

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA

ARTICLE I.

CONTENTS OF THE CONSCIOUSNESS OF JESUS.*

BY PROFESSOR DAVID FOSTER ESTES, D.D.,

HAMILTON, N. Y.

It is hardly necessary to argue that Jesus of Nazareth was actually human. Since "it behoved him in all things to be made like unto his brethren," he lived his life on earth as being one of the sons of men, that he might indeed be the Son of Man. As we review his story, what that belongs to human life can we find to have been lacking? Born a babe and wrapped in the swaddling clothes common at the time, growing in size and knowledge like other boys, an obedient son in the Nazareth home, hungry with abstinence, wearied with toil till he sleeps amid the dangers of the storm, wounded with the lash, the thorn, and the nail, questioning, surprised, grieved, indignant, tempted, prayerful, submissive after intense spiritual struggle, Nazarene carpenter, Galilean field-preacher, prophet, reformer, friend, soul-physician, Messiah and Master only to the little circle of those who knew him intimately,—from the manger cradle to the rock-hewn tomb no one, so far as the records show, ever failed in any way to recognize his real and full humanity, no one, so far as we have any right to suppose, ever thought of him or spoke of him as other than a man.

Yet, when we consider further, we find that the claims of

* Copyright, 1917, D. F. Estes.

Vol. LXXIV. No. 295. 1

Jesus, by their necessary implications, outrun and far transcend what would be possible for any other man. Over against the divine law of the past, no jot or tittle of which he declares shall fail, he sets himself not as an authorized expounder merely, but rather as an authoritative lawgiver, supplementing, completing, correcting with an "I say unto you." Some other claims which he made have been summarized with much effectiveness by Denney thus: "Earlier messengers of God to Israel were only servants; he is the Son, only and well beloved. . . . Other men are stricken with disease; He is the physician who has come to heal. Other men have consciences laden with guilt; He is the sacrifice whose blood is to be shed for the remission of sins. The lives of other men are forfeited; His is the one free life which is to be given as a ransom for them."¹ Thus he sets himself as the needed and efficient Saviour on the one hand, on the other he demands the supreme devotion of every soul. On the acceptance or rejection of him hang the issues of life or death; the loss of all else on earth is to be gladly accepted "for my sake"; "Happy are you when they reproach you, and persecute you, and say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake"; the tenderest relations of life as well as its choicest treasures are to be sacrificed, if need be, "for my sake." In short, though if he were only human, as he certainly is really human, then "to demand that all the world should bow down to him would be worthy of scorn like that we feel for some straw-crowned monarch of Bedlam," he yet makes himself the rightful center of all men's thought and sentiment, makes relation to himself parallel to relation to the Father. He is the bond of the saved, the kingdom is his kingdom, the church is his church. He

¹ *Studies in Religion*, p. 40. He adds: "At the present time there are few elements in the self-consciousness of Jesus which have less justice done them than this."

is the bridegroom, the master of the house. He even sets himself as the final judge and the universal arbiter of the destinies of the race and its every member.

All these claims we find recorded in the Synoptic Gospels, with their established early date and their demonstrated historical accuracy. If the claims recorded in the Fourth Gospel are here kept distinct, it is not because of any distrust of the accuracy of this report, but rather to emphasize the essential harmony of the reports of John and the other evangelists. That Jesus is the good shepherd who gives his life for the sheep is scarcely, if at all, stronger than that he is the ransom for many. When Jesus calls himself the Bread, the Door, the Vine, or when he proclaims himself the source of life and promises that he who believes on him uplifted as was the serpent may have life, and that he who eats his flesh and drinks his blood insures eternal life and shall share the resurrection of joy and glory, and, in a word, declares himself the resurrection and the life,—these claims, though different from those already noticed, are not really greater. In John alone, however, come out clearly the affirmation of his preëxistence, “Before Abraham was, I am,” the mention of the glory which was his before the creation, and the assertions that he came forth from God and came down from heaven. Finally is to be noted the affirmation of his unity with God, “I and the Father are one.” While it might be exegetically possible to limit the direct force of these words to a merely “dynamic fellowship,”¹ yet if the thought of Jesus had been limited to that, so that there was no basis for the charge of the Jews that “he being man made Himself God,” why did he not, horror-stricken, at once repel the charge? Godet has well said: “The minister

¹ As Meyer does.

of state who allows himself some day to say, 'The king and I, we,' provokes the laughter of the whole Parliament. What would the creature deserve who should dare to say, 'I and God, we—?'" But though the claims just quoted appear at first glance plainer and more definite than those to be found in the other Gospels, it should be carefully noted that, according to Synoptic report, early in his ministry Jesus in the face of a charge of blasphemy, without entering on any discussion of his nature and rights, yet assumed to exercise the divine prerogative of the forgiveness of sins. Finally, the puzzling and yet, when answered, profoundly instructive question which at the very end of his ministry Jesus left ringing in the ears of the Pharisees, involves in its complete answer the full divinity of David's Son, and it is naturally reasonable to hold that Jesus recognized the implication and asked the question because he intended to teach the fact.

Such, then, were the claims of Jesus, though clearer and more definite as recorded in the Ephesian Gospel, yet appearing with no less force by necessary implication in the Gospels which embody and are controlled by the earliest Galilean traditions. Some may feel, as Wellhausen is reported to have said, that the treatment of the subject of the consciousness of Jesus has been much overdone of late. The more thoughtful may not be ready to say, as has lately been said, that our estimate of Jesus cannot be higher than his own consciousness of himself; but certainly we ought not to have, dare not have, a lower estimate of him than was his own thought of himself. And so we find ourselves forced to climb, step by step, the long ladder of his claims till they bring our thought to the very plane of the Divine, till we say that in some sense, in some way which possibly we may not explain or understand while

yet we must assert the fact, this man of Nazareth knew himself to be peculiarly, uniquely, actually God as well as man.

Two attempts have been made to set aside the claims of Jesus and their significance which perhaps require discussion. Some would do it by disputing the trustworthiness of the Gospel records. But research and criticism are steadily confirming rather than undermining the value of these records. Alike for John and the Synoptics scholars have found dates later than the first century to be out of the question, and the study of the possible forms of the material which lies behind our present evangelic documents only seems to carry the records nearer the events, so near in fact that myth, legend, or variation through oral transmission are, if not absolutely excluded, at any rate reduced to a minimum negligible for our present purpose. We must admit, why use the word? we must assert that Jesus actually made the claims which have been enumerated.

So some have recognized the fact of his claims and have gone on to class him as an extravagant and fanatical visionary.¹ Under the influence of misapplied psychological theories the vague suggestions of Renan and Strauss have been sharpened into an affirmative answer to the question which Otto Holtzmann made the title of a pamphlet, "War Jesus Ekstatiker?" An excellent answer has been made by the German Licentiat Steinbeck to these thus far exclusively German slanders. He enumerates the many traits of Jesus' behavior and work which are inconsistent with such a view,—his humility, his devotion to the service of the needy, his clearness of thought and speech, his reticence as to his miracles and his claims,—and ends with the assertion: "If such a man at once and in the same breath with expressions of his meekness

¹The exact word most often used is *Schwärmeret*.

and humility sets himself on a superhuman elevation for the specific character of which there was absolutely no occasion in the ideas of the time but rather the contrary,— if he makes such claims with no trace of passionate demand for recognition, without ever appealing to any proofs of any sort, acting quite as if they were a matter of course, should there be in such a case any talk of visionary extravagance, then all rational psychology is at an end.”¹

What has just been quoted might be regarded as not only a fair but a sufficient answer to the charge of hysterical extravagance; but a few additional sentences of Steinbeck's have a bearing so much broader than the point to which they directly relate, that it may be worth while to add them here: “There is a presumption against this charge of fanaticism, because in view of the indescribable blessing which Jesus and his work have brought to the world and are still bringing, it is a piece of folly scarcely to be comprehended that one should stamp the author of this blessing as a hysterical fanatic. On this supposition the religious and moral regeneration which men and nations have experienced by the might of this personality and which they are continually experiencing, becomes an insoluble puzzle. That many lack this experience is no proof against its reality in the case of others who feel their consciences stirred to their depths through him and yet at the same time reconciled with God.”²

¹ *Das göttliche Selbstbewusstsein Jesu*, p. 45.

² When the writer first read these words, he was most forcibly reminded of the still profounder words of the Apostle who had to meet in his day just such gainsayings: “No one speaking in the Spirit of God says Jesus is anathema and no one can say Jesus is Lord, but in the Holy Spirit.” Is there not too often failure to give due weight to the fact that the taproot of skepticism in regard to Christ is sin, and that the only thoroughgoing cure is an intelligent spiritual experience under the power of the Holy Ghost?

To return to the direct course of our discussion, we find that we may safely neglect the attempts to set aside the claims of Jesus, on the ground either of lack of historical evidence that they were actually made or of fanaticism on the part of the maker. On the other hand, we find the claims confirmed by the mighty fact of the resurrection and by the concordant faith of apostles, evangelists, martyrs, theologians, saints, the acceptance of the claims and its consequences in every age freshly verifying and fortifying them to our faith.

We may then well hold to the truth that Jesus was both really and fully human and at the same time no less really and fully divine, that he was deity incarnate. We may also confidently assert that Jesus was himself positively assured of this great fact. But the question has not yet been raised, How did he reach this assurance? How did Jesus know the depths of his own nature? To this question, perhaps seldom formally raised, the spontaneous answer of most Christian believers and, for that matter, the reasoned reply of most theologians, would be that this was to him a fact of consciousness. They would almost certainly accept the saying of La Touche, "The character of our Lord's self-consciousness is the vital fact."¹ The purpose of this discussion is to inquire whether it was necessarily by a direct verdict of his consciousness that Jesus reached the assured confidence as to his own deity which he displayed.

Perhaps it should be remarked, in order to obviate a possible misunderstanding, that while a broader use of the word "consciousness" is common, and therefore fully legitimate, in some cases preferable, yet in this discussion consciousness will be regularly used in the narrower sense, which is no less authorized and in which it is the word which will usually best

¹ *Person of Christ in Modern Thought*, p. 231.

express the idea under consideration. Consciousness will then be freely used in the sense in which Hamilton used self-consciousness, as "the power by which we apprehend the phenomena of the internal."¹ Into psychological and epistemological discussions there is no need to enter. Whether we directly read what is in the soul or not, others may debate. Whether we can really know anything at all, thus or otherwise, others may debate. For practical purposes all may agree that certain notions are formed in a way that seems to us a direct vision of our inward selves, while other notions come by observation of what does not seem to lie within the mind itself, or by reasoning on the fruits of consciousness and perception and by drawing inferences which are logically justifiable and practically reliable. Our question is then, When Jesus claimed the place of God, did he do it because his self-consciousness gave him a direct report that such he was, or did he reach this conclusion and gain his assurance by some other means and in some other way? Was his assurance to be called a consciousness of self or a conviction as to self?

Lest any one may be questioning whither the current of this discussion may lead those who follow it, it may perhaps be well to say in advance that the writer's answer to this question has never led him to hold lightly what he regards as the fundamental and fountal Christian truth, the Incarnation, and

¹ Baldwin's Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology states that "in reflective consciousness the self is not only subject — the subject self — but it is also object of its own reflection — object self." But under consciousness it is also stated that "in the earlier English psychologists the word signifies the mind's direct cognizance of its own states and processes." Accordingly this simplest expression will, as has been said, be freely used in this discussion, always intelligibly it is to be hoped, and in some cases more simply than the perhaps less ambiguous word "self-consciousness" or the phrase "the reflective consciousness."

that there is on his part no intent or willingness to lessen the significance and certainty of this truth in any mind. But is it not true that many who hold this truth of the deity of Christ hold it in a partial and one-sided way? As an intellectual animal man always finds it hard to stand square. He usually leans too hard on one of two complementary truths. Though both should be equally honored, "either he will hate the one and love the other, or he will hold to one and despise the other." Now many who believe that in Jesus the Word became flesh and that thus he was divine as well as human, are so overwhelmed by the thought of deity that they give little or no practical value to the thought that he was and is our brother man. In their minds the deity so completely absorbs the humanity even in regard to the thirty years of Judean life, the infinite so swallows up the finite, that only it is really apprehended.¹ But while it is to be recognized, as Forsyth reminds us, that "there is something presumptuous in certain kenotic efforts to body forth just what the Son must have gone through in such an experience,"² yet over against this may be set the other truth which Gore states thus: "If Scripture represents the divine intention, then we should conclude that it is the divine intention that we should meditate on the reality of the

¹For example, a colleague has assured the writer that in his boyhood all the talk about the temptation of Christ or his prayerfulness or that he is our example seemed to him wholly unreal. An eminent preacher (I. M. Haldeman, D.D., in "Could our Lord have sinned?" p. 8) positively denies that in his temptation Jesus was an example to us, and even goes so far as to deny in set terms that he possessed free will. This illustrates the fact that many popularly repeat to-day the mistake which Dorner charged on the later Greek thinkers, namely, that they "laid great stress on the distinction between the natures, but did not bestow equal care on showing how they could be united in one person."

²Person and Place of Jesus Christ, p. 320.

self-humiliation of the Son which is revealed to us and pressed upon our notice," and his further suggestion that "The real recognition of the suggestions of Scripture about our Lord's human state will give to the Church's teaching a great enrichment."¹

We may well take into consideration, further, that if we find that the Lord's assurance of his own deity was gained in some other way than from his own reflective consciousness, we yet do not thereby rob this assurance of any of its validity or value. Ultimately all assurance of the human mind rests on one and the same premise, which is that our faculties in their normal working are trustworthy and that we may confidently act accordingly. Now, all things considered, the verdicts of consciousness are not the things of which we are surest. Mathematical processes, though of course consciously carried on, are not a matter of consciousness. We are as sure of the affection of mother or wife as of ours toward them. It has been the experience of many a soul to cry with John Newton,

" 'Tis a point I long to know,
Oft it causes anxious thought,
Do I love the Lord or no?
Am I his, or am I not?"

But the same soul would sing with all the confident assurance of Gerhardt,

" Jesus, thy boundless love to me
No thought can reach, no tongue declare."

It follows, then, that even though not a verdict of consciousness, but a conviction arrived at in some other way, the assurance of Jesus as to his own deity may have been equally certain and equally valid.

¹ *Dissertations*, p. 98.

The assumption that Jesus could not really be divine unless he was consciously so is an assumption out of harmony with the facts and phenomena of the human nature which was his. To be assured of this, we have but to remember what a rôle has of late been played by the so-called "subliminal" on the stage of psychological science, or we have but to bethink ourselves how much there has been and is in relation to us of which consciousness has given and can give no report.¹ Nor does this find complete explanation in the alternations of consciousness and non-consciousness, of recollection and of failure of memory, with which also we are all familiar. In a striking passage Edwin Arnold speaks of observing at the South Kensington Museum "a graceful English girl lost in momentary interest over the showcase containing the precise ingredients of her fair and perfect frame." After discussing the relation of the body to its chemical elements, he goes on thus: "But if . . . science had dared to speak to her of the deeper secrets in Nature which she herself embodied and enshrined — without the slightest consciousness and comprehension on her part — how far more wonderful the mystery of the chemistry of her life would have appeared! Some very grave and venerable F.R.S. might, perchance, have ventured reverently to whisper: 'Beautiful human sister! built of the water, the flint, and the lime; you are much more marvellous than all that! Your sacred simplicity does not and must not yet understand your

¹ This was, nearly forty years ago, the starting point of the thinking the results of which are embodied in this paper. It began something like this: "We are all always conscious of only a small part of what we are. Nine-tenths of us never comes into the field of consciousness at all. The Incarnation must have taken place in these profound and most intensely real parts of our nature; and as the consciousness of the man Jesus would have been unaffected by great facts below consciousness, so his life could be lived in a naturally human way."

celestial complexity! Otherwise you should be aware that, hidden within the gracious house made of these common materials — softly and silently developed there by forces which you know not, and yet govern, unwittingly exercising a perpetual physiological magic — are tiny golden beginnings of your sons and daughters to be.”¹ Enough has been quoted to suggest the existence of rich stores deep hidden in human nature far below the illumination of what often seems scarcely more than the flickering candle of consciousness which barely touches with its gleam the treasures of physical, intellectual, æsthetic, spiritual powers which we may, yes, must possess. How unconscious was the girl of Arnold’s parable of the jewels of emotion, feeling, affection related to the sex life of which he reminds us, jewels as chastely pure as pearls, so full of the heart’s passion that they glow beyond rubies!

The contention that consciousness is no decisive measure of nature is confirmed by weighty words from Professor Bateson in his Presidential Address before the British Association for the Advancement of Science held at Melbourne in 1914. In presenting his views as to evolution in general, and inhibition in particular, he said: “Shakespeare once existed as a speck of protoplasm, not so big as a small pin’s head. To this nothing was added that would not equally well have served to build up a baboon or a rat. . . . I have confidence that the artistic gifts of mankind will prove to be due not to something added to the make-up of an ordinary man, but to the absence of factors which in the normal person inhibit the development of these gifts. They are almost beyond doubt to be looked upon as releases of powers normally suppressed. The instrument is there but it is ‘stopped down.’” It is, then, not the

¹ *Death — and Afterwards*, p. 13.

mere fancy of the poet, but the latest dictum of science that in any country churchyard we may confidently say:—

"Some mute, inglorious Milton here may rest,
Some Cromwell, guiltless of his country's blood,"

or, we may add, some Edison or Moltke, some Raphael or Mozart, who lived and died as unaware of the powers which slumbered within him as were his neighbors.

It seems no wild suggestion that, as passions lie unrecognized by consciousness awaiting maturity and evocation; as faculties and powers lie hidden even from the man himself till occasion arouses them by the opportunity for their exercise;¹ as even spiritual life may be truly and richly possessed, yet all unconsciously, so it may not unreasonably be held that the sharing of the nature of God, the treasure which through the divine act of Incarnation was uniquely possessed by Jesus, lay hidden from even his own consciousness amid the "subliminal" treasures of his spiritual nature, awaiting the emergence into consciousness and the opportunity for dominance in his nature which would come through the experiences which would follow upon the resurrection.

The theory thus advanced has been held by the writer for some forty years, but was first put in print a few years ago by the Oxford theologian Sanday.² While it seems to have attracted little attention in this country, in Great Britain it has been more discussed. In the sequel to his book,³ now published as a part of it, Professor Sanday recognized Professor Mackintosh as a thoroughly competent critic, and his criticism

¹ Thus, for example, it took the success of his first Faneuil Hall speech to reveal Wendell Phillips to himself as well as to the world.

² *Christologies Ancient and Modern*, 1910.

³ *Personality in Christ and in Ourselves*.

as such a philosophical voice as he had hoped and waited to hear.¹

Before advancing his main objections to the theory, Professor Mackintosh suggested the difficulty that, according to modern psychology, the subliminal is (in words quoted from Professor Stout) "an organized system of conditions which have been formed in and through bygone conscious experiences." That this is the generally accepted view of the subliminal is certainly open to serious question. To many it seems more reasonable to hold that there lies beyond consciousness not only the mass of results of past activity, but also the incomparably greater mass of faculties and powers yet to be developed, like the Shakespeare in the germ of which Professor Bateson reminded us. And in any case, it would not be demonstrably impossible that in the single special case of the Incarnation the divine should reside in this sphere, and not present itself within the consciousness of Jesus. It may perhaps well be noted, in passing, that Professor Percy Gardner has developed somewhat fully a distinction between the "sub-conscious" and what he calls the "superconscious."² But even if Gardner's criticisms are justified in reference to some expressions of Sanday's, they do not touch the main part of the theory itself. So far as the present discussion is concerned, all of and in ourselves which consciousness cannot report upon might be combined under the one awkward word, the "unconscious"; indeed, it would serve the present purpose just as well to call it all the "extra-conscious."

The first formal objection of Mackintosh to Sanday's theory is that he makes the subliminal superior to what is contained

¹ The criticism of Professor Mackintosh, first published in the *Expository Times*, is given in full in his work, *Doctrine of the Person of Jesus Christ*.

² *Hibbert Journal*, vol. ix. pp. 477-496.

in the sphere of consciousness. But at most this objection touches only Sanday's presentation of his case. It is in no sense vital to the view presented that the subliminal should be thought of as superior. All that is needed is that it should be recognized as possibly other. Again, Mackintosh urges, as an objection against this theory, that it makes deity unknowable. When he develops this thought, he emphasizes only the ethical side of the divine. But there is a rational as well as an ethical side to the Incarnation, and it is here that this theory has proved most helpful. Nor need we be troubled if a theory involves the admission that our minds cannot measure the infinite or plumb the profundities of the divine. Would not a God in whom we found nothing unknowable to-day be a God whom we were liable to outgrow sometime? Jesus Christ is, as he claimed, a sufficient, and consequently he is the final, manifestation of the Father, but it is not to be thought that even he could by his Incarnation body forth all the fullness of the Deity, so that there is now no mystery, no longer anything unknowable. The third objection made by Mackintosh is that this theory does not "evade the haunting dualism of tradition," the proper "fundamental principle" being "that to the believing study of our Lord's person all that is divine in Him is human, all that is human is divine." Now is this really an objection? It should certainly always be recognized that man is made in the image of God, and this likeness is important in many relations. But if the kinship is such that in any other way than as a metaphor "the divine is human, the human is divine," then at all events there can be no talk of a unique Incarnation in Christ Jesus, for we are all already divine and human both. Is it not gravely to be feared that this substitution of the notion that man actually shares the divine nature for the notion that man was made in the image of God is be-

coming more and more prevalent, and will not this pantheistic notion, common alike to Hindu philosophy, gnostic heresy, and theosophical speculation, seriously pervert Christian theology and religious teaching, and ultimately, if unchecked, moral life? It appears, then, that the discussions of Sanday's work have thus far brought out no decisive objections against the essential points in his theory.

Before considering what may be said in favor of the theory, it should perhaps be noted that no theory of the method of the Incarnation will be presented or is necessary as a basis of the discussion, only the fact that the Divine Word became flesh and dwelt among us. Certainly there is no "kenotic" basis for the theory presented. To the mind of the writer the vast edifices of theological hypothesis and speculation and assertion and inference which have been erected on Paul's one-word metaphor of the "Kenosis" are absolutely destitute of sufficient and substantial basis. On the other hand it may be noted that some of the most modern teachings sacrifice a true and proper Incarnation. From "kenotic" theories the pendulum seems to have swung with unusual rapidity to the opposite extreme. While these theories do maintain the true and full humanity of Christ, even though it may be held with somewhat of a sacrifice of the Divine element in the Incarnation, there has been of late a surprising renaissance of the view connected in the history of doctrine with the name of Apollinaris, to the sacrifice of the full humanity. According to these views Jesus was not really a man, properly speaking, as he lacked the spirit which alone is distinctive of humanity in this world, its place in him having been supplied through the Incarnation by the Divine. There is another view which is, it is to be feared, even more widely prevalent, which, though unlike those just mentioned in preserving the reality and full-

ness of both natures, does so after the Nestorian fashion at the sacrifice of the unity of the personality. When we read or hear, as we not seldom may, that Jesus said or did this as human and that as divine, or that he was ignorant as human while in the sphere of the same personality he knew as divine, then by this duality of personal action the bond of the Incarnation is relaxed and in so far, though unintentionally, yet in reality, the Incarnation is denied.

Now the conception to be considered is that, while of course our Lord's Divinity was an essential part of his personal nature, yet, so far as merely consciousness was concerned, it abode wholly below consciousness (or above it), so that he thought, felt, and willed wholly as a man. This view is certainly in harmony with the general picture of him as he lived among men. As a child he did not differ, so far as we know, from any and every "baby new to earth and sky." His growth in mind kept no more than even pace with his physical development. He questioned, and once at least in a way that seemed foolish to his disciples. He learned facts from phenomena as we all do.¹ On one great occasion he even asserted his positive ignorance of the time of that far-off event toward which creation moves and which he proclaimed.

Jesus often shows, to be sure, a more than natural knowledge, as in his intuition of the characters of those with whom he dealt, and sometimes of events in their lives, his forecasts of the future, his declarations of truths about the Father,

¹ At any rate such was the opinion of those who knew him best, as is shown by the frequent use in relation to him of the word which means to know by finding out (*γινώσκω*), instead of the word which signifies intuitive knowledge (*οἶδα*), though the use even of the latter word does not necessarily imply a complete divine knowledge, as it is constantly used for such knowledge as all men intuitively possess.

about himself, and about his work. It is not necessary to accept as supernatural every thing which has ever been classed as such. For example, some of his marvelous readings of character may have been to some extent paralleled in the histories of certain great masters of men, and occasionally a natural explanation is possible, even if not preferable, as of his knowledge of the colt on which he rode into Jerusalem and of the way in which his disciples sent before found the supper room. This qualification, however, properly applies only to relatively insignificant groups of things which Jesus knew. Sanday's explanation is that it is the function of the subconscious "to feed the conscious," and as "a never-ending train of images, memories, and ideas keeps emerging into the light," so in the case of Christ "there was a sort of Jacob's ladder by which the divine forces stored up below found an outlet."¹ In a somewhat similar way the Reverend Darwell Stone speaks of the possibility that the human mind of Jesus "might receive from the unimpaired divine knowledge whatever at each fresh stage it was capable of receiving," and also argues as if "our Lord's divine knowledge was always resident in Him while on earth and was continuously made available in this human mind for the purposes of His mortal life," adding that "it is to some extent parallel that our Lord's human will could to whatever extent each occasion needed call into active operation the forces of divine power which were always possessed but ordinarily latent."² But this parallel turns almost decisively against this theory. Careful study of the miracles has led to the view that, while in some cases the narrative is not inconsistent with the opinion that they were wrought by virtue of his own "forces of divine power

¹ *Christologies*, pp. 144, 166.

² *Church Quarterly Review*, Oct. 1910, pp. 51, 52.

which were always possessed but ordinarily latent" while incarnate and as incarnate, yet this is nowhere the necessary conclusion, and in other passages the miracles are clearly referred to powers which were not his own as incarnate, but were specially received from the Father for the purpose. It seems best, on the whole, to hold that these powers were due to the indwelling activity of the Holy Spirit who had been bestowed upon him "without measure." From him Jesus received, not, to be sure, sanctification as we do, but divine guidance, divine illumination, divine empowerment. Is not the gift of the Spirit to Jesus a fact and factor left unexplained on any other theory, and according to Sanday and Stone would it not be superfluous? Are we not constrained to hold that the Spirit served a real purpose in the thought and life of Jesus, and what can be suggested other than that he might be by his activities as indwelling the organ of the impartations and communications from the Father?

The theory that Jesus, while also divine, yet lived here a simply human life by virtue of the fact, that during the incarnate life here deity refrained from entering the sphere of consciousness and directly affecting it, and that consequently the human intellect, emotion, conscience, will, could run a truly human course, explains some matters hard to explain on other theories. How could the Divine One be tempted? How could the Infinite Son really pray? How could a being plain before whose consciousness were all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge which belong to the omniscient, really enter on the struggle of Gethsemane or pass into Calvary's valley of death-shade ending in a feeling of divine abandonment? All this is inexplicable save as the consciousness of Jesus was in processes and contents a purely human consciousness.

Thus, and only in some such manner as this, was it possible

for him whom it behoved to be made like his brethren to gain this great end. Thus he could develop his character by resistance to evil, by choice of good, by actual performance of chosen good. It is to be noted that most people find absolutely unintelligible the idea of perfecting by development (of course not by correction of evil) on which the writer to the Hebrews dwells so often; and this is because their theory of the character and contents of the consciousness of Jesus makes him practically infinite to begin with. The same author brings out with a clearness not paralleled elsewhere that the dominant note in the character of Jesus was faith, submissive, persistent, triumphant faith. But most people, I think, can practically no more connect faith with Jesus living among men than with the preincarnate Logos or with the Son as he is now seated in triumph on his throne. Dr. Du Bose, for example, says: "The credibility and efficiency of the gospel depend upon the absolute knowledge of its Founder. Knowledge that falls short of complete apprehension of the physical cosmos and its phenomena is not absolute. . . . When Jesus knew altogether what was in man, he knew equally whatever else was existent, or possible, in the universe."¹ To a being with such knowledge, faith, like temptation and prayer, is an absurd impossibility. To those who hold this view Jesus is the "author and finisher of faith" only in the sense that he evokes and perfects our faith,—not, as it should be thought, that he was in soul and act the great and perfect exemplar of faith to all his own in all ages. To fail to appreciate what was the main-spring of the one perfect human life would merely as an intellectual error be unfortunate, but to rob ourselves of the example of our elder brother in temptation, in activity, in submissiveness in suffering, is a failure incomparably more seri-

¹ *Methodist Review*, May, 1915, p. 396.

ous. Toward the avoidance of this error, and toward the securing of the encouragement and strength and hope which come from the example of him who is not only our Master and Lord, but also our friend, our brother, our fellow in suffering, in patience, in faith, the thoughts here set forth have for many years been found most practically helpful.

It may reasonably be asked, In what way did Jesus, then, come to the positive and assured knowledge of his own divine nature which underlies and upbears his mighty claims? We all recognize his confident assurance and its rightness; the question now is, How did he reach it? Du Bose clearly states what in substance, if not in precise form, is the common view when he says, "How did Jesus know the world of phenomena? How did he cognize that vast and intricate whole of the knowledge of which the philosophies of men comprise but a figment [? fragment]? We have seen," he continues, "that he came to the absolute knowledge . . . through the perfect uncovering of the divine consciousness." But such "perfect uncovering of the divine consciousness" is so inconsistent with the wholeness and genuineness of his human life and human consciousness, that we are constrained to set it aside, and to hold that his assurance must have been reached in some other way and as the result of some other intellectual process. What suggestions, then, can be made as to other means and processes? Is it not most thoroughly reverent to hold that Jesus was made like his brethren intellectually as well as physically? If so, inference must have played a large part in the increase of his knowledge in manhood as well as in childhood. The great thinker is he who can project himself to the far-off point where the varied lines of fact converge in the focus of a mighty truth. Jesus showed that he possessed a vision clear beyond parallel of the great spiritual phenomena of the soul

and of human life. He had a unique apprehension of what God must be and is, an apprehension perfected by a sympathy with his character such as no other ever approached. He read the Old Testament "God-breathed" with a keenness of insight and breadth of view which also his perfect sympathy with God rendered incomparable. Finally, through the power of the indwelling Spirit, who came to him uniquely and possessed him measurelessly, he must have received perfect control and illumination, and must also have become receptive of Divine revelation to an extent to which no limit can be set. Given the wholly normal mind (other there never was) of a perfectly sinless man (other there never was), so that his soul, like a lake with absolutely unruffled bosom, faultlessly reflected the whole of heaven spread above it, add the unveiling of truth to the human soul by the Holy Spirit in a manner possible to him as to none other, and we can see the possibility of the perfect revelation of God to his Son and through him to the world. Upon such a basis Jesus could confidently rest his teaching and his claims, though not based on self-consciousness yet an assured and unshakable conviction; upon such a basis we may rest our acceptance of his teaching and devotion to his person, sharing the same unshakably confident assurance of his conviction.

It remains to show something of how, at the great crises of his life, Jesus, even though not having psychologically a direct consciousness of what transcends humanity, yet with absolute assurance, saw by faith the great truths relating to the Father, to man, to himself, to his work, to his nature and rank, and thought and acted accordingly. For example, when we hear the boy in the Temple speaking of his "Father's

house," many think of the eternal metaphysical sonship,¹ or of the supernatural birth, the story of which is supposed to have been told him lately. But is it not most reasonable to think that here is the wholly natural expression of the ideal relation of the soul to God? The soul which is filial in temper ought to call God Father. Did not Jesus speak as the typical child-Christian, could we find him, would naturally speak to-day?

When and whence came his conviction of his Messiahship? Was he conscious that he was Messiah when he went to the Jordan to John? If he possessed a consciousness positively and definitely divine in its nature, why were the confirmatory events needed and given? May we not rather represent to ourselves the mental and spiritual experiences of the young carpenter of Nazareth somewhat thus? He finds himself a member of the ancient royal family to which the promised king was to belong, and he has been told that peculiar events attended his birth. More important, he finds himself unable to make his own the universal sense of guilt; he appreciates his own absolute sinlessness which leaves no room for penitence; what does it mean that in this great fact he is unique? He knows, and knows that he knows, the great spiritual realities of God and man to which other men are blind, after which they grope. He knows, and knows that he knows, that in a way which he cannot but recognize as unique there stirs within him the devoted purpose without measure or limit to do God's work for men, whatever it be: "Lo, here I come to do thy will," "My food is to do the will of him that sent me, and to finish his work." Would it need a special sense of divine "call," as it has been talked about in relation to the ministry, for him to be convinced that he is the Messiah, though it may most reasonably be held that, in addition, such

¹ See Meyer-Weiss.

a call was given with peculiar clearness and force? When, then, the desert prophet begins to proclaim the kingdom as near and to plunge the throngs beneath the Jordan, not merely in penitence but still more as pledging themselves to the kingdom coming soon, must he not go forth in confident faith that he is the king? Then, as he prays, come the heavenly voice and the descending dove, tokens useless to a divine consciousness, but who can say how needful and precious to him who was our brother in faith as well as our example in service?

What wonder that, now his conviction is thus confirmed, he turns away to absolute solitude to dwell on the work to which he has devoted himself? And what wonder that Satanic temptations follow fast on the heavenly assurances? And it is, we remember, within human limitations and by the submissiveness of faith that he fights off the tempter and goes forth, assured, to do the work of the Messiah.

But he knows, it seems must have known from the beginning, that the Jews would not have that man to reign over them. With his insight he could not have failed to foresee from the first that his own would not receive him. He must have known that only as lifted up could he draw all men to him, ay, more, that he must give his life a ransom for the many whom he should save. Possibly in connection with this thought, that his suffering would have the measureless value needed in that the very God had taken upon himself the suffering for sin, he came to the assurance that, while like his brethren, he was also unlike them, that the Son of Man must be and so was the Son of God. When he had reached this conviction, wrought, it may be, or confirmed, it may be, by the indwelling Spirit, then, even though his soul saw no "trailing clouds of glory," he could yet speak positively of his

existence before Abraham and his glory before the world was.

Once, indeed, he seems to have received a special confirmation of his conviction of incarnate deity, a confirmation greater even than the baptismal credentials. His way is tending fast to become the *Via Dolorosa*. Even if faith was perfect as faith, his soul may have cried for strength, and the most natural, reasonable, and satisfactory explanation of the Transfiguration is that it was primarily and mainly intended for such confirmation. As the hero who is bidden transport a priceless jewel at the risk, at the cost of his life, might be strengthened if once the lid of the casket was lifted and he beheld the glory of his treasure, so the veil which so close shut in the deity of the nature of Jesus is raised on the slopes of Hermon, and his face glows and his very clothes glow with a positively divine radiance outshining from within, and by this, even more than by the discourse of his heavenly visitants, Jesus is heartened to go on to the decease which he should accomplish at Jerusalem.

At Gethsemane and Calvary we seem to see the working of the same purely human consciousness.¹ We perhaps more often hear agony of soul connected with the former than with the latter for the struggle of faith which, though it struggles, yet never ceases to submit is more conspicuous in the garden, but on the cross is not anticipation but actual realization, the more "arduous greatness of things done." We need not think,

¹ Relton in his late "Study of Christology" (1917) treats very satisfactorily the real deity of Jesus and his own recognition of himself as divine, but his theory of a "single consciousness, unique in its Divine character, eternal, unlimited," which "would mediate for Him His knowledge of His filial relationship with the Eternal Father" and which "would secure for Him an unbroken communion with God" (p. 230) leaves no real room for such experiences as those in the garden and on the cross, as also no need of the gift and power of the Holy Spirit.

as some have done, that every soul of all the race was visibly present to the mind of Jesus, that all the woes of every age were brought into his consciousness; a consciousness that could grasp that would cease to be human, if it ever had been such. Rather, over him may, must have rushed in one overwhelming flood a sense of all the sinfulness of the world with all its guilty passions, its calculated crimes, its willful waywardness, its stubborn persistence, its pollution, its fear, its despair, its sense of its own abominableness, its assurance of the consuming fire of the holy indignation of divine love, until in his fellowship with his brethren by race whose lot his soul was sharing by the power of human sympathy, by the one-sidedness which is as characteristically human as it is not divine, he seemed to himself to be actually sharing the sinner's lot, and cried in unimaginable anguish, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" Then in truly human fashion came the revulsion, and he passed from the darksome horror of struggling under the crushing weight of the weight of the woe of a sin-cursed world to the triumphant rapture of assurance that the same world's salvation was now secured by his suffering, and he cried with a mighty voice, and as he expired committed his spirit to his Father. To this very end of his life on earth does not such a view of the contents of the consciousness of Jesus better meet the facts than does the common view?