

This is a section of [doi:10.7551/mitpress/15336.001.0001](https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/15336.001.0001)

Winds of Doctrine

Studies in Contemporary Opinion

By: George Santayana

**Edited by: David E Spiech, Martin A. Coleman,
Faedra Lazar Weiss**

Citation:

Winds of Doctrine: Studies in Contemporary Opinion

By: George Santayana

Edited by: David E Spiech, Martin A. Coleman, Faedra Lazar Weiss

DOI: 10.7551/mitpress/15336.001.0001

ISBN (electronic): 9780262377324

Publisher: The MIT Press

Published: 2023



The MIT Press

Textual Commentary

TEXTUAL PRINCIPLES AND PROCEDURES FOR *THE WORKS OF GEORGE SANTAYANA*

THE WORKS OF GEORGE SANTAYANA AND EDITORIAL SCHOLARSHIP

The volumes of *The Works of George Santayana* are unmodernized, critical editions of George Santayana's writings. This scholarly edition is "unmodernized" because it retains original and idiosyncratic punctuation, spelling, capitalization, and word division in order to reflect the full intent of the author as well as the initial texture of the work; it is "critical" because it allows the exercise of editorial judgment in making corrections, changes, and choices among authoritative readings. The goal of the editors is to produce texts that accurately represent Santayana's final intentions regarding his works while recording all evidence on which editorial decisions have been based.

Except for the *Letters* and *Marginalia* volumes, *The Works of George Santayana* typically consist of materials composed by Santayana that he intended for publication and dissemination in a printed form. For these writings there may exist a holograph manuscript, a typescript, printers' proofs, two or more editions, and multiple impressions of editions. In such cases of needing to consider so many types of text, the term "critical editing" indicates the task of comparing these various forms in order to ascertain and perpetuate the author's settled intention regarding his work. In the absence of the holograph manuscript, the most authorial form (designated "copy-text") is normally the document that is closest to the author's hand. Two independent sight or machine comparisons are performed against the copy-text for each discovered successive form of the text found to have been produced by Santayana or published during his lifetime.

Editorial judgments are based on an assessment of all available evidence manifest in Santayana's works, letters, annotations, and other authorial material. The editors study this evidence to identify all of the forms of the text over which Santayana is known to (or can reasonably be assumed to) have exercised authorial control. They then compare (or "collate") all of these relevant forms of the text and account for any divergence, whether substantive or accidental, from the earliest surviving version of the text. When completed, this procedure enables scholars, using the information presented in the editorial apparatus, to recover readings of the documents used in preparing the text and to evaluate the editorial judgments made in establishing the critical text.

TEXTUAL THEORY

The central editorial decision for unmodernized, critical editions is the choice of copy-text, the document on which a critical text is based. The texts for *The Works of George Santayana* are constructed according to the theory of copy-text first formulated by Sir Walter Greg,¹ which continues to be a model for recent texts on scholarly editing.² Greg distinguishes between substantives (variants in the words themselves) and accidentals (variants in punctuation, spelling, capitalization, word division, paragraphing, and devices of emphasis). This is a pragmatic distinction used to account for the known behavior of authors and of intermediaries involved in publishing a work. In practice, authors tend to regard accidentals as less important than substantives. In proofreading, they concentrate on the fidelity of the words and more freely permit or overlook changes in formal matters made by typists, copy editors, and compositors. Simply stated, Greg maintains that the copy-text should be the most authoritative source of accidentals and that unless clear and certain evidence indicates otherwise that source will be the document closest to the author's unmediated hand, i.e., the fair-copy manuscript, or, when a manuscript does not exist, the typed or printed document that is closest to it.

Santayana always produced a handwritten manuscript, usually after earlier drafts (pre-copy-text forms). The holograph manuscripts of some of his later writings were given to a typist³ and the typescript was corrected by Santayana. Because a typescript may contain errors in accidentals that Santayana over-

¹Walter Greg, "The Rationale of Copy-Text," *Studies in Bibliography* 3 (1950–51): 19–36, reprinted in *The Collected Papers of Sir Walter W. Greg*, ed. J. C. Maxwell (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966), 374–91. Guidelines for the application of this method were taken from Fredson Bowers, "Textual Criticism," in *The Aims and Methods of Scholarship in Modern Languages and Literatures*, 2nd ed., ed. James Thorpe (New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1970), 29–54, and the *Statement of Editorial Principles and Procedures: A Working Manual for Editing Nineteenth-Century American Texts*, rev. ed., prepared by the Center for Editions of American Authors (New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1972). Two exceptional essays on the art of modern scholarly editing that have been very helpful to the editors of this critical edition are by G. Thomas Tanselle: "Greg's Theory of Copy-Text and the Editing of American Literature," *Studies in Bibliography* 28 (1975): 167–229, and "Some Principles for Editorial Apparatus," *Studies in Bibliography* 25 (1972): 41–88.

²See for example William Proctor Williams and Craig S. Abbott, *An Introduction to Bibliographical and Textual Studies*, 4th ed. (New York: Modern Language Association of America, 2009).

³Evelyn Tindall, an Englishwoman employed at the British Legation to the Holy See in Rome, began typing Santayana's handwritten manuscripts late in 1933, beginning with his novel, *The Last Puritan* (1935), and made typescripts of all of Santayana's subsequent work through *Dominations and Powers* (1950).

looked, the fair-copy manuscript best represents Santayana's preferred use of accidentals, even when a corrected typescript is extant. Hence, in *The Works of George Santayana* the fair-copy manuscript, when extant, is the copy-text unless there is clear authorial evidence to indicate otherwise. When a manuscript remains unlocated, the surviving form closest to it is chosen as the copy-text. This may be the typescript, or, lacking the typescript, proofs (ideally a set read and marked by Santayana). Where none of the authorial or presswork stages have been located, the first printing of the first edition will stand as copy-text.

Critical editions are eclectic in that readings may be adopted from subsequent authorially revised or corrected versions, or from corrections made by Santayana's successive editors. The authority for accidentals is the copy-text; variants in the accidentals of subsequent presswork or later editions must be rejected, except on the rare occasion where (1) there is direct evidence of authorial revision, or (2) the variant corrects an obvious error (such as spelling or capitalization) that the author would want corrected. Consistent idiosyncrasies in Santayana's spelling and punctuation preferences represent an important aspect of his style, and will not be emended. However, the authority for substantive variants may shift to later impressions (printings) or editions known to be revised by Santayana. Such variants may be authoritative, and where the evidence is compelling they will be emended into the copy-text. This practice is based on the existence of evidence of authorial revision in later editions or from evidence in the correspondence. But even when such evidence exists, some substantives may have been altered by other persons and overlooked by Santayana; these substantives—often the result of compositorial (typesetting) error and editorial styling—are not authoritative and the copy-text forms retain their authority.⁴ All editorial emendations to the copy-text are recorded (and the sources of emended readings identified) in the editorial apparatus located at the end of each volume.

GENEALOGY OF THE TEXT

Establishing critical texts thus requires the utmost scholarly rigor. The relative authority of each textual document and the relationships among these documents are determined by establishing a genealogy of each text. This process involves locating all relevant forms of the texts and collating them to prepare tables of variants that can be used to delineate the development of and the relationships among the texts.

All material bearing on the history of the text must be examined. This analysis includes items related to the publication of the work (such as letters, publish-

⁴G. Thomas Tanselle, "Textual Scholarship," *Introduction to Scholarship in Modern Languages and Literatures*, ed. Joseph Gibaldi (New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1981), 40.

ers' files, and printers' ledgers), outside sources quoted by Santayana in the text itself, and every text that has *prima facie* authority (such as pre-copy-text forms, fair-copy manuscripts, and all impressions of all editions of the work prior to the death of the author).

One of the first tasks of the editors of the Santayana Edition, therefore, is to locate all extant materials which pertain to any of Santayana's published works. Santayana's papers are located in several repositories within the United States as well as other countries. Major repositories include: Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University; The Bodleian Library, Oxford University; Department of Rare Books and Manuscripts, Boston Public Library; Butler Library, Columbia University; The Library of Congress; William R. Perkins Library, Duke University; Lauinger Library, Georgetown University; The Houghton Library, Harvard University; Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Libraries; Rockefeller Archive Center; Morris Library, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale; Temple University Libraries; Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center, University of Texas at Austin; Albert and Shirley Small Special Collections Library, University of Virginia at Charlottesville; and the University of Waterloo, Ontario.

In addition to the above, over one hundred institutions and several individuals have papers, particularly correspondence, written by Santayana. Well over three thousand letters are known to exist, many housed in libraries and archives throughout the United States, Europe, and Japan, and others are in the possession of family members such as David Bidwell, the Sturgis family, and the Sastre family in Spain. Fortunately, the majority of the library of books and papers once in Santayana's personal possession, which are full of his handwritten annotations, are concentrated in repositories at Columbia, Georgetown, Harvard, Texas, and Waterloo.

The major collections of Santayana's papers from which the Edition has drawn information specifically for publication of the critical edition of *Winds of Doctrine* are as follows:

- Louis Round Wilson Special Collections Library, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, holds J. M. Dent & Sons Records, 1834-1986, which includes correspondence between Santayana and Joseph Malaby Dent, the publisher of the first edition of *Winds of Doctrine*.
- Special Collections at the Lauinger Library of Georgetown University holds the original books used by Santayana in preparing the manuscript of *Little Essays: Drawn from the Writings of George Santayana*, including material from a January 1913 printing of *Winds of Doctrine*.

The Santayana Edition has acquired photocopies of all known Santayana material from the various repositories and individuals. Copies of primary and secondary source materials and dissertations are available in the office of the Edition for staff research and use by other scholars.

To determine the authority of all documents containing the text for previously published works of George Santayana, all true editions (distinct typesettings) are collected and collated, and their variants are recorded in a table of historical collations.⁵ Each variant is studied to determine whether it is an authorial revision or the result of other factors, such as house styling or type damage. If there is evidence that Santayana revised an edition, the editors must distinguish between his revisions and non-authorial impositions or errors, such as those introduced by copy editors or compositors. As each printing or impression of a single edition also may have been revised by Santayana, the editors collect and collate the first and last impressions of each edition to locate possible authorial variants. When variants are found, the intermediate impressions (if any) are studied to determine when the variants were introduced and whether they are authorial. Eventually, all impressions are collated to insure that no other readings were altered and then restored within the interim impressions. Such variants would not surface in the initial collation of first and last impressions, but would nonetheless need to be recorded and evaluated.

The chronological order and relationship of editions and impressions are determined by internal as well as external evidence. Printing records or publishers' statements in the printed volume may indicate separate impressions, and correspondence sometimes provides clues to the existence of new printings of an edition. Lacking such external evidence, the editors may distinguish between otherwise apparently identical impressions by internal evidence, such as wear and deterioration of the plates. Variants between impressions may be discovered by extensive collation of copies of the edition collected from disparate regions in which the work was marketed.

When the genealogy of the text has been established and the relationships of all textual documents have been determined, the editors choose the document that will serve as copy-text. Greg's theory of copy-text, described above, is the basis for this choice.

Textual information presented in four lists following the "Textual Commentary" constitutes the evidence for and record of editorial decisions upon

⁵ All editions of Santayana's works are listed in *George Santayana: A Bibliographical Checklist, 1880–1980*, edited by Herman J. Saatkamp Jr. and John Jones (Bowling Green, OH: Philosophy Documentation Center, 1982). Corrections and annual updates of the checklist are in *Overheard in Seville: Bulletin of the Santayana Society* (see links to electronic archives of the *Bulletin* at <https://www.ulib.iupui.edu/digitalcollections/Santayana>).

which the text of the critical edition is based. The first three of these lists concern editorial decisions; the fourth is a historical record. The editorial apparatus for this volume records editorial decisions in (1) the “Discussions of Adopted Readings,” (2) the “List of Emendations,” and (3) the “Report of Line-End Hyphenation.” A fourth section, the “List of Variants,” permits the reader to compare the critical text with all variant readings in every other possibly authoritative text. The editorial apparatus enables the reader to reconstruct the copy-text and to evaluate judgments made by the editors in establishing the text of the critical edition. For a description of the entire editorial appendix, see page 147.

PRODUCING THE CRITICAL EDITION

Transcribing, editing, and typesetting the copy-text(s) to reproduce a critical text as accurately as possible is the primary goal of the Santayana Edition. This reproduction of *The Works of George Santayana* is, therefore, done electronically and, beginning with Volume VII, *The Life of Reason*, the books are produced with Adobe InDesign, a commercial electronic typesetting program. First the text is carefully transcribed (a literal transcription indicating internal variants is produced if the copy-text is the holograph manuscript or a typescript corrected by Santayana). As part of the initial transcription, the editors identify the various text elements (chapter headings, subheadings, marginal notes, standard paragraphs, extracts, poetry lines, footnotes, and the like), each of which is rendered visually distinctive with the help of InDesign, making systematic use of the program’s template features. Each transcription then receives at least two independent sight collations against the copy-text to ensure its accuracy.⁶ Various software programs aid the editors in locating, counting, and compiling material needed in making editorial decisions. For example, searching the digital files can indicate Santayana’s usage and spelling of problematic words, identify patterns of punctuation and spelling, and find all line-end hyphens in the copy-text.

In addition to the copy-text, the front matter, textual commentary, notes, apparatus, and index are compiled and organized using a variety of software programs. These files are converted to InDesign format and the pages produced are proofed twice for accuracy and checked against the text as necessary. Use of the InDesign desktop publishing program enables the editors to send proofed

⁶The term “sight collation” refers to the process of comparing two versions of a text “by eye”; that is, collating (comparing) a handwritten version against a typewritten version, or comparing two different editions (necessarily involving two different settings of type). The various editorial terms used in this commentary, including “edition,” “impression,” “printing,” “issue,” “state,” etc., follow the definitions found in Fredson Bowers, *Principles of Bibliographical Description* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1949): 379–426.

pages to The MIT Press for printing. Before the book is printed, the editors check the digital proofs from the publisher.

The desktop typesetting employed in *The Works of George Santayana* greatly facilitates the editing and publication processes because it maintains the accuracy of the textual record, keeping it free from the errors or alterations almost invariably arising from rekeying a document. In having direct control over the printing process, then, the editors also safeguard the integrity of the critical edition text.

DESCRIPTION AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE TEXT OF *WINDS OF DOCTRINE*

COMPOSITION HISTORY

Santayana's letters prior to the publication of *Winds of Doctrine* indicate that he was researching the topics in this volume's essays as early as 1907, when he took notice of the publication of Bergson's *L'évolution créatrice* while disparaging Bergson's philosophy: "I have no doubt it is most ingenious and contains good thinking in his private categories; but since I saw Bergson I have no serious interest in his productions."⁷ In a 5 February 1908 letter to Horace Meyer Kallen, Santayana expanded on his criticism of Bergson:

I thought him a great man, one of those whom we admire without feeling called upon to agree or disagree, since they seem to be above controversy, like the poets. But when I saw Bergson, and felt what his inspiration was, that he was a little cowed advocate of irrational prejudices and stubborn misunderstandings, feigning and acting the part of an impartial, subtle, liberal thinker—then all the charm vanished even from his written words, and I hear the cracked voice of the sectary and the whine of the reactionary in every syllable....⁸

Santayana may well have met Bergson while in France during the winter of 1905–6 delivering the Hyde Lectures, hosted by the Collège de France, where Bergson was chair of the Department of Modern Philosophy.⁹ Santayana had attempted several essays about Bergson's philosophy without publishing them,¹⁰ but by April 1912 had started the essay that appeared in *Winds of Doctrine*,¹¹ finish-

⁷ 23 June 1907 to Charles Augustus Strong (*LGS*, 1:368).

⁸ *LGS*, 1:378.

⁹ *PP*, 411–12.

¹⁰ Santayana wrote, "the essay on Bergson is only a selection of reams that I had written about him" (6 December 1912 to Mary Williams Winslow; *LGS*, 2:111).

¹¹ 8 April 1912 to Charles Augustus Strong; *LGS*, 2:86–87.

ing it in August 1912.¹² Santayana's negative inclination toward Bergson was confirmed by his reading of Julien Benda's *Le Bergsonisme* (1912); he wrote to Kallen that it relieved him of any concern that he had been too severe in his criticism¹³ and even led him to change "one or two complimentary epithets ... into epithets of a sour-sweet quality, in deference to Benda's criticism of the same, which opened my eyes."¹⁴

In July 1907, Santayana had just started reading John Calvin and Jonathan Edwards:

I found Calvin's Institutes awaiting me here—in a German translation which sounds like a pious, warm, hearty sermon of the seventeenth century—and I have devoted these two mornings to it—reading in bed, where I have my chocolate, in a manner that I fear is incongruous, voluptuous, and inspired of Satan. I am learning something nevertheless, and am delighted that the idea of reading Jonathan Edwards and Calvin came into my head, as it is opening a new world to me, at least, a much clearer and more genuine vista into a vague old world I had always heard about. "Righteousness"—almost the opposite of rational "justice"—will always be a clearer concept for me henceforth.¹⁵

The only book by Edwards found in Santayana's library was a 1935 printing of *Representative Selections*,¹⁶ so it is not clear which of Edwards's writings Santayana may have read between 1907 and his delivery of the lecture "The Genteel Tradition in American Philosophy" in 1911.

Already in 1908, Santayana had read an article sent to him by Bertrand Russell about pragmatism;¹⁷ this was most likely a draft of the article Russell published in *The Edinburgh Review* following the publication of James's *Pragmatism*, in which Russell surveyed the history of pragmatist thought up to that time.¹⁸ Russell's essay was later included as chapter 4 in *Philosophical Essays*,¹⁹ the book to which Santayana responded in his articles in *The Journal of Philosophy, Psychology,*

¹² 4 August 1912 to Charles Augustus Strong (*LGS*, 2:95–96); 3 September 1912 to Charles Augustus Strong (*LGS*, 2:97).

¹³ 7 April 1913 to Horace Meyer Kallen (*LGS*, 2:128).

¹⁴ 11 November 1912 to Charles Augustus Strong (*LGS*, 2:105).

¹⁵ 17 July 1907 to Charles Augustus Strong (*LGS*, 1:370).

¹⁶ Jonathan Edwards, *Representative Selections* (New York: American Book Co., 1935).

¹⁷ 6 July 1908 to Bertrand Arthur William Russell (*LGS*, 1:386).

¹⁸ Bertrand Russell, "Pragmatism," *The Edinburgh Review* 209, no. 428 (April 1909): 363–88; William James, *Pragmatism* (London: Longmans, 1907).

¹⁹ Bertrand Russell, *Philosophical Essays* (London: Longmans, 1910).

and *Scientific Methods*;²⁰ Santayana's own overview of James's philosophy was not completed until after James's death.²¹

It is rather late to thank you for your "Philosophical Essays", but you may soon see unmistakable evidence of the great interest I have taken in them, as I am writing an elaborate review—in three articles—for the *Whited Sepulchre*—which is what we call the Columbia "Journal of Philosophy, etc". You will not expect me to agree with you in everything, but, whatever you may think of my ideas, I always feel that yours, and Moore's too, make for the sort of reconstruction in philosophy which I should welcome. It is a great bond to dislike the same things, and dislike is perhaps a deeper indication of our real nature than explicit affections, since the latter may be effects of circumstances, while dislike is a reaction against them.²²

Like Russell (see the preface to *Philosophical Essays*, page vi), Santayana had great personal respect for William James, but little regard for pragmatism as a philosophy:

You may be quite right in thinking that I agree almost entirely with what James means: but I often hate what he says. If he gave up subjectivism, indeterminism, and ghosts there would be little in "pragmatism", as it would then stand, that I could object to.²³

In March 1909, Santayana was preparing for two lectures in July on "the religious situation in Catholic countries before the parsons that come to the summer school" by reading "Loisy, Tyrrell, Paul Sabatier (who is a Protestant, but a great friend of the 'Modernists') as well as the Pope's Encyclical 'Pascendi' and other documents."²⁴ About modernism itself, he wrote:

Quite apart from my lectures, which will have to be very superficial, the subject interests me in itself. I believe I have always been a "modernist"; only it never crossed my mind that such an attitude was compatible with being a practical Catholic, much less a priest. How can they be so blind?²⁵

²⁰ Santayana's review of Russell's *Philosophical Essays* was first published as a series of three articles in the *Journal of Philosophy, Psychology, and Scientific Methods*, whose editor was Harvard (1908) graduate Wendell T. Bush, a professor at Columbia University (2 January 1911 to Wendell T. Bush). Santayana's articles were published as "Russell's Philosophical Essays": I. "The Study of Essence" 8, no. 3 (2 February 1911), 57–63; II. "The Critique of Pragmatism" 8, no. 5 (2 March 1911), 113–24; and III. "Hypostatic Ethics" 8, no. 16 (3 August 1911), 421–32.

²¹ "William James," Chapter 3 in *COUS*, 64–96.

²² 15 January 1911 to Bertrand Arthur William Russell (*LGS*, 2:28).

²³ 5 February 1908 to Horace Meyer Kallen (*LGS*, 1:378).

²⁴ 18 March 1909 to Susan Sturgis de Sastre (*LGS*, 1:402); on 19 April 1909 he wrote that the lectures were to be delivered on July 8 and 9 (*LGS*, 1:404).

²⁵ 18 March 1909 to Susan Sturgis de Sastre (*LGS*, 1:402).

Santayana's essay on Shelley began as a lecture inspired by the discussions in a poetry club he hosted in 1910–11, "a group of young men who came on Wednesday afternoons to have a cup of tea and read Shelley aloud."²⁶

Before leaving for California in June, Santayana delivered the lecture on Shelley at least four times, at Bowdoin College, Columbia University, Bryn Mawr College, and Williams College.²⁷ He gave the final lecture on Shelley in October, "in Montreal—and probably for the last time, so that it would be as well, perhaps, to publish it. But where?"²⁸

Between November 1911 and March 1912, Santayana sent the manuscript for the Shelley essay to J. M. Dent, a publisher in London. On 20 March 1912 he first mentions the idea of putting it "in a book with some other articles," and then on 2 April 1912 he states that he hoped to "get out a book of essays, including the Shelley, in the autumn ... a volume which Dent is to publish in London."²⁹

In December 1910, Santayana had accepted an invitation to lecture for six weeks the following summer at the University of California, Berkeley. In a letter to his sister Susan, he said that the lectures "will be mere shortened versions of those I give here [at Harvard], and will involve no preparation";³⁰ however, the exact content of this lecture series is unknown.

After finishing the regular lecture series at Berkeley, Santayana moved to the University Club in San Francisco, where he delivered an additional lecture on Saturday, 26 August: "The Genteel Tradition in American Philosophy."³¹ Santayana's audience seems to have been unimpressed:

My lecture went off rather cheerlessly. They say Professor Rieber behind me on the platform was visibly distressed at my attempted witticisms. Several persons afterwards put their heads together and said it had been all

²⁶ 16 May 1911 to Susan Sturgis de Sastre (*LGS*, 2:37); see also *PP*, 175.

²⁷ 25 April [1911] to [Sara or Grace] Norton (*LGS*, 2:34); 29 April 1911 to Charles Augustus Strong (*LGS*, 2:35); 16 May 1911 to Susan Sturgis de Sastre (*LGS*, 2:37).

²⁸ The lecture in Montreal was possibly at McGill University, considering Santayana's remarks about being among "ultra-British Scotch-Canadians" (7 December 1911 to Susan Sturgis de Sastre [*LGS*, 2:63]; 20 October 1911 to Mary Potter Bush [*LGS*, 2:54]).

²⁹ 24 November 1911 to Mary Potter Bush (*LGS*, 2:60); 20 March 1912 to Susan Sturgis de Sastre (*LGS*, 2:81); 2 April 1912 to Mary Williams Winslow (*LGS*, 2:84).

³⁰ 23 December 1910 to Susan Sturgis de Sastre (*LGS*, 2:25).

³¹ The lecture was later published in the *University of California Chronicle* 13 (1911): 357–80 and in *Winds of Doctrine* as chapter 6 (*WD*, 125–43).

rhetoric, and that, if you stripped the rhetoric off, what you found was a plain Atheist.³²

Overall, Santayana's feelings about his trip to California were mixed: "I liked the Californian country, but the people I saw seemed cheap"; "In retrospect, my summer in California seems rather dismal; the people are too hopelessly commonplace and artificial."³³

The Summer School at Berkeley (now over) has not been very agreeable on the whole—the farce of it is too marked. But there have been pleasant moments, and San Francisco has a delighted climate (better than Berkeley) and the Bay is comparable to Naples or Constantinople. I also like the air of the people—except the academic set, which is worse than at Cambridge. The whole country from the Rockies west is fine and noble, and ought eventually to have a chastening influence on the inhabitants.³⁴

One bright spot for Santayana was the opportunity to see *The Green Knight*, a play written by Porter Garnett and presented by the Bohemian Club of San Francisco on 12 August 1911.³⁵ He later thanked Garnett "for the absolutely unmatched opportunities you have given me of seeing what is best in Californian life. I shall never forget the Grove, and The Green Knight."³⁶

Santayana's journey to California had begun around June 15th, passing first through Wisconsin to deliver lectures at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, as he had done the previous year.³⁷ Santayana departed California on 27 August 1911, "going by Santa Barbara, Los Angeles, the Grand Canyon, and Boston," stopping along the way in Chicago, which he had also visited the previous year.³⁸ He stayed in Cambridge until January 1912, leaving for England shortly before his mother died in February.³⁹

³² Charles Henry Rieber (Ph.D., 1900) was a former student of Santayana's whose wife, Winifred Smith Rieber, had previously painted oil sketches of Santayana (10 October 1908). Charles Rieber was at this time dean of the summer sessions at the University of California, Berkeley (20 August 1911 to Charles Augustus Strong; 27 August 1911 to Mary Potter Bush).

³³ 14 October 1911 to Sydney Allan Friede (*LGS*, 2:54); 13 September 1911 to Charles Augustus Strong (*LGS*, 2:52).

³⁴ 10 August 1911 to Charles Augustus Strong (*LGS*, 2:44)

³⁵ *The Green Knight: A Vision* (San Francisco: The Bohemian Club, 1911).

³⁶ 15 August 1911 to Porter Garnett (*LGS*, 2:46).

³⁷ 16 May 1911 to Susan Sturgis de Sastre (*LGS*, 2:37); 1 July 1911 to Horace Meyer Kallen (*LGS*, 2:42); 1 March 1910 to Susan Sturgis de Sastre (*LGS*, 2:7).

³⁸ 10 August 1911 to Charles Augustus Strong (*LGS*, 2:44); 22 August 1911 to Charles Augustus Strong (*LGS*, 2:47); 6 September 1911 to Henry James III (*LGS*, 2:50); 1 March 1910 to Susan Sturgis de Sastre (*LGS*, 2:7); 6 April 1910 to William Morton Payne (*LGS*, 2:11).

³⁹ 29 January 1912 and 6 February 1912 to Susan Sturgis de Sastre (*LGS*, 2:68–69).

By August 1912, Santayana had selected the title *Winds of Doctrine* for the new book and stated that “the California address” would be included; he had also finished revising the chapters on modernism, Bergson, and Russell.⁴⁰ On 3 September 1912, Santayana wrote to Strong,

I was giving the last touches to my book—at last in the publisher’s hands—on which I had been working terribly hard (for me)... I have been very happy, especially when I felt the book was getting on. It certainly has cost me very great pains, and now we shall see what people say of it.⁴¹

Santayana repeatedly mentions the difficulty of finishing the book, “by making a great effort (for I wasn’t very well)” and that it “was a terrible piece of work getting it off, and took me all summer.”⁴²

Santayana describes working on the Shelley, Bergson, and modernism essays as “revising and rearranging old stuff,” which “is harder than composing afresh from the beginning.”⁴³ By contrast, the first essay is mentioned only in August 1912, and the tone of the essay itself suggests it was written as an introductory chapter only after the decision in April 1912 on the contents of the book.⁴⁴

Santayana finished reading the first proofs for the whole book on 22 October and saw page proofs sometime in November, so that by 6 December it was said to be in press.⁴⁵

PUBLICATION HISTORY

Winds of Doctrine was first published by British publisher J. M. Dent & Sons, printed at The Temple Press, Letchworth. The Temple Press was set up by Joseph Malaby Dent in 1906 to produce books for The Everyman’s Library, envisioned as a series of inexpensive reprints of classics, but the press also produced other Dent books. Santayana had first worked with Dent in 1910 while writing the introduction to Dent’s edition of *Ethics and “De intellectus emendatione”* by Benedict de Spinoza (London: Dent, 1910), and he eventually also published *Egotism in German Philosophy* with Dent (1916). Although Santayana considered publishing

⁴⁰ 2 August 1912 to George Herbert Palmer (*LGS*, 2:93–94); 4 August 1912 to Charles Augustus Strong (*LGS*, 2:95–96).

⁴¹ 3 September 1912 to Charles Augustus Strong (*LGS*, 2:97).

⁴² 30 November 1912 to Elizabeth Stephens Fish Potter (*LGS*, 2:107); 6 December 1912 to Mary Williams Winslow (*LGS*, 2:111).

⁴³ 6 December 1912 to Mary Williams Winslow (*LGS*, 2:111).

⁴⁴ 4 August 1912 to Charles Augustus Strong (*LGS*, 2:96); 2 April 1912 to Mary Williams Winslow (*LGS*, 2:84).

⁴⁵ 22 October 1912 to Susan Sturgis de Sastre (*LGS*, 2:102); 8 November 1912 to Charles Augustus Strong (*LGS*, 2:103); 6 December 1912 to Mary Williams Winslow (*LGS*, 2:111); 10 December 1912 to Horace Meyer Kallen (*LGS*, 2:112).

other books with Dent—such as *Little Essays* and *Dominations and Powers*—*Winds* and *Egotism* remained the only ones.⁴⁶

In March 1913, Santayana stated that the “shape and size” of Dent’s edition were “not altogether agreeable,” but later (in 1917 and 1919) expressed his satisfaction with the binding and the form.⁴⁷

Dent arranged with Charles Scribner’s and Sons for an American edition using the same typesetting. Santayana wrote to Scribner’s that he had actually intended to let them publish *Winds of Doctrine*, but “circumstances made it impossible.”⁴⁸

Winds of Doctrine was generally well received, and Santayana wrote letters specifically responding to praise from Arthur Davison Ficke (Harvard class of 1904) and Oliver Wendell Holmes (Harvard class of 1861), who were regular correspondents. Upon hearing that *The Harvard Monthly* had devoted a special issue to *Winds of Doctrine*,⁴⁹ Santayana seemed humbled, though he was most gratified “to see that I have so many friends among the young wits at Harvard, that they read and talk over my books, and that some of them remember their old teacher with affection.”⁵⁰

In 1923, Joseph Dent asked Santayana to approve a new edition of *Winds of Doctrine* with an introduction, since Dent had exhausted its stock from the earlier printings.⁵¹ In reply, Santayana expressed his intent to revise parts of the book:

There are parts of that book that can stand, and have a permanent interest: others, especially the essay on Russell are already out of date. I should be glad to revise the whole, cutting out or condensing most of the Russell article and parts of the Bergson, thus reducing them to what I conceive to be their real importance: and to balance those omissions, I might add a chapter on Freud, and a few pages to the first essay, to carry the survey over the war. It would thus make a fair commentary on my own times, which might have a permanent interest.⁵²

⁴⁶ 5 July 1910 to Charles Augustus Strong (*LGS*, 2:14); 27 June 1950 to Ira Detrich Cardiff (*LGS*, 8:266); 9 March 1919 to Logan Pearsall Smith (*LGS*, 2:342); 19 September 1919 to Joseph Malaby Dent.

⁴⁷ 6 March 1913 to Charles Augustus Strong; 8 July 1917 to Logan Pearsall Smith (*LGS*, 2:278); 9 March 1919 to Logan Pearsall Smith (*LGS*, 2:342).

⁴⁸ 16 March 1913 to Charles Scribner’s Sons (*LGS*, 2:125).

⁴⁹ Cyril B. Harris, ed., *The Harvard Monthly* 56, no. 2 (April 1913).

⁵⁰ 18 July 1913 to Arthur Davison Ficke (*LGS*, 2:136); 21 January 1914 to Oliver Wendell Holmes (*LGS*, 2:166); 22 April 1913 to Scofield Thayer (*LGS*, 2:130-31).

⁵¹ 5 February 1923 letter from Joseph Malaby Dent to George Santayana (unpublished letter in folder 4310, J. M. Dent & Sons Records #11043, Rare Book Collection, Louis Round Wilson Special Collections Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill).

⁵² 12 February 1923 to Joseph Malaby Dent (*LGS*, 3:126).

However, in the same letter, Santayana asked to postpone a new edition for “a year or two” while he worked on his “system of philosophy” (*Scepticism and Animal Faith, Realms of Being*). Finally, in 1926, after Joseph Dent’s death, his son Hugh Dent issued a so-called second edition with a new preface but no revisions. Possibly because of the good reception for *Winds of Doctrine*, Santayana also considered the possibility of publishing a “New Winds of Doctrine,” but nothing ever came of it.⁵³

EDITIONS AND IMPRESSIONS

The first printing features the Dent logo embossed on the front cover and “J·M·DENT & SONS·LD” on the bottom of the spine. Other copies examined by the Editors show “Scribner’s” on the spine, including those listing Dent on the first line of the title page. The title page in all the copies examined includes red printing for the main title, “Winds of Doctrine”, and for the first listed publisher’s imprint. In the case where only one publisher’s imprint is shown, it is in red.

The title pages for printings of the first edition variously credit Dent, Scribner’s, or both (one listed below the other, with the first in red ink). All of the first impression title pages bear both Dent and Scribner’s imprints with either listed first, whereas later impressions may bear either or both. The first impression, first printing, is marked “First Printed in 1913”; the second impression is marked “First Edition January 1913 / Reprinted July 1913”; the third impression is marked “First Edition February 1913 / Reprinted July 1913, / September 1913”; the fourth impression is marked “First Edition February 1913 / Reprinted July 1913; / September 1913; / November 1914”.

The first state of the text has a plain-text insignia for the press, “The Temple Press, Printers, Letchworth”, on the final page, whereas in 1926 the insignia is a reproduction of an engraved graphic logo.

The 1926 printing is marked “First Edition 1913 / Reprinted 1913 (twice), 1914 / 1926”. The copies of this printing examined by the Editors each show only one publisher’s imprint, and the copyright page for each shows “Printed in Great Britain.” Due to the addition of the preface, the signature marks shift, starting with this impression.

The 1926 impression included a new preface but no revisions, and thus was not a true second edition.⁵⁴ The actual second edition of the contents was reset

⁵³ 16 May 1926 to Charles Augustus Strong (*LGS*, 3:278); 1 August 1926 to Otto Kyllmann (*LGS*, 3:285); 11 August 1926 to Charles Augustus Strong (*LGS*, 3:287).

⁵⁴ 1 August 1926 to Otto Kyllmann (*LGS*, 3:285); 16 May 1926 to Charles Augustus Strong (*LGS*, 3:278).

and published by Scribner's in two separate volumes of their Triton Edition, the Shelley essay in volume II (1936) and the rest in volume VII (1937).

The 1940 printing has a new copyright page with "Made in Great Britain at The Temple Press Letchworth", both publisher's imprints, then "First Published 1913 / Reprinted four times / New Edition 1940". The insignia for The Temple Press is not found at the end of this printing, although the signature marks are the same as in the 1926 impression.

The different press runs for the first edition can be distinguished by certain anomalies in printing, such as diminished periods or commas, as well as broken or obscured type at the ends of lines. These variations in print quality are not noted in the list of variants.

Although the book was typeset and first published by Dent using The Temple Press, only the Scribner's manufacturing records are extant. The Scribner's manufacturing records show 2,115 copies of the first impression printed and bound, with 1,865 in the first two years (February 1913 through December 1914) and an additional 250 after the end of the war (October 1919 to November 1921). For the 1926 impression, 1,040 were ordered initially and an additional 1,050 were produced over the following thirteen years, for a total of 4,205 copies of the American edition issued during Santayana's lifetime. The American edition has official publication dates of 29 March 1913 and 15 October 1926, with print runs up until 1949 and the last bound volumes sent out on April 20. The production numbers for the Scribner's press and bindery correspond except for one anomalous binding order in 1931 for 71 books, possibly using pages already prepared in Great Britain and sent to Scribner's to be bound for an American issue.

SUBSEQUENT AUTHORIAL INTENTIONS

Santayana expressed interest in revising *Winds of Doctrine*, but never authorized major revisions. He also told correspondents such as Logan Pearsall Smith and Otto Kyllmann that he was considering compiling another anthology of essays which he tentatively called *New Winds of Doctrine*, but ultimately he turned away from this idea to concentrate on other books.

During Santayana's lifetime, parts of *Winds of Doctrine* were translated into Italian, but there is no evidence that Santayana was involved in this work or reviewed the translation.⁵⁵ Excerpts from *Winds of Doctrine* were also included in

⁵⁵ Chapters I, III, IV, and VI were included in *Il pensiero americano e altri saggi*, trans. Carlo Coardi (Milan: Valentino Bompiani, 1939), 9–36; 193–248; 251–99; 64–96. See 25 March 1941 letter to Daniel Cory (*LGS*, 7:23).

an anthology prepared by Ira Cardiff, but Santayana was not directly involved in the selection or editing.⁵⁶

HISTORICAL COLLATION

At least two independent sight collations were completed for all distinct typesettings of the text. One set of collations was performed by a team of readers including an assistant editor and staff, and the second set by the textual editor and assistants reading both as a team and individually. The combination of team and individual sight collations provides a valuable safeguard against oversights possible in collations confined to a single method.

In the process of obtaining copies for collations, the Editors examined the following physical copies: Scribner's/Dent January 1913, Dent/Scribner's January 1913, Dent/Scribner's July 1913, Dent/Scribner's September 1913, Dent/Scribner's November 1914, Scribner's 1926, and Dent/Scribner's 1940.

Also, the Editors examined Logan Pearsall Smith's copy of a Dent/Scribner's 1913 first impression, which he had sent to Santayana with sections marked to extract for *Little Essays*. Santayana then marked it up further and cut out the pages which were later used to construct a manuscript for setting copy for *Little Essays*; these items are held at Georgetown University.

The Editors examined scans of a first impression, first printing marked Dent/Scribner's; a first impression, first printing marked Scribner's/Dent; a September 1913 Dent/Scribner's impression; two November 1914 Dent/Scribner's impressions; a Dent 1926 impression; a Scribner's 1926 impression; and a Dent/Scribner's 1940 impression.

Sight collations for *Winds of Doctrine* included reading the standard for collation⁵⁷ (first edition, first issue, Dent/Scribner's 1913) against the second Scribner's edition, included in the Triton edition, volumes II and VII (1936/1937); the discarded portion (*GSC_D*) of the 1913 impression used for compiling *Little Essays: Drawn from the Writings of George Santayana*; the portion of the 1913 impression that was used to create setting copy for *Little Essays* (*GSC_{LE}*); and the printed edition of *Little Essays* (*LE*).

Because two of the essays in this volume ("The Philosophy of Mr. Bertrand Russell," chapter IV, and "The Genteel Tradition in American Philosophy," chap-

⁵⁶Ira D. Cardiff, ed., *Atoms of Thought: An Anthology of Thoughts From George Santayana* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1950).

⁵⁷The terms "standard for collation" and "collation standard" are merely methodological designations and have no authorial significance. They refer to the earliest form of the text that can easily be read against all other forms of the text during the collation process. The text designated as the standard for collation may very well become the copy-text, but that determination cannot be made until collations are complete.

ter VI) were previously published, scans of the earlier publications were compared to the standard for collation.

The sigla for this volume do not differentiate between the successive editions and impressions labeled Dent, Scribner's, Dent/Scribner's, and Scribner's/Dent. Evidence indicates that the American (Scribner's) printings were simultaneous re-issues of the British (Dent) printings. In his letters, Santayana consistently referred to Dent as owning the copyright to the contents of *Winds of Doctrine*, and referred correspondents to Dent on inquiries regarding reprints.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CRITICAL TEXT FOR *WINDS OF DOCTRINE*

CHOICE OF COPY-TEXT

The earliest surviving form of *Winds of Doctrine* in its entirety is the first edition, first issue; neither holograph manuscript nor stages of presswork have been located for the texts.

Two of the chapters, chapter IV and chapter VI, were previously published. However, based on the composition history, all of the variants noted between the earlier publications and *Winds of Doctrine* are considered to be authorial revisions in order to prepare scholarly articles for mass-market book publication.

Santayana's correspondence indicates that he was revising the entire book up to the time he sent manuscript to the press, and then he later reviewed initial proofs and page proofs. Therefore, the copy-text for the work as a whole is the first state of the first printed edition, lacking extant setting copy or marked-up page proofs.

EMENDATION POLICY: DETERMINATIONS INVOLVING POST-COPY-TEXT READINGS

Only five emendations have been made to the copy-text, all of which first appeared in the July 1913 impression and were preserved in subsequent versions of the text.

The copy-text (*A*) serves as the authority for the vast majority of words and punctuation. The later impressions, re-issues, and the second edition (*B*¹⁹³⁶ and *B*¹⁹³⁷) of *Winds of Doctrine* have no independent authority, but represent potential sources of emendation by virtue of the successive states of textual variation that these published forms contain.

However, for the Triton Edition, the type was completely reset and the format was changed. There is no evidence of Santayana's direct involvement in creating the setting copy or in checking page proofs; and the only significant

variants, aside from the corrections initially introduced in the July 1913 impression, are three compositor errors.

The author's holograph revisions across Logan Pearsall Smith's disassembled copy (*GSC_D* and *GSC_{LE}*), which are mingled with Smith's marks, represent a subsequent and distinct authorial intention—the *Little Essays* project of 1920.

The editors take a conservative approach in editing the copy-text: a reading adopted from any source other than the copy-text is justified only by the certainty or great likelihood that it is a revision by Santayana. Obvious grammatical and spelling errors (those that fall outside of Santayana's known idiosyncratic preferences) and compositorial errors are also corrected by emendation. The text of the critical edition adheres to the copy-text accidentals except where there is compelling evidence to justify emendation. Substantives are emended when a corresponding reading in another version of the text reflects Santayana's clear intention or, in those instances where the copy-text is a published form (book or article), when the editors judge that in the process of printing and publishing the work an unauthorial alteration (for example, a misprint) occurred. Santayana's occasional misquotations within the text are not corrected, however; to do so would risk obscuring some particular significance that these misquotations might have in the text (all quotations are correctly rendered, or variants are described, in the present volume's "Notes to the Text"). The sigla used in the emendations list identify the source text of the emended reading; an emendation originating with the editors of the present edition is identified by the siglum *CE* (critical edition). All emendations in the copy-text, both in substantives and in accidentals, are recorded in the "List of Emendations" in the "Editorial Appendix."

Discussions of Adopted Readings

Below are the substantive variants discovered through collation with pre-copy-text forms. Because Santayana worked diligently to prepare all of the essays in *Winds of Doctrine* for book publication, these changes are considered to be authorial. They are presented here because of their potential scholarly interest.

DENT JANUARY 1913 v. *JOURNAL OF PHILOSOPHY*, 2 MARCH 1911 ("THE CRITIQUE OF PRAGMATISM") – SUBSTANTIVE VARIANTS

- 82 [*not present*] many emotional impulses...almost every quarter [¶] It is not... altogether final. *RPE*₂ (114.6–35)
- 84 [*not present*] the habit...misunderstood my intention." *RPE*₂ (116.25–33)
- 84 [*not present*] This may be...our own knowledge. *RPE*₂ (116.37–43)
- 86 [*not present*] Rather than admit...reacting upon. *RPE*₂ (118.28–31)

DENT JANUARY 1913 v. *JOURNAL OF PHILOSOPHY*, 3 AUGUST 1911 ("HYPOSTATIC ETHICS") – SUBSTANTIVE VARIANTS

- 94n.16–18 vital. Plato attributes a single vital direction and a single moral source to the cosmos. This is what determines and narrows that scope of the true good; for the true good is that relevant to nature. Plato] vital. The narrowly determinate scope of the good recognized by Plato is a consequence of a single vital direction and of the single moral source attributed by him to the cosmos. Plato *RPE*₃ (432.45–433.43)
- 97 [*not present*] Another appeal to the...is in serious danger of stultifying it. *RPE*₃ (427.3–428.13)
- 98.4 locus in which] locus, or the "organic unity," in which *RPE*₃ (428.31)
- 98.7 compared save as] compared, nor organic unities determined, save as *RPE*₃ (428.34–35)
- 98.23 suppress the tragic good called ferocity,] address the "organic unity" called ferocity, *RPE*₃ (429.7–8)
- 101.29–30 personal life. [*not present*]. What] personal life. It is also...For this relief much thanks. What *RPE*₃ (432.3–7)

**DENT JANUARY 1913 v. UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA CHRONICLE,
OCTOBER 1911 – SUBSTANTIVE VARIANTS**

- 129.30 save a new emphasis] save a selection or a new emphasis *GT*
(362.34–35)
- 134.27–28 The winds and clouds come to minister to the solitary ego.] [*not present*] *GT* (369)
- 137.29 passionately hungry] emotionally hungry *GT* (373.1)
- 138.33–34 more materialistic the pragmatist's theory] more materialistically we
interpret the pragmatist theory *GT* (374.16–17)
- 138.34 of the mind] of what the mind *GT* (374.17)
- 138.35 his theory] our theory *GT* (374.18)
- 142.6 was making.] was putting up. *GT* (378.28–29)
- 142.22–23 been pre-established. Much less can you feel it when she destroys your
labour of years in a momentary spasm. You] been preëstablished. You *GT*
(379.7)
- 142.33 the relativity] the finitude *GT* (379.19)
- 143.6 are which] are from which *GT* (379.33–34)
- 143.18 itself that] itself, your tyrant from the cradle to the grave, that *GT*
(380.12–13)

List of Emendations

This list records all changes made in the copy-text by the present editors. Critical edition readings are listed to the left of the lemma bracket; to the right of the bracket is the first appearance of the emended reading, followed by a semicolon; then the rejected copy-text reading and its symbol, as well as intermediate variant readings when they exist. See “List of Variants” for all post-copy-text variants (page 331). For discussion of emendations marked with an asterisk (*), see “Discussions of Adopted Readings” (page 325). The tilde (~) stands for the word or words cited to the left of the lemma bracket and indicates that a punctuation mark is emended. The caret (^) indicates the absence of a punctuation mark. (See page 149 for “Editorial Sigla and Symbols.”)

42.6 agorophobia] *A*¹⁹¹³ (July 1913); agorophobia *A*

46.37 combination] *A*¹⁹¹³ (July 1913); combination *A*

52.29 its] *A*¹⁹¹³ (July 1913); it *A*

74.3 made up for by] *A*¹⁹¹³ (July 1913); made up by *A*

113.8 worldling] *A*¹⁹¹³ (July 1913); worlding *A*

Report of Line-End Hyphenation

I. COPY-TEXT LIST

The following are the editorially established forms of possible compounds which were hyphenated at the ends of lines in the copy-text.

4.12–13 all-permeating	65.10 self-reversing
10.12 counter-current	66n3.1 non-existence
11.36 unpatented	68.29 devitalises
13.16 non-human	86.35 self-consciousness
15.31 freehold	92.5 self-denial
23.35 prison-walls	96.30 self-criticism
25.22 blamelessness	131.36 undismayed
27.2 deep-rooted	136.16 nineteenth
32.9 well-fed	141.6 dislodged
34.11 bridegroom	141.9 insidious
36.9 old-fashioned	141.26 disproved
37.18–19 double-minded	142.22 pre-established
39.9 undercurrent	
40.21 stepping-stone	
44.17 workmanship	
48.16 inorganic	
49.23–24 generalship	
52.39–53.1 stumbling-point	
62.17 outgrown	
64.26 immovable	

II. CRITICAL EDITION LIST

In quotations from the present critical edition, no line-end hyphens are to be retained except the following:

4.12-13 all-permeating

37.18-19 double-minded

51.35-36 day-dream

52.6-7 self-congruous

52.39-53.1 stumbling-point

78.6-7 second-best

111.26-27 angel-like

114.34-35 ill-will

132.7-8 world-builder

142.28-29 non-human

List of Variants

This list is a historical record of the variants in the authorized forms of *Winds of Doctrine*. Copy-text readings are listed to the left of the lemma bracket, along with the page and line numbers of the corresponding text in the critical edition; variant readings are listed to the right. The tilde (~) stands in for words to the left of the lemma bracket that are omitted from the collated text and the caret (^) stands in for the absence of a punctuation mark. (See page 149 for “Editorial Sigla and Symbols.”)

42.6 agorophobia] agorophobia *A*¹⁹¹³⁻¹⁹¹⁴ *A*¹⁹²⁶ *A*¹⁹⁴⁰ *B*¹⁹³⁶

46.37 combination] combination *A*¹⁹¹³⁻¹⁹¹⁴ *A*¹⁹²⁶ *A*¹⁹⁴⁰ *B*¹⁹³⁶

52.29 it] its *A*¹⁹¹³⁻¹⁹¹⁴ *A*¹⁹²⁶ *A*¹⁹⁴⁰ *B*¹⁹³⁶

74.3 made up ~ by] made up for by *A*¹⁹¹³⁻¹⁹¹⁴ *A*¹⁹²⁶ *A*¹⁹⁴⁰ *B*¹⁹³⁶

113.8 worlding] worldling *A*¹⁹¹³⁻¹⁹¹⁴ *A*¹⁹²⁶ *A*¹⁹⁴⁰ *B*¹⁹³⁷



This publication has been supported by the National Endowment for the Humanities, a federal agency which supports the study of such fields as history, philosophy, literature, and languages.

In honor of James Gouinlock, additional funds for the publication of *Winds of Doctrine* have been provided by Frederick and Nancy Marcus.

Winds of Doctrine was first published in 1913 by Charles Scribner's Sons.

© 2023 Massachusetts Institute of Technology

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form by any electronic or mechanical means (including photocopying, recording, or information storage and retrieval) without permission in writing from the publisher. The Association of American University Presses' Resolution on Permissions constitutes the only exception to this prohibition.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Santayana, George, 1863-1952, author. | Spiech, David E., editor. | Coleman, Martin A., editor. | Weiss, Faedra Lazar, editor.

Title: *Winds of doctrine : studies in contemporary opinion* / by George Santayana ; edited by David E. Spiech, Martin A. Coleman, and Faedra Lazar Weiss with an introduction by Paul Forster.

Description: Critical edition. | Cambridge, Massachusetts : The MIT Press, [2023] | Series: The works of George Santayana; volume IX | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2023000210 (print) | LCCN 2023000211 (ebook) | ISBN 9780262048675 | ISBN 9780262377331 (epub) | ISBN 9780262377324 (pdf)

Subjects: LCSH: Philosophy, Modern. | Spiritual life.

Classification: LCC B945.S23 W7 2023 (print) | LCC B945.S23 (ebook) | DDC 111/.85--dc23/eng/20230328

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2023000210>

LC ebook record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2023000211>

Manufactured in the United States of America

The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Sciences—Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials. ANSI Z39.48 1984. ∞™