky does. On this point, therefore, there is a difference between them, the same difference which, as we said, characterizes in general these two philosophers as concerns their understanding of the person of Christ. But independently of this, both, as we have seen, understand salvation in the same manner, that is, as something attained through suffering and not by escape from suffering.

(To be continued)

37. *Ibid.*, pp. 207-208.

38. *Ibid.*, p. 203.

39. E. J. Simmons, *Dostoevsky, the Making of a Novelist*, p. 362.

40. Among the many sufferings of Dostoevsky were his exile in Siberia and his troubles in his family life, his epilepsy for forty years, as also his chronic tuberculosis, which caused finally his death. Like Dostoevsky, another great sufferer, Kierkegaard, relates also his joy through suffering to the same source of eternity. In the first discourse of his *Gospel of Suffering*, having as motto Christ's saying: «If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross and follow me» (pp. 13ff.; see also pp. 17,19), he explains that «on that way where a man follows Christ, the height of suffering is the height of glory», because «here, on this way», «the greater the suffering the nearer the perfection» (*Ibid.*, p. 23). So, «greater joy there cannot be than this – to be able to become what is highest» (*Ibid.*, p. 22; also pp. 23,25). About this joy Kierkegaard says the following by which he ends his discourse: «In life there is one blessed joy: to follow Christ; and in death is one final blessed joy: to follow Christ into Life!», that is, into «eternity» (*Ibid.*, p. 26; also 23-24). Especially, Kierkegaard treats joy through suffering in view of eternity in his third discourse by the title: «The joy in the thought that the school of suffering forms us for eternity» (*Ibid.*, pp. 47ff.). This joy is also the subject of the seven Christian discourses, and especially of the first one, in the «Joyful Notes in the Strife of Suffering» (See Kierkegaard, *Christian Discourse*; tr. by W. Lowrie, A Galary Book, New York, Oxford University Press, 1961, Pt. II, pp. 94-163).