

infant terrible. "It is nice to have fame; but in my opinion you do not know enough to be qualified for the position of a herdsman of oxen." So far from being offended by this disparaging remark, the meek Rabbi Akiba added a rider, "Aye, not even as a herdsman of sheep." So the famous Akiba was the famous Akiba after all.

St. Paul and his Converts is the title which the Rev. Harrington C. Lees gives to a small volume of studies in the Pauline Epistles (Robert Scott; 1s. net). Mr. Lees always finishes his work. This book has more in it than some formal Introductions, though it is so unpretentious.

Psychism, by M. Hume (Walter Scott; 2s. 6d. net), has seven sections. The titles of the sections are Hallucinations, Force, Soul, Fore-knowledge, Sub-conscious Memory, General Sub-conscious Action, and Mysticism. Each section is divided into short paragraphs. Here is a paragraph from the Hallucinations: 'During two years I had a servant who amused me by her habit of saying "Good-morning" and "Good-night" twice over; first with her internal body-voice, not audible to herself, but quite audible to me, and then properly and externally. She was rather scared when at last I told her of it!'

Chronology has a curious fascination for some minds. And Bible Chronology has the additional attraction of a vindication of the accuracy of Holy Scripture. Drawn by this twofold cord, Canon R. B. Girdlestone has published *Outlines of Bible Chronology Illustrated from External Sources* (S.P.C.K.; 2s.).

The Principal of Ridley Hall, Cambridge, lectures on the Thirty-nine Articles. He recommends no text-book. If he is asked what text-

book he recommends to his students, he answers the library. But he dictates outlines. And these outlines he has now printed and published, not for the use of his own students only, but for the use and to the great advantage of students and lecturers everywhere. The title is, *Lecture Outlines on the Thirty-nine Articles*, by Arthur J. Tait, B.D. (Stock; 3s. net).

For the encouragement of those who are trying to recover the lost art of pulpit exposition, the Rev. D. Macfadyen, M.A., has published an exposition of the prophet Malachi, which he delivered in lectures on Sunday mornings to the congregations worshipping at the Highgate Congregational Church. The success of the lectures will make the book successful. And others will be encouraged to attempt what he has done so easily and so well. The title of the book is *The Messenger of God* (Elliot Stock; 2s. net).

Mr. F. C. Conybeare has issued a new edition of his *Myth, Magic, and Morals* (Watts; 4s. 6d. net). He himself, however, calls it simply a reprint. He says: 'A few insignificant verbal changes have been made in the text, and such clerical errors corrected as had been noticed by reviewers or detected by myself. Several additions have also been made to the notes at the end of the book.' But there is also a new preface. In that preface Mr. Conybeare replies to Professor Sanday. Professor Sanday reviewed the first edition in a pamphlet which he entitled *A New Marcion*. It is to that pamphlet Mr. Conybeare replies. But it is a disappointing reply. Not a position is seriously defended. Mr. Conybeare simply repeats the not very original statement that there are two Christs, the historical Christ and the Christ of the Church. He expects us to draw the inference that his is the historical Christ.

Christologies Ancient and Modern.

BY THE REV. H. R. MACKINTOSH, D. PHIL., D.D., PROFESSOR OF SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY
IN THE NEW COLLEGE, EDINBURGH.

AN exposition of Dr. Sanday's 'new and unexplored' theory of our Lord's Person ought, so far as may be, to keep sedulously to the words he

himself has chosen, for the matter is one of some preciseness and delicacy. We may perhaps start with this summary statement, which comes at the

end of a lecture on Presuppositions: 'The proper seat or *locus* of all divine indwelling, or divine action upon the human soul, is the subliminal consciousness. And . . . the same, or the corresponding, subliminal consciousness is the proper seat or *locus* of the Deity of the incarnate Christ.' The gist of the new tentative modern Christology is contained in these words.

Nearly five years ago Principal Dykes had with great caution pointed in something very like this direction, and it is remarkable that Dr. Sanday should quite independently have come out at exactly the same spot. 'Our best hope of understanding the dual life of our Lord,' wrote Dr. Dykes, 'may lie in the humble study of our own personal life. There are whole regions of psychical phenomena, little attended to till of late, which betray the existence in the soul of subconscious states and processes of psychic life.' He goes on to give familiar examples of this. Not that the analogy between our personality and that of Christ seems to him either close or satisfying; in the nature of the case that cannot be. But what it does suggest 'is that within the mysterious depths of a single personality, there may co-exist parallel states of spirit life, one only of which emerges in ordinary human consciousness. They may serve to repel the superficial objection that such a dualism is impossible.' Dr. Sanday takes up the same idea in his own way, working it out with a good deal of illustrative detail, and furnishing what I feel may well come to be regarded as the classical interpretation of it. It is a conception at which not a few students of the subject have recently been gazing with a hopeful interest. One of the sanest and most acute thinkers in our ministry wrote to me not long since: 'Dr. Dykes' idea has interested me for some years now—I mean the grounding of the Divine in the subliminal in Jesus. . . . I should not wonder if we need to think ourselves into the subliminal, before we can ever begin to do justice to the conception of it. What if the relation between the subliminal and the supra-liminal be the really important question for us? In ideal man there would be a free flow to and fro between the two spheres.' The idea is in the air, and we may take it that thoughtful men are going to look at it undeterred by scorn or misconception.¹

¹ Cf. an able and lucid chapter in the Rev. N. Macnicol's *Religion of Jesus* (Christian Literature for India, 1910), pp. 53 ff.

Personally I am as yet unconvinced; but this need not, I hope, prevent the inquiry which follows from being a quite impartial one. We have to ask what the objections are which such an hypothesis invites, and whether it is a solution that can permanently be maintained?

In a preliminary way the emphasis of Dr. Sanday's welcome to the idea of the subconscious is striking. In his fine chapter on the subject we cannot help noticing a certain tendency to speak as if it were decidedly more important than the conscious. Thus on p. 145 we read: 'The wonderful thing is that, while the unconscious and subconscious processes are (generally speaking) similar in kind to the conscious, they surpass them in degree. They are subtler, intenser, further-reaching, more penetrating. It is something more than a mere metaphor when we describe the sub- and unconscious states as more "profound." The work of the Holy Spirit is subliminal; it belongs to the lower sphere. A favourite metaphor with Dr. Sanday to represent the two levels of psychic life is the 'finely poised needle on the face of a dial. The really important thing is not the index, but the weight or the pressure that moves the index. And that, in the case of moral character and religious motive, is out of sight, down in the lowest depths of personality' (p. 158). In the same way he speaks elsewhere of the unconscious 'as containing the key to moral problems.' The general drift of these passages, one feels, is somehow to exalt the subconscious and abysmal at the expense of ordinary consciousness. I am not sure whether Dr. Sanday quite goes all the way with Mr. Myers in regarding the subliminal consciousness as primary and superior—the ordinary mental life being derived from it—rather than its originating source, as psychology has held; but he quotes Mr. Myers without criticism to the effect that 'there exists a more comprehensive consciousness, a profounder faculty . . . from which the consciousness and the faculty of earth-life are *mere selections*.'² We shall return to this point; for the present we make a note of it. Whether the subconscious is or is not the source of the conscious, it is at least in Dr. Sanday's view superior to it; and for that reason presumably a worthier receptacle of Deity.

Another introductory conception is that of the *Unio Mystica*. The indwelling of God in the soul

² Italics mine.

may be taken as (so to speak) the limiting case of Divine Immanence, and the mystical union so construed is an analogy helping us further to conceive the Incarnation. As Dr. Sanday put it in a former work: 'The Holy Spirit is the bond which binds all humanity together in one. In each one of us He is present after our measure, but in Christ He dwelt as the fulness of the Godhead bodily.'¹ We get some aid from the idea that the human spirit is capable of penetration by the Divine, but still more from combining this second mystical conception with the thought of what we have already called the subliminal. 'The deepest truth of mysticism, and of the states of which we have been speaking as mystical, belongs not so much to the upper region of consciousness—the region of symptoms, manifestations, effects—as to the lower region of the unconscious' (p. 155). Here also we are obliged to ask whether mysticism of the kind undoubtedly present in the New Testament is even congruous, let alone bound up with the idea that the subconscious is a profounder or (in some spiritual sense) more important parallel to ordinary conscious life. Can anything be so important as the conscious and active faith that unites the soul to Christ? One can quite well understand how stress should come to be laid on unconscious process in the interest of a less than ethical theory of the sacraments, but it is just to add that in this volume Dr. Sanday has uttered not one syllable connecting his new hypothesis with ulterior questions of that kind. That there is a buried life of the soul, an 'underworld' or lower region of the unconscious, and that in believers it also is pervaded by the Spirit of Christ, is surely undeniable; but it receives its content and quality, a sound psychology must hold, from what goes on in consciousness, and is itself, as Professor Stout puts it, 'an organized system of conditions which have indeed been formed in and through bygone conscious experience, but which are not themselves present to consciousness.'² I grant the difficulty of explaining on these terms how, say, infants can have a real relation to the love of God prior to the wakening of the moral consciousness; but on that subject it seems best to say that *for them* that relation is not such as we are able to interpret; while, on the other hand, our confidence that it is entirely real and redeeming springs from

the knowledge of the Divine character which we owe to Christ. What it seems impossible to grant on any terms is that the unconscious is 'higher' than the conscious. True it is that

'From the soul's subterranean depths upborne,
As from an infinitely distant land,
Come airs and floating echoes';

but, in the first place, these 'murmurs and scents of an infinite sea' are due to traces or dispositions formed in the course of previous conscious experience; secondly, they become significant for us only as they emerge into the upper stream of conscious life. Only then can we assign to them spiritual value. We all of us, for example, are already united in dim, unconscious relation to the whole historic past; but if that relation never came into clear awareness it might just as well be non-existent. Subliminal process, therefore, is the indispensable condition of all mental life; but psychology appears to class it not as the higher reality of the two, but rather as a subordinate and co-operant condition of the 'supraliminal.'

Dr. Sanday's use of the theory for the purposes of Christology is made clear in an important passage which I quote nearly in full. 'We have seen,' he writes, 'what difficulties are involved in the attempt to draw, as it were, a vertical line between the human nature and the divine nature of Christ, and to say that certain actions of His fall on one side of this line, and certain other actions on the other. But these difficulties disappear if, instead of drawing a vertical line, we rather draw a horizontal line between the upper human medium, which is the proper and natural field of all active expression, and those lower deeps which are no less the proper and natural home of whatever is divine. This line is inevitably drawn in the region of the subconscious. . . . Whatever there was of divine in Him, on its way to outward expression whether in speech or act, passed through, and could not but pass through, the restricting and restraining medium of human consciousness. This consciousness was, as it were, the narrow neck through which alone the divine could come to expression.' And he claims that 'the advantage of this way of conceiving of the Person of Christ is that it leaves us free to think of His life on earth as fully and frankly human, without at the same time fixing limits for it which confine it within the measures of the human; it leaves an opening,

¹ *The Life of Christ in Recent Research*, p. 310.

² *Hibbert Journal*, October 1903, p. 47.

which in any case must be left, by which the Deity of the Incarnate preserves its continuity with the infinitude of Godhead' (pp. 165-166).

Points to be carefully noted here are these. Dr. Sanday would lay a good deal of emphasis on the figure of 'the narrow neck' as applied to our Lord's human consciousness. In other words, the expression is human, completely human; but that which is expressed is neither human alone nor divine alone, but divine and human fused or blended. It is a mistake, that is, to equate the Divine and the unconscious; but the unconscious is at any rate the region in which the divine and the human merge in each other, and the divine so entering and mingling with our nature is continuous with the infinite Godhead. It is thus a cardinal point with the new theory to maintain that the influence of the one upon the other takes place below the point or line at which the resultant consciousness comes to expression. And if it be asked what ground we have for believing that there was in Christ 'a root of being striking down below the strata of consciousness, by virtue of which He was more than human,' Dr. Sanday in reply would simply indicate 'the marks which have been appealed to all down the centuries in proof that in Him Deity and humanity were combined' (p. 174).

Such, then, are the new suggestions of the book towards the Christological theory, and it is very possible that it may form a subject of no little discussion in the immediate future. The majority of readers will probably feel that the theory is in itself attractive, and I need scarcely add that the statement of it is a finely conceived piece of argumentative exposition. Dr. Sanday puts the hypothesis at its best and strongest. All will sympathize with his vital interest in the unity and consistency of Jesus' life, and with his unreserved acceptance of the position that 'there is no possible or desirable division between what is human in Him and what is divine.' How seriously this is meant comes out in a few pages, near the close, on the working of our Lord's consciousness, which I take leave to say belong to the very best that has been written on the subject, and ought to be read and re-read by every student. Had the book contained nothing more than the reasoned explication of this passage, it would have added greatly to our insight. Dr. Sanday has at least made it still clearer than before that the strict Two-Nature doctrine is

not the last word upon the subject, whether we do or do not accept the particular hypothesis he has put forward of the subliminal consciousness of Christ as the region where His Deity may be localized.

Now, in regard to this theory, as set forth in the passages just quoted, one cannot but feel the pressure of certain initial difficulties which it may be as well to express frankly.

(a) The superiority of the unconscious. I have already touched on this point, but we may recur to it. It seems to be an essential premise of the theory, but is it as a fact really tenable? It is hard for many of us to get over the objection that the subconscious has as such no moral character at all; and that out of it there well up all sorts of things, not only impulses which we are entitled to regard as divine, but also, as Dr. Sanday himself concedes, the really diabolical. From that region, it appears, derive not only the intuitions of genius and poetry, but the disordered and incoherent absurdities of dreams. If we are straitly charged to define the subconscious, indeed, we have to confess that we know nothing of it whatever save as process beneath the threshold of consciousness which indifferently co-operates in *all* mental construction, be the product of such construction from the ethical point of view good or bad. And the question at once arises: Are we justified in taking this half-lit region of psychic life, as to which our information is so largely a matter of hypothesis and inference,—it is, as Dr. Sanday admits, that part of the living self which is most beyond our ken,—and decide that *there* is the seat and dwelling-place of Deity; that there *par excellence* is a receptacle specially suited and adapted for the presence of God in man? Some people would maintain, I fancy, that the subliminal is that in us which approximates most nearly to the mysterious faculty or aptitude which we call instinct, and that it is for that reason akin rather to the animal than to the divine; and such arguments would require very grave consideration. At all events, Professor James seems hardly entitled to affirm that the subconscious is continuous—if by this he means homogeneous—with our conscious life; even if it be a *part* of a self, it is not therefore a self *suo jure*, but at most machinery subservient to the rational and ethical life of the Ego; and we cannot acknowledge that what belongs rather to the natural conditions out of which self-consciousness rises can be superior in worth or (so to speak)

spiritual status to self-consciousness proper. Or, to put it otherwise, 'the subliminal' is a form embracing a very dimly known content those changes or processes below the threshold of consciousness which we see are required to explain what goes on in normal mental life; have we any right to take that form, abstracted from the only content known to be associated with it, and assign to it the very different content of Deity? How do we really know that the form and the content are now adapted or suited to each other, that the content *fits* the form?

(b) Is the drift of the theory not inevitably towards the older conception of Deity as essentially unknowable? I am speaking, of course, merely of the implicit logic of the theory as a whole. That dim sphere of mental life which we name the 'subliminal,' and which we find it practically impossible to describe in genuinely positive terms, is taken to be the dwelling-place of Godhead; of Godhead, too, as coming so near to manhood as to be conjoined with it in a single life. God is so close to us; yet, on second thoughts, so far away! For to the Christian mind God is love; and love is above all things conscious, ethical, rational. It is something that I find it quite impossible to translate into terms of the subconscious. We know what is meant by saying that the love that looked out of Christ's eyes, touching men's lives and making all things new for them, was the very personal love of God Himself, present by a vast act of sacrifice in a human personality; and there need be no hesitation in admitting that by this entrance into earthly experience the Son of God submitted to restraints and disabilities of self-expression; 'the condition which He was assuming,' as Dr. Sanday puts it, 'permitted only degrees of self-manifestation.' But how shall we construe to ourselves a Holy Love—a love identical with the very essence of Deity, making God indeed to be God—which yet resides in the unconscious? For we must not be misled by the term 'subliminal *consciousness*' into thinking that the subconscious is really another kind or form of the conscious—a second self working (as it were) behind the curtain. Mr. Myers notoriously was tempted off into various exaggerations and inaccuracies of this kind, which led one of his critics to say that his theory had much affinity with 'such conceptions as that of a tutelary genius or guardian angel.' In reality, of course,

the subconscious is so far just the *unconscious*; and my difficulty in that case precisely is that the nature of the unconscious is indescribable by us in ethical or spiritual terms. Our Lord's life, we are told, is entirely human on the *surface* (p. 213); but there was beneath it a presence of Deity one in kind with that of God who rules the universe (p. 209). Yet since we are unable to characterize that Deity by epithets drawn from the human surface—love, holiness, wisdom, etc., all of them conscious attitudes or activities of mind—then, so far as I can see, it becomes for us simply the unknown and unknowable.

(c) I come now to what may be regarded as the gravest difficulty of all, I mean from the point of view of theory. Does the new hypothesis really help us to rise above the haunting dualism of tradition? I have already quoted a passage in which Dr. Sanday proposes that instead of a vertical line between the human nature and the divine nature of Christ, we should rather draw 'a horizontal line between the upper human medium, which is the proper and natural field of all active expression, and those lower deeps which are no less the proper and natural home of whatever is divine.' And we have to keep in view the phrases just noted as to the human surface and the divine depths beneath it. Now it is far from clear how these expressions are to be harmonized with the fundamental principle with which, like many of the best recent writers, Dr. Sanday operates, that to the believing study of our Lord's Person all that is divine in Him is human, all that is human is divine. Dr. Sanday will reply to this, I imagine, that the line in question 'is inevitably drawn *in the region of the subconscious*' (p. 166),¹ so that it is out of a subliminal whole in which the fusion of divine and human has already taken place that the resultant states of full consciousness actually rise. This, however, does not appear to me to get rid of the fact that, *ex hypothesi*, the consciousness is human only, so that to reach the divine in Jesus you have still to leave the specifically human behind. We still argue *from* the one *to* the other, instead of envisaging them as merged in a single divine-human consciousness. And more and more one's clear feeling is that if Godhead and manhood are one in Jesus—and faith is certain that they are—they must be both present everywhere in each part and region of His experience; with no

¹ Italics mine.

line, that is, between them of any kind which could obscure the vital fact that the character of God, which is ethical through and through, is actually being revealed in our human conditions.

But while I feel these objections strongly, and do not so far see how they are to be answered, I cannot think that it is just to reproach Dr. Sanday with saying no more about Christ than can be said of every man, simply because in every man humanity rests on a subliminal consciousness which is continuous with Deity. For one thing, an objection of this sort would hold equally against all theories of a real Incarnation, in so far as Incarnation *eo ipso* implies a congruity or kinship between God and man which renders their union possible; and Dr. Sanday does no more than give a special explanation of where, in his opinion, this congruity or meeting-point lies. God and man, he holds, are united in the subliminal region, and there it is that they were uniquely made one in Jesus. He may be wrong in much that he teaches as to the subliminal; so far I cannot myself see that he is always right; but at all events nothing in his theory is at all inconsistent with full adhesion to Christian belief in the divine uniqueness of Jesus. And for another thing, there is that in Jesus, on Dr. Sanday's own showing, the antecedents and origin of which mark Him off from all other children of men. The Deity that has its seat in the profounder consciousness of Jesus is defined as being an Incarnation of the Son, it is Deity

'one in kind with that of God who rules the universe.'

With the motives that animate Dr. Sanday's new theory and have guided him in its construction there is sure to be wide sympathy, a sympathy which it is to be hoped will take shape in frank and searching criticism from both sides. The subject is a fascinating one, and perhaps there are many to whom the new conception will be none the less attractive that in a modified form it may prove to be compatible with, or even introductory to, a modern reading of Kenoticism. Everything is of value that helps us to transcend the Two-Nature theory as handed on from the past, or that stimulates us to ask afresh how we can think of God as expressing Himself under the limitations of a human consciousness. It is no slight service to have these issues canvassed anew by a thinker of Dr. Sanday's independent power and thoroughness. And while I have felt bound to give unreserved expression to difficulties that occur on a first reading, I am conscious at the same time that his exposition has placed the central conception in a new light, and that we are no longer at liberty simply to put it aside as unfertile. Whether we do or do not assent to his special philosophy of the transcendent element in our Lord, at least he has deepened our feeling for the mystery of personality, and it cannot be seriously questioned that this is the first essential for a Christology that is to win or satisfy the modern mind.

In the Study.

Freely.

I.

The Use of the Word.

THIS word is used in the English Bible in three ways. It means—

I. Without restraint.

S. Augustine's *Manuel*, 1577 (Pickering's ed., p. 20): 'Happy is the soule whiche being let loose from the earthly prison, flieth up freely into heauen, and there beholdeth thee her most sweete Lord face to face.'

Gn 2¹⁶—'Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat.'

Ad. Est. 16¹⁹—'The Jews may live freely after their own laws.'

Ac 2²⁹—'Let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David.' The Greek here is *μετὰ παρρησίας*, lit. 'with boldness of speech.'

Ac 26²⁶—'Before whom also I speak freely.' The Greek is *παρρησιαζόμενος λαλῶ*: the same Greek participle is translated in 9²⁸ 'preaching boldly.'

Jn 2¹⁰ R.V.—'When men have drunk freely' This translation of the R.V. is a compromise