

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

Has He not also made Himself known in a sense of restlessness? 'Thou hast made us, Thou hast made us for Thyself, and we find our only rest in Thee.' Augustine touched a string that vibrated before and after. Job felt it long before and cried, 'O that I knew where I might find him.' John Byrom felt it many days after:

My spirit longeth for Thee, within my troubled breast,

Although I be unworthy of so divine a Guest.
Of so divine a Guest, unworthy tho' I be,
Yet has my heart no rest, unless it come from Thee.

And then there are what we call the theophanies of the Old Testament. He was seen by Moses and Isaiah before He came into the world, as He was seen by St. Paul after He left it. There is that mysterious person, the Angel of Jehovah. We must not introduce the incredible. We must not go back to the unscientific age of interpretation. But we may safely follow Professor DRIVER, who says that the Angel of Jehovah is a self-manifestation of Jehovah. He identifies Himself with Him; He speaks and acts with His authority;

and He is spoken of by others as 'God' or 'Jehovah.' It is true, He is also apparently distinguished from Jehovah, which DRIVER explains by quoting DAVIDSON—'the mere manifestation of Jehovah creating a distinction between the angel and Jehovah, though the identity remains.' Yes, there is some uncertainty. But the great occasion upon which the Angel of the Lord appears is one in which He acts most like to the Lord Jesus Christ. It is the occasion of the Sacrifice of Isaac—an event in which Christ was certainly deeply interested. And when He says to Abraham, 'Lay not thine hand upon the lad,' we admit at once that that is just what Jesus Christ might have been expected to say.

But, seen or unseen, He has all the while been at work on His creation. He stood at the beginning, saw the whole, and said, 'Very good.' So, at a later stage, He stood on a high mountain and saw all the kingdoms of the world in a moment of time. He did not then say, Very good. But He was greatly drawn to the vision. He had come to do that which once again would enable Him to say, Very good.

The Value of the Subconscious: In Reply to Critics.

BY THE REV. W. SANDAY, D.D., LL.D., LITT.D., LADY MARGARET PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY,
AND CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH, OXFORD.

I SUPPOSE I ought to feel quite crushed by the judgement passed upon me—somewhat magisterially—by Dr. Garvie in the April number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, when he includes an experiment of mine in his collection of 'Mares' Nests in Theology.' I must say in passing that I cannot accept his representation of my views as at all accurate. He first exaggerates them, and then denounces his own exaggeration. He uses language (such terms as 'relegates' and 'dismisses') which I would not use, and the point of his attack really turns on these expressions. Under these conditions I do not feel crushed; and I cannot help thinking that other criticisms, which affect me

more, really go off to a large extent on side issues and do not touch—or at least do not adequately and finally touch—the heart of the problem.

I shall not attempt now to answer my critics in detail. I have done so in part in the pamphlet *Personality in Christ and in Ourselves* (printed separately, and also bound up with copies of *Christologies Ancient and Modern*). But the kind of answer that I wish to give at present is a brief restatement of the whole position. I am in hopes that this may be done at once more simply and more guardedly, avoiding such terms as 'subliminal consciousness' and the like which have tended to excite a not always relevant opposition.

It will not be denied that the history of the Personality or Self embraces not only the continuous series of conscious states or activities, but a number of others that are sub- or unconscious as well. It will also, I think, not be denied that until a comparatively recent date these sub- and unconscious states have by no means had justice done to them. I do not wish to discuss the question of their relative importance. It is just these discussions which seem to me to have had a tendency to obscure and confuse the main issues. Enough that both sets of states are of very great importance and play a very essential part in the history of personality as a whole. On the one hand it may be said that the sub- and unconscious states are, very largely but not entirely, a product of the conscious. Impressions consciously received are stored up in the memory; sometimes these impressions are recoverable, and sometimes not. But it does not follow that even when an impression cannot be recalled by an act of will, it is therefore destroyed; the impression remains and continues to have its effect, fainter perhaps and less distinct, along with the multitude of other impressions. In like manner the effect of conscious arguments and decisions, conducted in the privacy of conscience, are formulated and remain as permanent possessions and principles of action. The effects of conscious struggles with temptation are permanently felt in either case, whether the temptation is yielded to and so becomes stronger on its recurrence, or whether it is overcome and so the power of resistance is gradually strengthened. It may rightly be said that the conscious life is the field of our probation; it is the field for the expression of character, and by its expression character will be ultimately judged: 'By thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned' (Mt 12³⁷); 'we must all be made manifest before the judgement seat of Christ; that each one may receive the things done in the body, according to what he hath done, whether it be good or bad' (2 Co 5¹⁰).

When this side of things only is considered, the conscious life may well be thought to be of overwhelming importance. And it is quite true that it has a continuity of its own; conscious acts are very often the direct result of previous conscious acts. But that is still very far from exhausting the whole matter. After all, when we speak of char-

acter, we include a great deal more than has ever been consciously formulated or expressed:

What I aspired to be,
And was not, comforts me. . . .

. . . all, the world's coarse thumb
And finger failed to plumb,
So passed in making up the main account;
All instincts immature,
All purposes unsure,
That weighed not as his work, yet swelled the man's
amount:

Thoughts hardly to be packed
Into a narrow act,
Fancies that broke through language and escaped;
All I could never be,
All, men ignored in me,
This, I was worth to God, whose wheel the pitcher
shaped.

It may be said that, however subtle and fugitive these light-wing'd embodiments of character may be, they will have yet at one time or another definitely entered into consciousness. But there are others, more subtle still, of which not even so much as this can be said. Character is indeed fuller and richer than any of its manifestations; it is a whole in which the total sum of the past counts for more than even the most exciting moments of the present.

It is just this influence of the accumulated past which is most perplexing. How are we to think of it? It is only a very small portion of a man's life of which he is conscious at any given moment; the vastly greater part he cannot recall, however much he tries. And yet, though lost, it is very far from being dead. Somewhere and somehow—and we know very little of either the 'where' or the 'how'—it lives on; and it not only lives, but is active. I ventured to describe this state of things by saying that the storehouse of the past—whatever it may be—'is not only a storehouse but a workshop.' Active processes are constantly going on in it. We cannot follow these processes, because they are withdrawn from consciousness; but we infer their existence from their effects. We know that an item of experience recalled rarely, if ever, comes back into consciousness in the same shape in which it left it. New combinations, new groupings, have happened to it. The sharp edges of the original experience are worn off, and it has been affected by other experiences, with which it would seem in some way or other to have come in

contact. Subtle changes have taken place—sometimes for good and sometimes for evil—which cause the new form of consciousness to differ from the old. There is progress of some sort, either in a right direction or in a wrong one. Plastic forces have been at work; one tendency is weakened as another is strengthened. It may be that old temptations lose their power, or it may be that they are stronger than ever. The principles that determine action may be fortified and enlarged, or they may lose the hold they had.

And a special point among these unconscious workings appears to be that they are not confined to the effects of one old experience upon another. There are influxes from without as well as decomposition and recomposition within. Of all such influxes the most important are those that we call divine, the influence of the Spirit of God. For it is here, more than anywhere, that processes elude us, and the process is known only by its effects. The 'fruits of the Spirit' are evident and palpable enough; but the fruit is one thing, the fructifying process is another. It is just as in nature—the bud and the flower catch the eye, but the bulb and the germ are hidden out of sight. The old saying holds good: 'The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth'; and the breathing of the Spirit is like that of the wind. I would not of course deny that there have been in the past and are at the present time very different degrees of sensitiveness to this breathing of the Spirit. There were holy men of old whose ears were so attuned to it, who by a special gift of God apprehended it so vividly and so strongly, that it was as though they heard the voice of God actually speaking to them; and they felt themselves authorized to pass on what they heard with the emphatic preface, 'Thus saith the Lord.' There have also been mystics in many ages who have seemed to themselves to hold direct communion with God. And there is doubtless a graduated scale downwards of experiences more or less approximating to these, in which holy living and concentrated self-discipline have made individual men and individual women more receptive than their fellows, so that what is unconscious or at most subconscious for the rest of the world enters more directly into consciousness with them. But for the average man and woman I think it must be said that these divine influences, though

very real, are not consciously apprehended at the time of their occurrence, but reveal themselves indirectly through their consequences.

In all that I have written on this subject I have had at the back of my mind the experience of the average man or woman in regard to *answers to prayer*. I have been thinking especially of those prayers which are most legitimate and most surely answered—prayers for help to resist temptation, for strength in the performance of duty, for the lifting of despondency, and for all the many ways in which men are raised above themselves and out of weakness are made strong. In such cases as these it does not often happen that the supplicant is conscious of any direct intervention of God. He will indeed rise from his knees in a calmer frame of mind; the habit of prayer, and the trustfulness which goes with such a habit, cannot fail of their effect in quieting for the time the troubled spirit. The humble Christian does not look for more than this; but he waits awhile, and the crisis passes. He does not know what has happened; but in some strange way the difficulties that seemed to beset him have vanished; the problem that seemed so unmanageable is solved; the thing that seemed so impossible is done.

Then again, it would, I imagine, be true to say that all the great changes that take place in men's lives have a comparatively long subconscious, and in part wholly unconscious, preparation. The conscious change, the deliberate and recognized change, is always of the nature of a culmination. Our ordinary ways of thinking and speaking of such changes are rough and wholesale, simply because the mind is not able to follow, or even guess, the subtle and delicate threads of influence and association which have led up to them. The processes are, as we say in a metaphor, 'underground'; they elude our analysis. The changes are sometimes of such a kind that we find ourselves compelled to assume a divine element in them; but the presence of this element is a matter of inference rather than of observation. It shades downwards by imperceptible degrees. The conscious processes lie, as it were, on the top; but we know very well that these are not all, that they would hardly be there if they had not been preceded and accompanied by other movements of which we are not conscious. Any one who turns his attention to the workings of the human mind

will be prepared for an almost infinite variety in the conditions. Some changes are to outward appearance violent, and come as the result of a bitter inward struggle. But this may be like the heaving of the waters in a storm; we do not know how far the lower depths are agitated. Perhaps a still better analogy would be that hidden ferment of microbes, crossing each other in an infinite variety of directions, sometimes helping and sometimes thwarting and counteracting each other, that we are told is perpetually going on within the human frame.

The kind of changes that I have in my mind are by no means confined to those which we are in the habit of calling 'conversions.' Many other changes take place in the course of a lifetime that are so gradual as to be hardly perceived at all, and yet may involve great and far-reaching alteration—changes of mental attitude and understanding. It is no uncommon thing for a man to have what seems to him a new light suddenly thrown back over wide spaces of his past; a multitude of points in that past assume a new significance; the facts remain as they were, but the interpretation put upon them, and the consequent attitude in regard to them, are wholly different. In cases of this kind, as in cases of conversion, we may be sure that the apparent 'suddenness' of the change is mainly subjective; it is perhaps rather a degree of emphasis in consciousness than any special abruptness in point of time. But the point on which I desire to lay stress is that, however important a mental or moral or spiritual change may be, we should have a most inadequate conception of its causes and antecedents if we were to confine ourselves to those which lie upon the surface of consciousness. It is true that prolonged introspection and dwelling upon the past may bring to light a good deal more than we began by suspecting. The will does seem to have this power of raking among the ashes of fires that are seemingly extinct. But, when all is done, there will remain a great deal that is quite mysterious; and mysterious chiefly because it has never definitely entered into consciousness, though it has supplied all along the primary impulse by which the conscious train of thought has been set in motion.

I will make bold to say that the sub- and unconscious elements in human life are the chief cause of the mystery in which it is involved. Our attempts at analysis fail us, more than anything

else, because when they reach a certain point the object that we are pursuing seems to vanish out of our ken. And yet we know that, although we cannot follow it, its flight is by no means ended; it has rather entered into a region in which countless influences are brought to bear upon it that are not faint and dead because they are invisible, but just as alive and active as anything that stirs our consciousness. Among these mysterious influences I feel sure, for reasons which I have given, that we must reckon in particular a large part of those which we are most inclined to set down as supernatural. It is the Spirit interceding with our spirit 'with groanings which cannot be uttered.' Some of these groanings, it is true, come to utterance; but St. Paul was certainly right in implying that numbers of them are never uttered, and that many are never even felt. The Holy Spirit works in its own hidden ways. As I have already said, its workings are known by their *fruits*, and not—or but imperfectly—by direct impression upon that part of the mind which is mirrored in the conscience. Once more I admit that there are all sorts of degrees—that there are some choice souls who by deliberate study and application of the will can realize more of what is going on within them than others. But the class that Wordsworth described is certainly a large one:

There are who ask not if thine eye
Be on them; who, in love and truth,
Where no misgiving is, rely
Upon the genial sense of youth:
Glad Hearts! without reproach or blot;
Who do thy work, and know it not. . . .

And even those who constitute the other class must often find their powers of self-analysis reaching their limits, and themselves 'moving about in worlds not realized.'

I do not want to speak too absolutely, or to draw any hard-and-fast lines. But I cannot help thinking that, if we take a survey of human life as a whole, we shall be aware of a tendency for much of it to shade off into mystery; for much of this mystery to be involved in the sub- and unconscious; and for a considerable part of these sub- and unconscious motions to run up into, or be directly associated with, what the Christian calls 'the indwelling of the Holy Ghost.'

But if this is so, then I think it will be natural to ask, and we shall be justified in asking, whether

in the life of our Lord Himself there may not have been something analogous to these phenomena. In the Person of our Lord there was in any case a great deal that is mysterious. And is it not true that, as we contemplate His Person, the mystery rises in proportion as we approach that side of His Being which to us is most inscrutable? And is not this inscrutability at its highest when we come to consider the relation of the Divine Son to the Divine Father, of the incarnate Christ to God?

We are sure that this relation constitutes the essence of His Being. But when we come to look at its expression in outward speech and act, we cannot help seeing that in fact it was attended by a great amount of reticence and reserve. The *Messiasgeheimnis*, of which Wrede made so much use in the way of destructive criticism, was no figment but a very real and very marked feature in our Lord's life. He did not proclaim His Messiahship from the housetops, but rather carefully avoided direct and public enunciation of it. It is true that He assumed its existence and gradually led on His disciples to recognize that He was the Messiah; but He seems to have wished that this recognition should come spontaneously from them and that it should not be put into their mouths. And when, at an advanced stage in His public ministry, their spokesman St. Peter broke out into a warm confession of the truth, he was commended indeed, but they were all bidden to keep their knowledge to themselves. Not until one of the very last scenes of all, the trial before the High Priest, did the definite question, 'Art thou the Christ?' receive a definite and affirmative answer.

This appears to be the key to the remarkable manner in which our Lord chose to refer to Himself, indirectly rather than directly and in the third person rather than in the first, as 'the Son of man.' That designation seemed exactly to suit the purpose for which it was used. A Jew who inquired into its history could not fail to see that it really pointed to the Messiah; but at the same time it was not a current synonym, frequently employed and universally understood. It seems to have been intended to half reveal and half conceal its own significance. As the inner circle of the disciples, so also the outer circle of those who saw and heard had its time of probation, its gradual education of which some availed themselves, though many did not.

This state of things has left its clear mark upon the Gospels, especially upon the Synoptics—for in the Fourth Gospel, where the events are looked back upon from a greater distance, the gradualness of the process has been somewhat, though not entirely, obliterated. In the earlier Gospels the allusions to our Lord's Messianic character and functions are almost all incidental and such as might easily be overlooked: 'I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil'; 'the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins'; 'A greater than Jonah . . . a greater than Solomon is here'; 'if I by the Spirit of God cast out devils, then is the kingdom of God come upon you'; 'Woe unto thee, Chorazin! woe unto thee, Bethsaida! for if the mighty works had been done in Tyre and Sidon which were done in you, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes'; 'Whosoever shall confess me before men, him will I also confess before my Father which is in heaven'—and many other sayings of the same kind.

I do not think I know any other feature in the Gospel reports of our Lord's teaching that speaks so strongly in favour of their substantial truth as this common quality that is found to run through them. It is surely most paradoxical that there should come a Teacher who himself by inference claimed, and for whom his followers claimed, that he played so momentous a part in the religious history of mankind, and yet that his own allusions to that part should be so subdued and guarded as they are. No other feature reflects so vividly the full freshness and originality of a teaching and a life that are beyond the reach of invention.

And yet, when we look at the Gospels broadly, and especially when we look at that eschatological aspect of them which has had so much light thrown upon it by recent research, I think we shall see how well and fitly these paradoxical features fall into their place. So long as it was supposed that the Messianic Coming of our Lord Jesus Christ was a single Act, begun and finished within the thirty odd years of His earthly life, there might seem to be a certain discrepancy or want of proportion between its real significance and its apparent manifestation. But as soon as it is clearly understood that the real Messianic Coming is a double Act, of which the earthly life is but the first preliminary part and the revelation of the

risen and living Lord the predestined complement and consummation, the apparent humiliation of what we have been in the habit of calling the First Advent is lost and absorbed in the grandeur and world-wide significance of its sequel, which will not be fulfilled until the knowledge of the Lord covers the earth as the waters cover the sea.

If we may presume to analyze—or attempt to analyze—the contents, so far as they are revealed to us, of the incarnate life of Christ upon earth, we should, I think, be led to some such gradually deepening impression as this. On the surface we should see—as the crowds who gathered around Him saw—those seemingly slender, veiled, incidental hints and intimations of confined and hidden majesty which are all that the Synoptic Gospels preserve for us. They were indeed sufficient for those who had ears to hear, for the wise who could penetrate beneath the surface, and grasp, if only in part, the sublime possibilities latent in that despised and rejected human form. But we should know that these recorded utterances were but a small part of the total self-revelation which our Lord made to those around Him during His sojourn upon earth. And we shall be sure that even that—the self-revelation which He permitted Himself to make—was but a small part of His total consciousness of the Divine within Him. Nor, if it had been possible to add together all the several items of that consciousness as they occurred, would even these exhaust the real significance of His Divine Nature. For, besides the waking consciousness present to His mind at any given moment, there were all the dormant impressions of the past, the full potentialities of the matured Divine self—that Divine Self which not only dwelt on the present and on the past, but which also ranged over a vast incalculable future. Truly, we stand appalled before the picture conjured up by our own imagination.

The fact that has to be realized, and that we are in danger of not realizing, is that the self is alive and active even when it is to all appearance asleep. Even the Messiah Himself could not have been exempt from that condition. The perpetual influx from above which constituted His Messiahship was not confined to conscious states, but was going on just as much behind the screen of the unconscious. If among ourselves there are certainly workings of this kind on no inconsiderable scale, we may be sure that in Him who was

made in all points like as we are there must have been similar workings, however much they may have been magnified and glorified. No doubt there are wide differences of degree even amongst us men as to the power of calling up into consciousness these deep and hidden impressions. We may well believe that the Messiah had a supreme and unparalleled power of exercising this command over the latent forces of His being. But that does not mean that they came to Him in any different manner, by any fundamentally different avenues or channels. If we may for a moment speak of the 'sphere' of these Divine workings, it was the same kind of sphere for Him that it is for us—a region of roots and processes rather than of manifested expression.

We remember how St. Paul, when he is comparing the Christian society to the bodily organism, is careful not to raise questions of precedence, but balances part against part: 'Those members of the body which seem to be more feeble are necessary: and those parts of the body, which we think to be less honourable, upon these we bestow more abundant honour; and our uncomely parts have more abundant comeliness; whereas our comely parts have no need: but God tempered the body together, giving more abundant honour to that part which lacked; that there should be no schism in the body; but that the members should have the same care one for another' (1 CO 12²²⁻²⁵). It is idle to debate degrees of dignity, where every part contributes something that is essential to the economy of the whole. So is it precisely in the more spiritual context. We do not need to ask whether one section of psychology is more honourable than another; what we really need is to watch the living interaction by which part works in with part and the whole attains to the fulness of the stature of the perfect man.

May I say with all reverence that I would not adopt any other attitude in contemplating the Person of our Lord Jesus Christ? I am quite willing to be criticised for drawing harder lines than I should have done. I should wish any language that I may have used to be discounted to any extent that may be right. But I still cannot help thinking that behind what I wrote there was a nucleus of substantial truth. If in any sense it can be truly said that the Divine enters into man from below and spreads upwards and outwards, in the same kind of sense I must

needs think that it is legitimate to use similar language of our Lord.

In this lies the likeness. But there was also unlikeness—which, just because it is unlikeness, withdraws itself from our powers of observation and description. When St. Paul is speaking of the Divine indwelling in Christ, he says: 'For in Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily' (Col 2⁹; cf. 1¹⁹). The Apostle would not have written thus of any child of man. We must leave the phrase as it is, and let it stand for something that we are not able to define further.

I have avoided as much as possible the use of metaphor, and especially of local metaphor. I used it freely when I first wrote, partly following in the track of other writers, and partly because I hoped that in this way my meaning would be more readily apprehended. I do not, however, think that the use of such metaphors is really necessary. The main point is that certain phenomena of which we have evidence are conscious, others subconscious, and others again not conscious at all. I have tried, so far as I could, to make these distinctions serve my purpose.

At the same time I must not be supposed to yield in principle to those of my critics who would bar the use, in matters of psychology, of 'spatial and material metaphors' altogether. It seems to me quite impossible to do this. Whatever might be true of another state of being, it seems to me that in the present state of which we have experience, our souls—ourselves, whatever they may be

—are certainly in space. They are bounded by the body, and we carry them about with us in the body wherever we go; they are affected by changes that happen to the body; apart from this embodied state, anything that we may say about them must be highly speculative, and with such speculations we are not at present concerned.

Neither can I conceive that the picturesque language which has got into general use, about 'the subliminal' and the like, is really to be tabooed. People use it, and it conveys a meaning. It has a meaning for the speaker, and it awakes a corresponding meaning in the person addressed. In other words, it rests on both sides upon real experience; and although it does not exactly coincide with that experience, it must have at least a certain relative rightness in regard to it. It holds good as far as it goes; it is knowledge limited and qualified by conditions that are unknown to us.

This is what I have to say in self-defence. The element of 'self' in this defence is very subordinate. It does not matter to the world at large whether I, as an individual, am right or wrong; but it does matter whether the facts to which I have sought to give expression are right or wrong. And that must be my excuse for returning to the subject and stating my case once more. It is probable that this will be my last word, and I shall in any case look on the course of further discussion with equanimity.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL.

JOHN III. 8.

The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the voice thereof, but knowest not whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit.—R. V.

1. SUCH were the words of Christ to a man who had regarded the doctrine of the new birth of the soul as an apparent impossibility. To Nicodemus the emphatic assertion, 'Ye must be born again,' came with all the novelty of a voice from another world. He could not understand it, and stood in

startled unbelief before its mystery. Christ met at once the objection to its mystery by pointing him to a similar wonder in the world of nature.

Perhaps a gust of night wind swept round the chamber where Nicodemus sat listening to Jesus, and gave occasion for this condensed parable. But there is sufficient occasion for it in the word 'Spirit,' which, both in the language in which our Lord addressed the ruler of the Sanhedrin and in that which John employed in recording the conversation, as in our own English, means both 'spirit' and 'breath.' This double signification of the word gives rise to the analogies in the text, and it also raises the question as to the