

Santayana as a Hispanic-American Philosopher: The National, International, and Transnational Perspectives

by Krzysztof (Chris) Piotr Skowroński

English Abstract

In his life and philosophical work George/Jorge Santayana (1863-1952) represents the deep risks of both the Hispanic and North American cultures. He was aware of the complicated relations between these two cultures, including their tensions and differences. We can look into them by means of examining his texts, while at the same time, detect his acute understanding of the cultural problems in several contexts. On the other hand, we can remark and analyze how to seize the cultural confrontations in Santayana's thought in a fruitful way. In order to do so, I propose three perspectives: National, international and transnational. From the national perspective, the national culture as a bedrock of norms and values is emphasized. From the international perspective, we can remark on the interaction between two neighbor cultures. Finally, a transnational perspective seeks to understand norms, ideas and values as elements that are common, universal, and cosmopolitan.

Resumen en español

George/Jorge Santayana (1863-1952) representa, en su vida y en su filosofía, los riesgos profundos de la cultura hispánica y, simultáneamente, la cultura norteamericana. Él estuvo consciente de las complicadas relaciones entre estas culturas, incluyendo las tensiones y diferencias. Podemos investigarlas en sus textos y, al mismo tiempo, detectar su vista aguda sobre los problemas culturales en varios contextos. Por otro lado, podemos observar y analizar la manera de aprovechar las confrontaciones culturales en el pensamiento de Santayana. Para hacer eso, propongo, en este texto, tres perspectivas: nacional, internacional y transnacional. Desde el punto de la perspectiva nacional se acentua la riqueza de la cultural nacional como el fondo de normas y valores. En la perspectiva internacional, se observa la interacción entre dos culturas vecinas. Finalmente, la perspectiva transnacional propone ver las normas, ideas y valores como elementos comunes, cosmopolitas y universales.

Resumo em português

George/Jorge Santayana (1863-1952) representa, em sua vida e em sua filosofia, os riscos profundos da cultura hispânica e, simultaneamente, da cultura norte-americana. Ele tinha consciência das relações complicadas entre essas culturas, inclusive das tensões e das diferenças. Podemos investigá-las em seus textos e, ao mesmo tempo,

detectar sua aguda compreensão dos problemas culturais em vários contextos. De outro lado, podemos observar e analisar a maneira de aproveitar as confrontações culturais no pensamento de Santayana. Para tanto, proponho, neste texto, três perspectivas: nacional, internacional e transnacional. Da perspectiva nacional, acentua-se a riqueza da cultura nacional como fundo de normas e valores. Na perspectiva internacional, observa-se a interação entre duas culturas vizinhas. Por fim, a perspectiva transnacional propõe ver as normas, ideias e valores como elementos comuns, cosmopolitas e universais.

George Santayana (1863-1952) frequently interpreted philosophy and some philosophical problems in terms of their ethnic character, cultural background, and national context. He thus wrote, for example, about egotism in German philosophy (in *Egotism in German Philosophy*), about the British character, German freedom (both in *Soliloquies in England*), English liberty and American character (both in *Character and Opinion in The United States*). At the same time, the national character of Santayana's own philosophy has evoked some interest among scholars, and ample literature devoted to various aspects of this issue exists. I take on this topic in the conviction that in the era of globalization and growing cross-cultural encounters, meetings, and confrontations, Santayana can be a fruitful resource and a teaching exemplar for us to see their (I mean cross-cultural encounters) possible scale and meaning within the area of philosophical, intellectual, and cultural activity. Specifically, I propose the reading of Santayana as a thinker who was very conscious of the possible and factual dangers of the confrontation between the American and the Hispanic worlds on the one hand, and on the other, the benefits resulting from the meeting between them.

A Hispanic-American Philosopher

Santayana's Spanishness or Hispanicism has been investigated and at times confronted with his Americanism both having some grounding in the facts of his life and his own declarations in his published texts and correspondence. Hence, on the one hand, Santayana, a Spanish subject all his life, confessed that "in feeling and in legal allegiance I have always remained a Spaniard";[1] he admitted that "my own roots are Catholic and Spanish,"[2] and even considered himself to be a Castilian mystic.[3] Small wonder, then, that some scholars, mainly Spanish and Italian, tend to emphasize the classical, Castilian, Latin, Mediterranean, and Catholic factors in his thought. Consequently, there have been books and papers devoted to Santayana's *abulensean* (of Avila) traits in his philosophy (Martin),[4] and his "Mediterranean aesthetics" (Patella);[5] we can even find scholars (Sender, Gamo) who want to include Santayana in Generation'98 Spain's momentous intellectual movement.[6] Santayana would be intellectually and spiritually linked with the other members of the group

through a serious reference to “the problem of Spain” by way of redefining her national character, after her defeat in the Spanish-American war and the collapse of Imperial Spain in 1898.

On the other hand, Santayana, a Harvard student and professor who wrote all his works in English, in his “Three American Philosophers” included himself with these three American philosophers along with John Dewey and William James; in a different place he added that “my intellectual relations and labours still unite me closely to America; and it is as an American writer that I must be counted, if I am counted at all.”[7] Hence there are scholars, such as Max H. Fisch and John J. Stuhr, who treat Santayana as a classic American philosopher.[8] Others, such as Robert Dawidoff in *The Genteel Tradition and The Sacred Rage: High Culture vs. Democracy in Adams, James, and Santayana*,[9] put him exclusively in the cultural context of the United States. He is treated by some as a Pragmatist; some scholars, such as Henry Samuel Levinson in *Santayana, Pragmatism, and the Spiritual Life*, say that Santayana’s Pragmatic naturalism is compatible with Dewey’s and his followers,[10] and others, such as Kenyon Rogers, claim that Santayana’s *The Life of Reason* was “the first comprehensive presentation of pragmatism.”[11] Still others, such as John Lachs in “Santayana as Pragmatist,” give up revealing the core of Santayana’s Pragmatism in favor of deliberating “how much viewing him as a pragmatist contributes to our understanding, assessment and appreciation of his philosophy.”[12]

As far as I am concerned, I label a part of Santayana’s writings, partly ironically and partly provocatively, as *abulensean* Pragmatism,[13] in the hope that if some Pragmatists see Santayana as their philosophical friend it will not be at the cost of his non-pragmatic and non-American traits: for example his epiphenomenalism; his reservations about democracy; and his search for the best ways of social development by looking at the past, especially at Ancient Greece, rather than at the future. Thus if we agree that the metaphysical pillars for Pragmatism in James and Dewey are anthropocentrism, democracy, empiricism, practical activity, rationality, and social amelioration, Santayana would be practically against all of these. Anthropocentrism – so tersely expressed by W. James in the *Varieties of Religious Experience*: “The gods we stand by are the gods we need and can use, the gods whose demands on us are reinforcements of our demands on ourselves and on one another”[14] – was opposed by Santayana in the name of a meditative and spiritual approach toward eternal essences of which only a tiny part is accessible to the human mind. Democracy was opposed by Santayana’s timocracy of which, as we read in *The Life of Reason*, the Catholic Church is the best model.[15] Empiricism and sense experience was secondary to the work of the imagination and the life of spirit; indeed, there are scholars who would see Santayana as a “saint of imagination”[16] moreover, he regarded his philosophy as akin more to poetry rather than to science. The sense of practical activity was reduced in meaning by epiphenomenalism, according to which philosophy is practically inefficient in the realm of matter, and the spirit is impotent in rearrangement of the social world. Human rationality is confronted by Santayana’s idea of animal faith,

according to which the hiatus between the cognitive powers of animals and of humans is practically blurred and the advantage of human knowledge doubtful. Finally, social amelioration was opposed by calling for us to reach for wisdom ourselves and by stressing the need to change yourself in your relation to the world rather than making the world better (by, for example, making social institutions work more effectively) – a stance that has a Stoic (and Catholic) background, rather than Pragmatic (and Protestant).

At the same time, I join all those scholars who see Santayana as both a Spanish/Hispanic and as an American philosopher. For example, Herman Saatkamp claims in *The Blackwell Guide to American Philosophy* that Santayana “is the first and foremost Hispanic-American philosopher”;^[17] in “Santayana: Hispanic-American Philosopher,” he provides ample justification for the claim that “in many ways Santayana is the prominent Hispanic-American philosopher of the classical American period.”^[18] Thus he indicates his Spanish roots, formal and cultural, as well his meaning in American philosophy; however, most interestingly for the purposes of this paper, Saatkamp claims that “as a resident alien Santayana represents the perspective of a deeply involved outsider. He was both a part of and apart from the American intellectual and cultural scene – shaping and informing American perspectives as well as having his education and outlook fashioned by the American ethic.”^[19]

This claim prompts me to pass to the other part of the present paper and without neglecting Santayana’s cultural biography, which is interesting and worthy of further and deeper elaboration put the following question: why should we nationalize philosophy and treat some philosophical trends and problems as “American,” “Spanish,” or “Hispanic”? One may ask, is philosophy not as universal as science and wisdom? Below I propose three answers to these questions, trying to give them (1) national, (2) international, and (3) transnational tints successively, and place them in the context of Santayana as a Hispanic-American philosopher.

The National Perspective

We should not ignore the national character of a given philosophy because it can just so happen that this philosophy articulates or manifests the deepest tendencies of a given national culture at a given level of its development. Santayana understands this very well; from this viewpoint he can be seen as both a Hispanic and an American philosopher at the same time, and his output as referring in a parallel manner to both Spanish/Hispanic and American traditions: philosophical, intellectual, and cultural. This reference can be detected in many areas; I want to illustrate this briefly with just three of them: first, Santayana as an American thinker can be stimulating in his studies of the relation between Americanism and Pragmatism; second, by coining and developing the meaning of the term “the Genteel Tradition”; third, the reference to and interpretation of Spain’s tradition can be seen as a subject matter by Santayana seen as a Spanish/Hispanic philosopher.

Santayana suggests that American Pragmatism, at least in its classic version, can be seen, at least partially, as a form of the articulation of Americanism along with the spirit of American democracy; in other words, Pragmatism can be perceived and interpreted as America's national philosophy at some point in the development of American culture. Thus he claims, for example, that John Dewey's philosophy "is calculated to justify all the assumptions of American society." [20] It "is John Dewey who genuinely represents the mind of the vast mass of native, sanguine, enterprising Americans," [21] and his sympathies converged with "a deliberate and happy participation in the attitude of the American people, with its omnivorous human interests and its simplicity of purpose." [22] Something similar was written about William James, with the qualification that James was "perhaps more representative of America in the past than in the future"; [23] nevertheless, James belonged to the earlier generation of Americans who were still very sensitive to the old European curses of poverty, persecutions, and conflicts, and "disquieted by the ghost of tyranny, social and ecclesiastical." [24] Interestingly, if not surprisingly, the view on a possible link between Pragmatism and Americanism is corroborated by some American Pragmatists themselves. Thus Richard Rorty, in his essay "Americanism and Pragmatism," indicates that such representatives of American Pragmatism as William James, John Dewey, and (I suspect) Rorty himself treated America seriously and were conscious of her global, historical, and cultural significance, especially regarding the meaning of democracy. For them – as Rorty goes on to claim – as for Walt Whitman, the terms "America" and "democracy" sounded almost synonymic. [25] Rorty was not alone in this type of claim. Josiah Royce also interpreted Pragmatism in a similar way. For example, in "William James and the Philosophy of Life" he labels William James's philosophy as "interpreter of the problems of the American people," [26] adding that "his form of pragmatism was indeed a form of Americanism in philosophy." [27]

As mentioned above, articulating the relationship between Americanism and Pragmatism is not the only aspect of the nationalization of American philosophy in Santayana. On other occasions ("The Genteel Tradition in American Philosophy," *The Genteel Tradition at Bay, Character and Opinion in the United States*), Santayana redefined American culture by famously saying that "the American Will inhabits the skyscraper; the American Intellect inhabits the colonial mansion." [28] More generally, his idea of "the Genteel Tradition," as opposed to the "crude but vital America," has been seen by many scholars as an interesting notion that can be helpful in understanding the mentality of Americans in the nineteenth century and at the beginning of the twentieth century. We can speculate that after he arrived in New England in 1872 he witnessed the passage from the old genteel Boston to the new industrial one along with a growing split in the world of values, aims, and experiences. There emerged a new type of American mentality, "the untrained, pushing, cosmopolitan orphan, cock-sure in manner but not so sure in his morality, to whom the old Yankee, with his sour integrity, is almost a foreigner." [29] The American mentality became split because the old and noble categories of America's high culture were applied to the new and down-to-earth challenges of the America of enterprise and expansion: "Was not 'increase' in the Bible,

a synonym to 'benefit'? Was not 'abundance' the same, or almost the same as happiness?"[30]

On the other hand, Santayana, who spent some of his earliest years in the town of Spain's two greatest mystics Santa Teresa and St. John of the Cross (Avila), tried to construct his own attitude to Spanish tradition in practical and theoretical ways. Practically, he refused to permanently return to his motherland; one of the reasons was that "Spain was not Spanish enough." [31] Theoretically, and more importantly, he attempted to reinterpret the key figures of Spanish intellectual history, Don Quixote in the first instance - the Spanish version of *Don Quixote* was read aloud in his house when a child [32] - and he even once called himself "Don Quixote sane." [33] He paid special attention to the role of the imagination by saying that "Spain is a great country for the imagination with a great power over spirit," [34] which, among other things, could provide a specific and enormous sense of spiritual freedom. On the other hand, however, and more like Sancho Pansa than Don Quixote, Santayana stressed the dangers of an unbridled imagination by saying: "Cultivate your imagination, love it, give it endless forms but [do] not let it deceive you." [35] All this seems in tone with the reflections within Generation '98, although I do not want to prejudge whether Santayana contributed to the movement. However, like the members of the group, he devoted much attention to the spiritual, axiological, and moral aspects of Spain's weakness rather than to economic and military ones. Like the representatives of the movement, he advocated the cultivation of the mind, aiming at authentic self-awareness, striving for Socratic self-knowledge, non-institutionally or Church-imposed spirituality, and intellectual creativeness. Also like them, he avoided xenophobic tones by promoting openness toward Western (i.e., Anglo-Saxon, Francophone) ideas and, simultaneously, openness towards national self-studying other words, dialogue but not assimilation, discussion but not the imposition of truths. Despite his focus on the national aspects of culture and philosophy, he, like other members of the movement, rejected nationalistic tendencies, stating that studying glorious achievements of the country's history is much better than uncritical glorification of its past, and that searching for profound and eternal national qualities is much better than territorial extension and economic exploitation.

The International Perspective

Santayana shows us that in the shaping of his thoughts he referred to both traditions, Spanish/Hispanic on the one hand and American on the other, as interacting to each other. In this way he can thus be seen as a Hispanic-American philosopher in the sense of making the two traditions meet each other in his thought and in his output. I will briefly discuss three dimensions of this international perspective: first, juxtaposition of these two traditions; second, following Alexis de Tocqueville's way of assessing America; and third, approaching the problem of Americanization.

Santayana referred to his Hispanic, Classic, Catholic, and Mediterranean roots and, on the other hand, confronted them with important trends within the tradition of

American philosophy, that is, with transcendentalism (especially R. W. Emerson) and Pragmatism (especially J. Dewey, W. James, and J. Royce) as well as with some trends of American culture. As I point out in my book *Santayana and America*, a panorama of confrontational issues can be studied here, starting with the Quixotic imagination contrasted with the Genteel Intellect, going through the ethos of chivalry vs. mercantile morality,[36] and ending with juxtaposing Castilian “independence and capacity to live content with little and quite alone” to the symbols of Yankee spirit: ingenuity and haste. [37] Also, it is interesting to take a deeper look at the idea of loyalty in light of the fact that Santayana, a Spanish subject, was at Harvard during the Spanish-American War of 1898; in his interpretation the war was inevitable, given America’s imperialism on the one hand and, on the other, Spain’s weakness.[38] In my view, Santayana’s in-betweenness can be a lesson for many intellectualists today to use the intellectual resources of their own philosophical tradition(s) in order to transcend the boundaries created by religions, cultural stereotypes, various and incompatible hierarchies of values. Simultaneously, philosophers and intellectuals can whet their sensitivities in confrontation with or in reference to other and different philosophical and cultural traditions to the benefit of the philosopher’s insight and his or her awareness regarding the groundings for various problems, philosophies, and cultures.

It should be noted that this type of analysis and assessment by an outsider, yet an acute observer, suggests similarities to the famous deliberations on America by Alexis de Tocqueville in *Democracy in America*. Despite almost a half a century of difference in space between their examinations of America as well in the character of these examinations, their conclusions dovetail strikingly. Both outsiders, penetrating observers, and commentators on America’s cultural and political scene with their points of reference in high class, cultural, and aristocratic Europe, Santayana and de Tocqueville were impressed by America’s vitality and, on the other hand, her ability to generate a diluted culture. However, as Robert Dawidoff puts it, “What made Santayana especially helpful was that, unlike Tocqueville, he understood that the cultural problems for the American were elaborate, orthodox, and bulkily discouraging. There were plenty of subjects, but the established institutions, he seemed to see, would not allow them. The American Tocquevillian might as easy be modernist as traditionalist. America could be faulted for its too earnest and its insufficient traditionalism, as well as for its too timid or too locomotive modernism.”[39]

An important part of the international perspective is the problem of Americanization, and by this I understand the expansion of American cultural values on other cultures and traditions. The frontier between American culture and non-American culture does not have to necessarily be situated within the United States. The expansion of American culture is penetrating, and Santayana witnessed this from his earliest years. Thus, as he recollects in *Persons and Places*, a shrewd millionaire from Chicago purchased the damask hangings from the interior of the nine-hundred-year-old cathedral in Avila for \$20 000; on another occasion he recalls a conversation with John D. Rockefeller (whom he met thanks to his friend A. Strong) in which Rockefeller

converted the number of Spain's population into the amount of oil that he could sell there. In later years Santayana appreciated the vitality of American culture and encouraged the promotion of our cultural heritages and traditions. He viewed America as the next superpower—just one in a series of successive empires—whose might could be converted, under some conditions, for the meliorization of the world. Small wonder that Richard Rorty once wrote that Santayana “saw us as one more great empire in the long parade,” and that “his genial hope was that we might enjoy the imperium while we held it.”[40]

In my book *Santayana and America* I introduced the concepts of *encounter*, *meeting*, and *confrontation*; I believe that all of them fit well in our talk about Santayana in the context of Americanization. It should be noted that all these notions can have an individualistic and/or a collective character; that is to say, they may concern individuals involved in cultural contact with other cultures, interest groups, nations, and so on. Hence by *encounter* I understand a transfer of ideas, values, and experiences between two parties that can serve the intellectual, spiritual, cultural, and economic development of at least one of them; however, in the encounter we have a superior partner and an inferior one, the one that has to (or wants to) accommodate to the conditions imposed by the dominator. For example, there are many immigrants who (willingly) dissolve in the American melting pot and leave no original mark from their native cultures. Encounter is different than a *meeting*, in which two or more partners have no advantage over the other(s); for example, American philosophers and European philosophers can gather and discuss many issues to the profit of both, and there are many occasions to do it nowadays. Encounter and meeting are different than *confrontation*, which is a clash of interests, values, and experiences as a result of which we have a kill-or-be-killed scenario; here the difference between the opposite sides is so huge and the level of the will to dominate so high that all accessible powers are used to win the battle; [41] today's antagonistic relations between the West and the Muslim world can serve as an example here. Although Santayana's position at Harvard at the time of the Spanish-American War of 1898 could suggest that culturally he was in a confrontational mood towards the American lifestyle and, on the other hand, that the American environment of that time could hardly tolerate a Spanish subject, I have not found any evidence for this just the opposite. For Santayana himself, as he put it in *Persons and Places*, “the extreme contrast between the two centers and the two influences became itself a blessing.” He explains this in the following way:

The extreme contrast between the two centres and the two influences became itself a blessing: it rendered flagrant the limitations and the contingency of both. ... In each of these places there was a maximum of air, of space, of suggestion; in each there was a minimum of deceptiveness and of the power to enslave. The dignity of Avila was too obsolete, too inopportune, to do more than stimulate an imagination already awakened, and lend reality to history; while at Harvard a wealth of books and much generous intellectual sincerity went with such spiritual penury and moral confusion as to offer nothing but a lottery ticket or a chance at the grab-bag to the orphan mind.[42]

I believe Santayana can be an exemplar for non-Americans to creatively deal with the might of American culture. Both American culture and Santayana have gained something out of this meeting. America has gained one of the most penetrating critics of American culture and one of the most influential philosophers in the era of the rise of classical American thought.

The Transnational Perspective: Santayana's Cosmopolitanism

Thirdly and finally, we can talk about a given philosophy or given ideas *transnationally*, on having assumed that particular national distinctions tend to lose, at least to some degree, their specificity in favor of more universal features. One can claim, for example, that using such a transnational distinction as Richard Rorty once did, that is: “a Western urban lay liberal democrat,” can be, within the Western civilization, much more precise for many scholars today than any particular national or ethnic distinction. If we take a look at a past epoch, we can see that by pursuing wisdom and cultivating the art of (a good) life Michel de Montaigne in the Renaissance did the same; that is, he suggested to his own contemporaries transcultural and transnational ways to make the world a better place for them to live. Later, in the Enlightenment Era, the Encyclopedists wanted science and its universal promotion by means of education to do more or less the same; it was their deep conviction that the more enlightened or educated members of a given society are, whatever their nationality might be, the better functioning the society will be as a whole. Also, the basic assumptions and aspirations of American Pragmatism (declared or implicitly assumed) have a global, radical, soteriological, and even eschatological character, hence, for example, it suits the American Pragmatists perfectly well to claim that Pragmatism is a universal, not only an American, project. In this Santayana would have a similarly universal project whose tersely articulation we can find in the very final sentence of his book *Dominations and Powers*, where he writes that wisdom lies in an appreciation and understanding of the different forms of a good life.[43] As David Dilworth puts it in his *Philosophy in World Perspective*, “Santayana transcended the chauvinistic claims of the American tradition. Contrary to his own philosophical protestations, he produced a text for all ages and cultures by realizing an essential possibility of thought.”[44] This view was corroborated by Edmund Wilson, who personally met Santayana after World War II and described him as “the most super-national mind and personality.” This impression was made by Santayana's intelligence, which Wilson describes in this way: “The intelligence that has persisted in him has been that of the civilized human race.”[45] What Dilworth sees in Santayana as universal, Wilson as super-national, and I see as transnational can be inspirational to many contemporary philosophers, especially those whose backgrounds and/or interests make them transcend national borders, be they cultural, political, mental, or linguistic.

Nevertheless, all these ideas of Montaigne, the Encyclopedists, Pragmatists and Santayana's, no matter how noble and no matter how universally valid, are Western ideas that stem from Western culture and have spread all over the world due to the

power of Western institutions. In this way I come back to Santayana's suggestions, which I mentioned at the very beginning of the present paper, that we cannot ignore the national background of most universal ideas and values even when they articulate the needs and hopes of the peoples living in distant corners of the world.

In conclusion I would like to pay attention to an important aspect of this transnational approach of Santayana, which is cosmopolitanism.[46] Geographically, cosmopolitanism was part of the history of all of Santayana's family, whose members had lived in Spain, the Philippines, and the United States. Santayana was born in Madrid, moved to Avila when he was three, and then, at the age of nine, his father took him to Boston. At age forty-nine he returned to Europe in the meantime he had crossed the Atlantic thirty-eight times where he paid innumerable visits to England, Spain, France, Switzerland, and Italy, where he eventually died. Characteristically, if not symbolically, the family cosmopolitanism is corroborated by the eternal dislocation of their graves: Santayana's is in Italy, his father's in Spain, and his mother's in the United States. But his cosmopolitanism did not end with his physical travels and with the graves of his family. According to Santayana's philosophy of travel and the philosophical background of cosmopolitanism, which somehow complement theoretically his practical traveling, the transcending of boundaries and experiencing otherness should be accompanied by the traveler's own axiological, cultural, and philosophical point of reference – otherwise traveling becomes rambling, wandering, drifting, and tramping. The traveler, then, "must be somebody and come from somewhere, so that his definite character and moral traditions may supply an organ and a point of comparison for his observations. He must not go nosing about like a peddler for profit or like an emigrant for a vacant lot. Everywhere he should show the discretion and maintain the dignity of a guest. Everywhere he should remain a stranger no matter how benevolent, and a critic no matter how appreciative." [47]

Traveling, from a philosophical point of view, also means an attempt "to overcome moral and ideal provinciality, and to see that every form of life had its own perfection, which it was stupid and cruel to condemn for differing from some other form, by chance one's own." [48] Sometimes this attempt takes on a form of a struggle against various forms of prejudice: social, religious, cultural, and others. The respect for a deep wisdom of the past cannot be limited exclusively to *our* wisdom; thus, for the humanist or philosopher or just an unprejudiced person, "there is no more reason for swearing by the letter of the Gospels than that of Homer or the Upanishads or the Koran." [49]

Notes

[1] George Santayana, "Three American Philosophers," in George Santayana, *The Birth of Reason and Other Essays*, ed. Daniel Cory (New York: Columbia University

Press, 1968), 134.

[2] *The Letters of George Santayana, Book Three 1921-1927*, ed. William G. Holzberger (Cambridge, MA and London: The MIT Press, 2002), 310.

[3] *The Philosophy of George Santayana*, The Library of Living Philosophers, ed. Arthur P. Schlipp (La Salle: Open Court, 1951), 603.

[4] Cf. Pedro Garcia Martin's *El sustrato abulense de Jorge Santayana [The Avilian Background of George Santayana]* (Avila: Gran Duque de Alba, 1989).

[5] Cf. Giuseppe Patella, *Belleza, arte e vita. L'estetica mediterranea di George Santayana* (Milano: Mimesis, 2001); see also Giuseppe Patella, "Santayana's Mediterranean Aesthetics," in *Under Any Sky. Contemporary Readings of George Santayana*, eds. Matthew Caleb Flamm, Krzysztof Piotr Skowroński (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2007), 171-80.

[6] Cf. Ramon J. Sender, *Unamuno, Valle Inclan, Baroja y Santayana. Ensayos Criticos* (Mexico: Andrea, 1955); Ramon J. Sender, *Examen de ingenios. Los Noventayochos* (Mexico: Aguilar, 1971); J. M. Alonso Gamo, *Un español en el mundo. Santayana: poesia y poetica* (Madrid: Ediciones Cultura Hispanica, 1966).

[7] *The Philosophy of George Santayana*, 603.

[8] Cf. Max H. Fisch, general ed., *Classic American Philosophers. Peirce, James, Royce, Santayana, Dewey, Whitehead* (New York: Appleton, 1951); John J. Stuhr, ed., *Classical American Philosophy: Essential Readings and Interpretative Essays* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987).

[9] Robert Dawidoff, *The Genteel Tradition and The Sacred Rage: High Culture vs. Democracy in Adams, James, and Santayana* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1992).

[10] Henry Samuel Levinson, *Santayana, Pragmatism, and the Spirituals Life* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992), 3-4.

[11] *Ibid.*, 3.

[12] John Lachs, "Santayana as Pragmatist," in John Lachs, *A Community of Individuals* (New York and London: Routledge, 2003), 156.

[13] Cf. Krzysztof Piotr Skowronski, *Values and Powers: Re-reading the Philosophical Tradition of American Pragmatism* (Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2009), 167nn.

[14] William James, *The Varieties of Religious Experience*, Electronic Text Center, University of Virginia Library, 324, URL=<http://etext.virginia.edu/toc/modeng/public/JamVari.html>.

[15] Cf. George Santayana, *The Life of Reason* (Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 1998), 146-47.

[16] Cf. M. M. Kirkwood, *Santayana: Saint of Imagination* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1961).

[17] Herman J. Saatkamp, Jr., "George Santayana, 1863-1952," in *The Blackwell Guide to American Philosophy*, eds. Armen T. Marsoobian and John Ryder (Oxford: Blackwell, 2004), 135.

- [18] Herman J. Saatkamp, Jr., "Santayana: Hispanic-American Philosopher," *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society, A Quarterly Journal in American Philosophy* 34, no. 1 (winter 1998): 53.
- [19] *Ibid.*, 54.
- [20] George Santayana, *Obiter Scripta. Lectures, Essays and Reviews* (New York: Scribner's Sons, 1936), 216.
- [21] Santayana, *The Birth of Reason and Other Essays*, 130.
- [22] Santayana, *Obiter Scripta*, 218.
- [23] *Ibid.*, 217.
- [24] George Santayana, *Character and Opinion in the United States with the Reminiscences of William James and Josiah Royce and Academic Life in America* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1920), 91.
- [25] Cf. Richard Rorty, "Amerykanizm i pragmatyzm [Americanism and Pragmatism]," in *Filozofia amerykańska dziś [American Philosophy Today]*, eds. Tomasz Komendziński and Andrzej Szahaj (Toruń: UMK, 1999), 120.
- [26] *The Basic Writings of Josiah Royce*, vol. I, ed. John McDermott (New York: Fordham University Press, 2005), 211.
- [27] *Ibid.*, 218.
- [28] George Santayana, "The Genteel Tradition in American Philosophy," in George Santayana, *Winds of Doctrine and Platonism and the Spiritual Life* (New York: Harper, 1957), 188.
- [29] Santayana, *Character and Opinion in the United States*, 14.
- [30] *Ibid.*
- [31] *The Philosophy of George Santayana*, 603.
- [32] Cf. George Santayana, *Persons and Places: Fragments of Autobiography*, Critical Edition, eds. William G. Holzberger and Herman J. Saatkamp, Jr. (Cambridge, MA and London: The MIT Press, 1986), 142.
- [33] *The Philosophy of George Santayana*, 604.
- [34] *Ibid.*, 602.
- [35] Santayana, *Persons and Places*, 427.
- [36] Cf. Krzysztof Piotr Skowronski, *Santayana and America: Values, Liberties, Responsibility* (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2007), 13-19.
- [37] Cf. *Ibid.*, 7.
- [38] Cf. *Ibid.*, 8-11.
- [39] Dawidoff, *The Genteel Tradition and The Sacred Age*, 161.
- [40] Richard Rorty, "Professionalized Philosophy and Transcendentalist Culture," in *Georgia Review* 30 (1976): 757.
- [41] Cf. Skowronski, *Santayana and America*, 149.
- [42] Santayana, *Persons and Places*, 98.
- [43] George Santayana, *Dominations and Powers: Reflections on Liberty, Society, and Government* (New Brunswick and London: Transactions Publishers, 1995), 466.
- [44] David A. Dilworth, *Philosophy in World Perspective: A Comparative Hermeneutic of the Major Theories* (New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press, 1989), 139.

[45] Edmund Wilson, "Visit to Santayana," in Edmund Wilson, *Europe Without Baedeker* (Garden City, N.: Doubleday & Company Inc., 1947), 51 and 63. I take this quote from Saatkamp, "Santayana: Hispanic-American Philosopher," 52.

[46] Cf. Krzysztof Piotr Skowronski, "El cosmopolitismo de Santayana," in *Jorge Santayana: Un hombre al margen, un pensamiento central* (Archipiélago: Cuadernos de crítica de la cultura, 70/2006), 81-85.

[47] Santayana, *Persons and Places*, 449.

[48] *Ibid.*, 170.

[49] George Santayana, *The Idea of Christ in the Gospels or God in Man* (New York: Scribner's, 1946), 5.