

the organic is not superimposed from without. The rise, however, is the evidence of an increased flow of energy from the primal source, and is, therefore, supernatural and not natural. This, at least, is the conclusion which a reading of the story of evolution forces upon us. Every attempt to repeat this rise by means of the powers and resources within the lower has failed, and so far as we are able to see must be regarded as impossible. The term supernatural, therefore, must be regarded, not as that which contradicts the natural, nor as that which acts apart from the natural, but as that which transcends the natural but manifests itself within the area of the natural. In this sense the whole Universe is interpenetrated with the supernatural. Not only the great lines which mark the transition from the lifeless to life and from unconscious to conscious life, but all the lines which mark the rise from lower to higher are witnesses to the indwelling of God and reveal stages in His self-manifestation. If evolution reveals to us the immanence of God it is at the same time the revelation of a God Who transcends the Universe in which He is manifested.

While evolution shows that Man is connected with all that is beneath him, it does not, when rightly interpreted, make him the product of all that is below him. He is from above, as well as from below; a part of the Universe, but akin to God. Like the whole of nature he is a manifesta-

tion of God, but he is the highest manifestation. That which we call the descent of man is, strictly speaking, the ascent of the Divine life to its present culminating point on this planet, Man. God in humanity, therefore, is the highest revelation of God which has yet been made to us. If we are to conceive of God at all, therefore, we are compelled to take the highest manifestation, Man, as the image of the invisible God. We must of necessity conceive of God as more than Man, but we cannot conceive of Him as less. Xenophanes, one of the earliest to denounce anthropomorphism, is reported to have declared that "if oxen and lions had hands with which to depict and execute human works of art, the oxen would draw the figures of the gods like oxen, and would give them bodies like their own." This, however, is extremely doubtful. It is far more likely that they would depict them as men, for the oxen have something higher than themselves by means of which they could depict their conception of the Highest. Man, however, is of necessity compelled to conceive of God in his own image, for he has no experience of anything higher in which he can conceive Him. In spite of all his imperfections, Man is the highest representation of God of which we have any experience. Even the Positive philosophy can only substitute Humanity as an object of worship, in place of the God it rejects.

While modern Theism acknowledges the relation of Man to the Universe, which the evolution theory depicts, it recognises a relation of Man to God which it is its special province to define. Whatever the relation may be, the Theist is determined to stand by the facts as they are manifested, for he realises that, apart from the revealed facts, no knowledge is possible. If the revelation cannot be trusted to give us a true knowledge of the reality underlying the manifestation, then knowledge is for ever beyond us. What, then, are the facts which are revealed in Man's constitution, and by which every theory of his relation to the Universe and to God must be judged? They are the foundation rock upon which Man's mental and moral constitution rests, and apart from which Man would not be Man. This rock is the consciousness of the self as a centre, separate and distinct from everything else, and the consciousness of a power proceeding from that centre by virtue of which the self determines its own actions within the restricted sphere of its influence. It is by virtue of the existence of a self standing in relation to an other-than-self that any knowledge is possible; and it is by virtue of a will standing in relation to another Will that any morality is possible. Theism recognises that the logic of fact is more imperative than the logic of theory. Any system, however logically deduced, which contradicts these facts of self-consciousness is *ipso*

facto untenable. Reason demands that our explanations of the Universe shall be self-consistent, but it demands with even greater insistence that they shall take in all the facts. The Theist parts company with the Pantheist because, however logical and self-consistent the Pantheistic system may be, it fails utterly to explain the facts of our consciousness. If he is compelled to choose between an illogical system of thought and an unreal universe of fact, he has no hesitation in deciding against the unreal universe. It is in this decision that the Theist differs from the Pantheist. The Pantheist is prepared to deny the validity of the facts of self-consciousness in the interests of his theory. The Theist, on the other hand, is prepared to bring his system into line with the facts.

While Theism can never consent to the identification of the human with the Divine, it has the fullest sympathy with that consciousness of likeness to God and that aspiration after union with Him, which are characteristic of Pantheistic feeling. Modern Theistic thought, therefore, rejects as inadequate all such conceptions of humanity which reduce it to a mere created work of God. It seeks for some other term which will convey a truer and more adequate conception of the likeness which exists, and the union which is desired between God and man. It recognises something which is Divine in every man, and

believes that this something, however minute or undeveloped, is the very essence of that ideal humanity which is yet to be. It does not shut its eyes to the actual man, as he is revealed both in the past and in the present, but it refuses to regard the actual as the real man. It believes that Man is in process of becoming; that his evolution is not complete, and that the ideal which his nature prophesies, is the Man that shall yet be realised. Recognising that all our conceptions must be anthropomorphic, it finds in the relation of child and parent the highest expression of the relation of man to God. Like every illustration this is imperfect, but it represents better than any other that likeness combined with difference which the relation between the human and Divine demands. We cannot identify the two, as every Pantheistic system is compelled to do, but we can and indeed we must recognise that in the truest perception of what humanity is there is something which is akin to Divinity. The highest relationship of which we have any experience is kinship. It is, of course, always possible for any one to say that our conception of God is nothing more than the conception of a magnified man. Such an assertion, however, ignores the whole spiritual experience of the race. If that spiritual experience is admitted as of equal value with all other experience, then the kinship of man and God is established. It is only through our likeness to

the Universe, the similarity, that is, between our bodies and what we call matter, that communication with it and the resulting knowledge are possible. In the same way it is only through our likeness to God, the similarity, that is, between our soul and God, that communication with Him and the knowledge resulting therefrom are possible. The basis of both is the same. The experience of the soul is just as real and just as valid as the experience of the body.

While it is necessary to recognise the likeness between Man and God, it is essential to acknowledge the difference. The distinction is just as real as the likeness. If we were unable to distinguish between the two, we should be just as much cut off from any knowledge as if there were no likeness. All true knowledge is the perception both of likeness and of difference. If our will were one with the Will of God, in the sense of being identical with it, morality would be impossible, and all distinction between right and wrong, good and evil, would vanish. Professor Deussen in his *Philosophy of the Upanishads* says: "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself, is the requirement of the Bible. But on what ground is this demand to be based, since feeling is in myself alone and not in another? Because the Veda here adds its explanation—thy neighbour is in truth thy very self, and what separates you from him is mere illusion." The explanation of

the duty which is here offered is of such a kind as to annihilate the duty it seeks to explain. The true reason, according to Professor Deussen, why I am to love my neighbour is that he does not really exist. If my neighbour is in truth my very self, then in loving myself I am in very truth loving my neighbour. Utter selfishness and complete altruism are consequently one and the same thing. If it be replied that to love the self in such a case would be to love a limited and not the real self, then we must ask how can we know this true self except by recognising the reality of the neighbour whose separateness from myself calls out my love? Moreover, is not the reality of the distinction essential to any expression of love at all? Have we any knowledge of a love which has no object to be loved? Professor Deussen confines himself to the first half of the moral law, but on exactly the same principle the other half of the moral law is abolished likewise. Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, is the first commandment, according to Christ's summary; the second, the love of one's neighbour, being like unto it. Adopting Professor Deussen's Vedantic commentary we should have to add: Because God is in truth thy very self and what separates you from Him is mere illusion. If God is in truth my very self, then in loving myself I am in very truth loving God. The basis, therefore, of all religion, as of all morality, vanishes

completely and selfishness reigns supreme. The principle of identity between myself and God and myself and my neighbour is the absolute destruction both of religion and morality. To make the distinction a mere illusion is to make both religion and morality equally illusory.

How, then, it may be asked, does Theism, while admitting all that is at the basis of Pantheistic feeling and that finds expression in religion and in morality, avoid the rock upon which every Pantheistic system is inevitably wrecked? It does it by fully admitting the reality and validity of the fundamental facts of self-consciousness, and by constructing a theory of Man's relation to God which accounts for the distinction between them. It sees in Man's constitution a repetition of a principle which is characteristic of the whole cosmic process. That principle is the principle of centralisation. The whole Universe seems to be built up by the formation of separate and semi-independent centres, which, from the moment of their formation until their final dissolution, become what we can only describe as centres of power, to which all the operations carried on within the circle of their influence must be referred to that particular centre as their true cause. The sun is the centre of the solar system and the movements of the planets are determined by it. Each of the planets, however, is also a centre determining the movements within the area of its influence. The

earth has its own centre of gravity determining the movements of all bodies within the area of its influence. On the earth itself innumerable other centres are found, which in like manner determine all movements within the smaller area of their influence. This principle of centralisation is met with everywhere. In the case of Man it reaches its highest expression, and in the will we find a centre of directive energy with a very wide range of influence. Man is dependent, in that he is not self-originated, but he is independent, in that he is self-directed. The energy within him is both a centrifugal and a centripetal force, and in this action and reaction the character of the centre, or rather of the force at the centre, is continually undergoing modification, so that a man's character is the result both of what he is and of what he does. It is this self-determination which is meant by the freedom of the will. This freedom does not mean that a man's actions are undetermined by any motive; it means that the true cause is not without, but within the centre which we call the man. It implies that the character of that life-force which centres in the individual is not determined solely by either what it is in itself or by external influences, but by all the movements which proceed from and return to, that independent centre which we call the self, which is constantly being modified in the process. Man is both an effect and a cause. As

an effect every individual is the result of all the causes to which he owes his existence from God all the way down to his immediate parents. At birth, however, he becomes a more or less independent centre, with all the possibilities and potentialities which constitute him an individual or a self.

This conception of centralisation enables us to see how the Divine and the human blend in our common humanity. Life or soul or spirit, whatever name we may apply to that which is our very essence, by virtue of which we are, is one with the life of God. It is, as it were, God's life gathered at a centre which by that very centralisation becomes distinct, contains within it the power of self-determination, and is thereby able to direct its own operations either in harmony with or in opposition to the mind and will of God. Whatever may be said for this conception of centralisation, one thing must be admitted, namely, that in the conception it gives of Man's nature it is in harmony with the facts of self-consciousness. It presents us with a self and an other-than-self, with a will and an other Will—the two foundation stones upon which all knowledge and all morality are built. At the same time it offers a feasible explanation of that Divinity which is an essential feature of humanity. It is, moreover, in harmony with all that we know of the nature of the vast cosmic process of which we form a

part. It is, of course, nothing more than an illustration, and like every illustration, it can easily be strained to the breaking point. It is useful, however, as an illustration in enabling us to see that the Theistic position is a reasonable *via media* between Pantheism and Deism.

The theory of evolution is not to be identified with any materialistic philosophy. It is a theory which Science has formulated on the basis of the facts which it has investigated, but true Science is not committed to any school of philosophy. Each school is welcome to take its theory and make what use it pleases of it so long as it does not alter the facts to suit its own special theories. Theism adopts the evolutionary theory and sees in it the clearest evidence of the Divine Mind. It regards man as the crown of the evolutionary process, not merely because of his body, but supremely because of his mind. Man, however, is not a duality of soul and body for each of which a separate origin must be sought. He is a unity of soul and body. Christian theology has conceived of the origin of the soul in three distinct ways, called respectively, the doctrines of Pre-existence, Creationism and Traducianism. Pre-existence is practically the same as the Hindu conception, apart, of course, from the theory of transmigration. Creationism regards the soul as a direct creation of God at the time of conception. Traducianism regards the soul as originated con-

temporaneously with the body, and as coming from the parents. The doctrine of Pre-existence has always had a great fascination for the speculative mind, and Origen, one of the greatest of the Greek theologians, adopted it. As a speculation it is ingenious and attractive, but it creates more difficulties than it solves.

In India, where it is associated with the doctrine of transmigration, its chief attractiveness lies in the superficial explanation it affords of the inequalities of life. The explanation, however, is merely the removal of the difficulty into a sphere which is still darker than that in which the mystery first confronts us. If we ask how the soul first contracted the sin for which its series of later existences is the expiation, no answer is forthcoming. The whole theory is based upon the supposition that everything which is regarded as unfortunate is the punishment for some transgression. Such a theory, however, is opposed to the facts of experience. Circumstances, which in themselves may be regarded as untoward, are frequently found to be distinctly beneficial, while others, which in themselves are unfavourable and undesirable, result in effects which are just as distinctly harmful both to the individual and the race. If it be said that punishment is itself remedial and that, therefore, the untoward circumstances are intended to prove beneficial, then what is to be said for the favourable circumstances

which are regarded as a reward for good conduct, since these just as often turn out to be harmful? On such a principle of rewards and punishments the sinner is helped forward and the saint is just as likely to be thrown backward. The doctrine offers an explanation of the inequalities of life which violates our sense of justice. It is a mechanical theory applied to a sphere where the mechanical is utterly out of place. The fact is, the theory is an early attempt on the part of man to solve a dark problem, and as such it is both interesting and instructive. When, however, it is put forward as the highest wisdom, a communication from superior beings, its claims must be submitted to reason and, when so submitted, are found to be fallacious. That it is a speculation of primitive man is proved by the fact that it is found amongst races whose intellectual development is of the most meagre kind. The absence of the doctrine of transmigration from the Vedas, upon which most scholars are agreed, points to the fact that its real origin is to be found among the aboriginals of India whom the Aryans replaced. In the Upanishads the crude belief has been developed into a philosophical doctrine and as such occupies a far more exalted place in Hinduism than it does in the crude beliefs of uncivilised races. Its true habitat, however, is not Aryavarta, the original home of the Aryans—whose conception of life is very

different from that found amongst their descendants in India—but India itself, where it must have existed long before the Aryans settled in the land.

Modern Theosophy has sought to enlist the services of the evolution theory in support of the doctrine of reincarnation. A careful comparison of the two conceptions, however, will show that the resemblances are purely superficial, while there is a fundamental difference which renders them irreconcilable. According to the theory of evolution Man is a unity, the resultant of a process of gradual development. The Theosophical conception of Man is essentially that of a duality of soul and body, each having a separate origin. The child is only the child of its parents so far as its body is concerned; its soul has an entirely different origin. The doctrine of reincarnation is supposed to explain, among other things, far more perfectly than the scientific theory of evolution and the law of heredity, the appearance of what is called genius. Theosophy admits that the law of heredity is capable of explaining similarities in bodily structure, but not in what are called mental faculties. The child's bodily organism is due to the parent, but his mind and soul are the result of his previous incarnation. Hence, when a musical genius appears his genius is the result of his previous life as a musician. There are cases, however, in which genius seems

to run in a family. Theosophy replies that this is due to the Lords of Karma who direct the reincarnation of the soul of the musician into a family which is musical. We are not here concerned with the ingenuity thus displayed in making use of facts when they are convenient, and dropping them when they are not, but with the principle of intervention from without, which this reference to the directing function of the Lords of Karma reveals. Such a principle is entirely inconsistent with the fundamental principle of scientific evolution. Theosophy may, of course, claim that it has a very much more adequate conception of evolution than the scientific one, and that this action of the Lords of Karma is quite consistent with such a principle of evolution. That is as it may be. We are not concerned with the theosophical theory, but with the scientific. Between this latter and Theosophy there is a fundamental difference, and consequently it is inadmissible to appeal to the scientific theory in support of the doctrine of reincarnation. Science emphasises the essential unity of man's nature and is utterly opposed to every dualistic theory of the separate origin of soul and body. It is not a question of matter *versus* spirit, nor of conceiving of man as nothing more than physical ; it is solely a question as to whether he is a unity rather than a duality, and on this question Science pronounces unhesitatingly in favour of unity.

The evolutionary hypothesis renders another great service to Theistic thought in the explanation it suggests of the difficult problem of moral evil. The Biblical doctrine of the Fall is the recognition of a fact of universal experience, whatever may be thought of its explanation of the fact, and entirely apart from the allegory in the early chapters of Genesis. The fact of moral evil is too patent to need any proof. It is the denial of the fact which taxes ingenuity to explain it away. While the fact, however, is admitted, the explanation of the fact, and the exact nature of the fact, are looked at in very different ways as a Theistic or a Non-Theistic standpoint is taken. From the Non-Theistic standpoint moral evil is nothing more than a necessary stage in human development. Sin is merely the mark of imperfect development. Whatever truth there is in this statement of the case, it is impossible to accept the statement as it stands, for it fails to give either a true description of moral evil, or a satisfactory explanation of its appearance. The chief cause of its failure is due to an inaccurate and unscientific observation of the essential distinction between a physical and a moral defect. Such a theory means that the thief is merely an imperfectly developed man, whose brain is suffering from some physical malformation which makes him insensible to the distinction between *meum* and *tuum*. He is no more to be blamed than the cow which breaks through the

hedge and feeds on the standing crops. Just as you put the blame of the trespass on the owner of the cow, and not on the cow, so if blame is legitimate at all in such a case, it ought to be put on Nature for so imperfectly developing the man. Strictly speaking, of course, on such an hypothesis there is no such thing as blame at all.

The theory has only to be stated to refute itself. It is not a theory which explains facts, but one which ignores all facts opposed to it. The very essence of moral evil is in the consciousness that the act is one which *ought not* to be done, and which there is no compulsion to do. It is only because of this sense of oughtness that the conception of blame attaches itself to the man who has either left undone what he ought to have done, or done what he ought not. Guilt is not the mere sense of imperfection and incompleteness; it is the sense of a failure which was preventable. Remorse is not the pain we feel for non-attainment; it is the sting we feel for having done what we know we need not have done. The theory which regards moral evil, therefore, as a necessity and undeserving of any blame is inconsistent with the whole of human practice in its treatment of sin and leaves unexplained the feelings of guilt and remorse. There is, however, a certain amount of truth in the theory, but it is strictly proportioned to the extent to which the

theory is in harmony with the evolutionary hypothesis. The presence of moral evil does mark a stage in human evolution, and sin is undoubtedly a mark of imperfect development. In the process of evolution the moment we reach the point where consciousness emerges, we arrive at a different plane of existence, and the facts which meet us on this plane cannot be explained by laws which confront us on a lower plane. Life-movements cannot be explained by physical laws of motion. The presence of the cow in the field of maize cannot be explained by the force of gravity acting on the cow's body so that it descended into the field down an inclined plane. The stubborn fact confronts you *that it walked uphill*. On the higher plane of conscious life again, the action of the cow in taking the grain yields no explanation of the action of the thief who walks off with the bag of rice. In dealing with physical and moral defects we are moving on different planes of existence, and the laws of the one are inapplicable to the other.

From the Theistic standpoint moral evil is a misdirection of energy from a new directing centre, Man, with his capacities for direction in his mind and will. For the origin of this misdirection, therefore, we do not go beyond the centre from which it proceeds. A telegram is sent off from some place in the West to some other place in the East, and it is subsequently

discovered that a serious error has taken place in transmission. It has probably passed through half a dozen different centres in the course of its transmission. We trace the error to, say, the third centre where the record shows that it was correctly received but incorrectly transmitted. The error originated there and the inquiry is at an end. The real reason for the misdirection at that centre may be inexplicable, but we stop the inquiry just because we know that we have arrived at a centre which is sufficient in itself to account for the error. In stopping the inquiry we are not evading a difficulty, but accepting a sufficient cause. In attributing sin to its true centre, the directing will of Man, Theism is not evading a difficulty by cutting short an inquiry. It is simply emphasising the fact that in Man you have a mind and a will which are sufficient in themselves to account for the possibility of moral evil. That the possibility is an inevitability is a pure supposition which the existence of the sense of guilt and remorse emphatically refutes. Theism, however, does not even stop the inquiry short when it affirms that sin originates with the self. It feels that the inquiry can be continued, and in the evolution theory, rightly interpreted, it finds considerable light upon the problem. Evolution shows us that while Man is more than the animal, he has been evolved from the animal and still retains many of the characteristics of the animal.

With the appearance of self-consciousness there appears the faculty of contemplating several aims and of discriminating as to their relative value. In man, therefore, mere desire is not the sole impelling force as it is in the case of the lower animals. Desire, moreover, is not simple, but complex. The mind has the power of contrasting one aim with another and of deciding between two or more desirable results. In addition to this it has also, in however small a degree, the consciousness of a Will other than and higher than its own, which sets its approval on the choice of the higher rather than the lower aim. This other Will is in no sense a compelling force, but it is distinctly an influencing power, urging always and at all times a decision in favour of the higher and nobler aim. The evolution of the moral, therefore, is a continuation of the evolution of the physical, and it proceeds by means of the same mutual action of environment and organism. The animal desires which man shares with the lower creation have their use, but they are no longer solely concerned with merely physical aims. In the higher evolution of Man the emergence of the moral ideal is a necessary stage in the process. Unless a distinction between desires, and between the various ways of satisfying them, were present, Man would remain an animal and nothing but an animal. The perception of such differences, however, would be useless unless with the percep-

tion went the ability to determine which should be followed. You cannot, however, have the capacity to choose without having also the possibility of choosing the lower rather than the higher. The evolution of the moral and spiritual means the rise of the animal into the moral and spiritual, and the very nature of the moral means that the rise must be effected, and can only be effected, by the conscious rejection of the lower in favour of the higher. Sin, therefore, is just such a rejection on the part of one who sees the higher and yet chooses the lower. It is on this account that it is always accompanied by more or less of shame and remorse. In the evil choice the self having heard the still small voice of that other Will, into the consciousness of Whose existence it has risen, decides to remain what it is and rejects the opportunity of rising to higher heights.

Such, in brief, is the explanation which Theism gives of those fundamental facts of self-consciousness which Pantheism rejects. Modern theology has modified its explanation so as to bring it into line with increased knowledge and it is prepared to modify it still more as knowledge increases. The modifications indicated show that it has approached far nearer to Pantheistic feeling than the older thought, but they emphasise quite as distinctly the essential distinction from all truly Pantheistic systems. While Theism is a *via media* between Deism and Pantheism, there is no *via media*

between Theism and Pantheism. The reason is, that there is no *via media* between accepting and rejecting the facts of self-consciousness. Modern Theism is not committed to any particular explanation of the facts, but it is absolutely committed to an acceptance of the facts. Every true Pantheistic system is just as absolutely committed to their rejection, for they can find no room in any true Pantheism. It needs to be remembered, however, that the choice between Theism and Pantheism does not turn upon religious feeling, but solely on the admission of perceived facts. The true dividing line is not a religious, but a philosophical one. True Pantheistic religious feeling finds full expression in modern Theism and not in Pantheism, for a consistent and logical Pantheism is the destruction of all religious feeling worthy of the name. Both religion and morality depend for their vitality on the real distinction between the individual self and the Supreme Self, between the individual will and the Supreme Will. To deny this real distinction is to deny the reality both of religion and morality. The various prismatic colours are no doubt all resolvable into the single ray of colourless light, but they are not on that account to be identified with each other. The prism which separates is as much a reality as the single ray of light, and the differences, therefore, are equally real. You may deny the reality of the different colours, but you cannot at the same time claim to be the patron and

guardian of Painting, which depends for its very existence on the variety of colour. There is a truth in Pantheism, but its adoption as a system means the destruction and not the preservation of both morality and religion.

CHAPTER VI

THE PERSONALITY OF JESUS

IN the preceding chapters we have considered the philosophic basis of Religion conceived of as essentially Theistic. In such a basis, while there is nothing which is inconsistent with Christianity, there is nothing which is distinctive of it. It might be the Theism of a modern Mahommedan or of a modern Hindu of the type represented by the Brahmo Somaj. The religious ideas and conceptions are characteristic of Religion itself, and are not identified with any particular or special aspect of religion. We now proceed to deal with Religion as it has found expression in Christianity. The question as to whether Christianity is Religion or only one of several religions will depend entirely upon whether its facts are of universal or only of particular significance. This can only be decided by examining the facts themselves, and of these facts the supreme one is the personality of Jesus.

That which distinguishes Christianity from every religion is in its being founded on the personality of Jesus. Other religions have had founders,

but the personality of the founders has not been the foundation of the religions. Christianity, like other systems, has its theology, but that theology is based on the revelation of God in the person of Jesus. Take away the personality of Jesus from Christianity, and everything which is distinctive of Christianity vanishes. In the founding of other religions the personalities of the founders have been important factors, but as systems of religion they are independent of the personality of their founders. Confucianism is the teaching of Confucius, but it is not the interpretation of the personality of Confucius. Buddhism is the way which Sakya Muni discovered, but the Way has nothing to do with his personality. Mahomedanism is an absolute and uncompromising monotheism of which Mahommed is the prophet, but monotheism is totally unconnected with the personality of the prophet. In Christianity, on the other hand, the personality of Jesus provides the data out of which its theology is constructed. Strictly speaking Jesus is not the founder of Christianity; He is its foundation. The knowledge of God and of the relation between God and Man, which is distinctive of Christianity, is based upon the belief that while no one has seen God at any time, in Jesus we have a personality which reveals Him. Whether such a belief is admitted or not, is not the question which at present concerns us. We are seeking to define the essential feature

of Christianity, and that essential feature is the person of Jesus as the supreme manifestation of God. Christian theology has many affinities with the doctrines of other religions, but it differs from every other in the fact that the constructive element in its theology is an historic personality who is regarded as the manifestation of the invisible God. This claim, however it may be interpreted, or whatever may be thought of its validity, is the distinguishing feature of Christianity and differentiates it from other religions.

This essential feature of Christianity causes the problem of the historicity of Jesus to occupy a far more important position than the historicity of the founders of other religions. The lives of Confucius, of Buddha and of Mahommed are of great interest to their followers, but they are in no sense essential to the religions. In Christianity, on the other hand, the life of Jesus is vital to the religion. The place of the Gospels in the New Testament is not an arbitrary one. They stand first because the life they record is the true message of Christianity to the religious life and thought of the world. Apart from the life there is no gospel, and apart from the gospel of the life of Jesus there is no Christianity. In thus emphasising the importance of the life of Jesus, there is no intention of ignoring or under-estimating the teaching of Jesus. In Christianity, however, the teaching is unmistakably subordinate to the life. The teach-

ing of Jesus, of inestimable value though it is, is but the commentary ; it is the life which is the text. It is significant that even in the Johannine writings, where so much is made of the exalted Christ, it is the manifested life of Jesus which is the dominating factor. "The Life was manifested, and we have seen and bear witness and declare unto you the Eternal Life which was with the Father and was manifested unto us. The Word became flesh and dwelt among us, and we beheld His glory, glory as of the only-begotten from the Father, full of grace and truth."

The supreme position which the life of Jesus occupies in Christianity explains and justifies the importance of that critical research which has been expended on the materials which are available in the New Testament for the construction of an accurate and historical life of Jesus. If a life was manifested which was so full of grace and truth, that those who saw it felt that they beheld a glory as of the only-begotten Son, then every endeavour must be made to enable us to see what they saw and feel what they felt. It is the truest reverence which demands that the materials shall be submitted to the most searching criticism in order that we may see, not merely the Jesus of an evolved faith but, the Jesus Who evolved the faith. In a very real sense the Jesus Who created the faith is greater than any Jesus Who is merely the creation of the faith. Historical criticism is engaged in

bringing to light a greater Jesus than the Jesus of faith. To do this, however, it must, for the time being at least, set aside everything which bears evidence of later reflection, and confine itself to what may be called contemporary impression. This does not at all mean that the later reflection is unimportant, but that the foundation must be the actual revelation which was made at the time in the life that was then lived. It was upon that impression that Christian faith was built and, though the later reflection is necessary for a true Christian theology, it is the actual life which is fundamental. The reflected light of faith is of great value for theology, but it is the actual light of the glory of God, as seen in the person of Jesus, which generates the faith. Criticism is right in disregarding the halo, but a true criticism will account for the appearance of the halo in the portraits. The modern portrait of Jesus will show us the face without the halo, but to be a true portrait it must by so much the more put into the face that Divine glory of the actual Jesus which produced the halo of the ideal Christ of Art.

Questions of historical criticism lie outside the range of the present inquiry, but it is necessary to indicate the position taken in regard to them. That position is one of full acceptance of the method known as the Higher Criticism, and a frank recognition of assured results. If the supreme revelation of God has come to the world

in the person of Jesus, every effort to reproduce that revelation as it actually was, cannot but be welcome. The results, however, of the application of the critical method must themselves be tested by their ability to account for the faith which has grown up out of that supreme revelation. This question is not one upon which the expert in criticism is alone entitled to speak. The layman is equally entitled to form an opinion. Historic Christianity is indissolubly connected with the historic Jesus, and the figure of the latter must be adequate to account for the former. It is especially necessary to remember this when the meagre and fragmentary character of the materials which are available for the construction of the figure of the historic Jesus is taken into account. The Gospels are not biographies, in the modern sense of the word ; they are but character sketches. As such they are of the greatest value for the purpose of arriving at a clear conception of the personality of Jesus. Like the impressionist sketch they give us a more realistic representation of the actual than the elaborate and finished portrait in oils. The difference between the Synoptists and the Johannine writer is very much the difference between an impressionist sketch and an Academy picture. In the Synoptic Gospels the rough sketches have probably been touched up by later hands and in the light of later reflection. Attempts have been made to turn them into

more finished portraits, but underlying them there is the unmistakable sketch of the impressionist. In the Fourth Gospel, on the other hand, we have evidently the oil portrait which has been turned out of the studio. The figure is painted in the robes of office and wears the insignia of Divinity. In comparing a number of cartoons with the Academy picture of any public man, the differences and contradictions are most marked, and more so in the case of one of strong individuality. The face, however, in all is unmistakable, and the differences do but reveal the strong and varied personality of the subject.

One of the results, but by no means a necessary result, of the work of the Higher Criticism has been to over-estimate the value of the Synoptic sketches, almost to the exclusion of the Johannine and Pauline portraitures. The Synoptic sketches are invaluable, but they are only sketches. A portrait, however, is no less necessary to the twentieth than to the second century. The twentieth-century portrait, though based on the first-century sketches, may fall as much short of a true presentation of the actual Jesus, as the second- or third-century portrait may seem to exceed it. In some of the modern portraits there is not only no halo round the face; there is no glory in the face. As we look at them we wonder wherever the halo came from. In the revolt from the mere theological doctrine of the Person of

Christ, some modern writers have given us a Jesus destitute of any real personality. "The Galilean peasant" is in some cases so entirely a peasant, that the fact that he ever became anything more is inexplicable. We cannot treat the Synoptic Gospels as though they were the only sources available for a true estimate of the personality of Jesus. The whole of the New Testament writings are based upon two factors which are equally important. Those two factors are the impression which the personality of Jesus produced at the time and the reflection on the meaning of the personality. The first is the dominating factor in the Synoptists; the second is the prominent feature in the other New Testament writings. The two are equally necessary and neither can be correctly estimated apart from the other. The older theology was no doubt almost entirely dominated by the second, and in the reaction we are in danger of being enslaved by the first. We are dependent upon the disciples of Jesus for any estimate we may form of the personality of Jesus. They are the witnesses upon whose evidence we must rely. It is, however, a most extraordinary canon of criticism to rule out everything which is due to later reflection and confine the attention solely to the immediate impression. A sound criticism will take account of both, but it will be dominated by neither. A Jesus isolated from historic Chris-

tianity is as much a travesty of the original as the most idealised Christ of theological speculation. It is, of course, self-evident that the exalted Christ in Whom the disciples subsequently believed is an entirely different figure from the historic Jesus with Whom they companied. but it is equally self-evident that the former arose out of the latter. Later reflection may doubtless colour the record of the impression, but the bare impression will just as truly fail to represent the original. For proving the reality of a fact the eye-witness is essential, but for revealing the significance of the fact the reflective mind is needed. Both are found in the New Testament, and for estimating the personality of Jesus both are needed.

Historical criticism has rendered invaluable service to Christianity in rescuing the figure of Jesus from the region of myth into which an older theology had done much to consign it. It has succeeded, however, by a method of rigidly excluding everything which could possibly be regarded as due to the creation of a worshipping faith, and laying bare a substratum of indisputable fact upon which Christianity rests. In thus exposing the actual and indisputable foundation it has disposed of the mythical theory in the only successful way. Such a method, however, has furnished room for misunderstanding. Some have thought that the bare stones in the foundations are the sole reality, while others have thought that the

superstructure has been demolished. Professor Schmiedel's article in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, in which he characterised nine passages in the Synoptics as "the foundation pillars" for the construction of a truly scientific life of Jesus, has been interpreted as though these passages furnished the only materials out of which the life could be constructed. Such an idea, however, is an entire misconception. These passages are not, and were never intended to be, regarded as sufficient for enabling us to see the real Jesus. They are the incontrovertible facts with which the mythical theory is confronted, and effectually dispose of it by making a real Jesus essential to Christianity. Upon these foundation stones we have to build, and in the building other material is both admissible and available.

We are not here concerned with the construction of a truly scientific life of Jesus, but with the far less pretentious task of presenting a true conception of His personality. The reality of Jesus is practically no longer called in question in any serious study of Christianity. Taking the reality of Jesus, therefore, as a fact, we have to ask what were the distinctive features of His remarkable personality? In such a study the data necessary must be drawn from a wider area than that which is sufficient for the construction of His life. A man's personality is most truly revealed in his influence, and in none more so than the influence which follows his work. The

greater the personality, the less sufficient is the estimate of contemporaries. If the estimate of Jesus formed by His contemporaries outside the circle of His disciples had never been exceeded, there would have been no Christianity. Even in the writing of a scientific life of Jesus it would be possible so to exclude everything which could in any remote sense be due to later reflection that the result would issue in a portrait of Jesus which fell as much short of the reality as a picture painted by the most adoring faith would exceed it. We have always to remember that it was not the Jesus as seen by His contemporaries Who created Christianity, but the Jesus as known by His disciples. The Synoptic presentation of the figure of Jesus is far more realistic than the figure presented in the Fourth Gospel. Every great man, and Jesus supremely so, is more, however, than the actual which is visible. He is an incarnated ideal, and to understand the man we must understand the ideal which he incarnates. In the Fourth Gospel the ideal is plainly stated at the beginning, and the evidence of its dominance is seen throughout the portraiture. In the Synoptics, on the other hand, it is the portrayal of the actual Jesus which is the dominating factor, but even there the ideal is of necessity constantly suggested and gradually emerges. The Synoptics have no prologue like the Fourth Gospel, but they demand an epilogue

in which the incarnated ideal which they have portrayed is described. Personality is essentially the incarnation of an ideal. The ideal must not be imposed upon the portrait, but the portrait, to be a true representation, must reveal the ideal.

In attempting to represent the personality of Jesus, His perfect humanity is the foundation on which we must build. This does not imply that the question of His Divinity is thereby prejudged. The Divinity of Jesus is a conclusion to which a true criticism may be led, but it is certainly not the premiss from which it can start. The perfect humanity of Jesus is the rock against which every Docetic theory, whether characterised as orthodox or heterodox, is shattered. Whatever implications there may be in a doctrine of Incarnation, one thing is essential, namely, that the Divine must become, and not merely seem to be, man. Apart, however, from all doctrinal considerations, the fact which confronts us in the Gospels are facts which indubitably prove that Jesus was really and truly a man amongst men. In the Synoptics, though Jesus is represented as supranatural, He is at the same time represented as perfectly natural also. He is described as miraculously feeding the multitude, but He is also represented as eating and drinking like any ordinary man. He is described as once walking on the sea, but He is far more frequently represented as making use of the boats of His disciples. He raises the

dead, it is true, but He also hangs upon the Cross and yields up His last breath like any other mortal man. This blending of the ordinary and the extraordinary is done without the slightest attempt to harmonise what at first sight would certainly strike us as contradictory. The point which is here urged is, that whatever else Jesus was, His figure, as seen in the Gospels, is that of a real, even though an extraordinary, man. Even in the Fourth Gospel this is equally noticeable. The Jesus Whom the writer portrays is by no means that purely supernatural person which some critics suppose. He turns water into wine at the marriage feast, but He is represented as one of the ordinary guests partaking like them of the viands set before Him. He is described as appealing to His works as being of a similar nature to those which the Father works, but He is also represented as being wearied with the journey, resting at the well, and appealing for water to slake His thirst like any other wayfarer. He is described as summoning Lazarus from the tomb, but He is also represented as sharing with the sisters in the grief at the loss of their brother. If we are told that He claimed to have descended from heaven, the fact is not concealed that the people ask one another, whether this is not Joseph's son, with whose father and mother they are well acquainted? There is nothing in any of the Gospels which suggests that there was anything

about Him which indicated that He¹ was anything other than purely human. On the contrary, with the exception of the miracles, everything about Him suggests that His appearance and habits were such as to cause Him to be regarded as an ordinary Galilean peasant, the son of a carpenter, and Himself a carpenter.

As regards His miracles it may be remarked that by far the majority were works of healing, which, though they reveal the possession of more than ordinary psychical powers, are by no means supernatural in the ordinary acceptation of the word, and certainly not superhuman. They lift Him above His fellows, but they do not put Him in a category apart from His fellows. There are some miracles, such as the feeding of the multitudes and the stilling of the tempest, which are of a supernatural character. They have been explained as parables which by easy transition have been mistaken for miracles. Such an explanation is certainly possible and decidedly plausible. In any case these two or three instances cannot be regarded as outweighing the abundant evidence which the Gospels supply as to the true and real humanity of Jesus. Jesus Himself distinctly and repeatedly repudiated that importance which has been attached to them as marks of the abnormal and supernatural. Far from regarding them as abnormal and peculiar, He rebuked His disciples for a lack of faith which prevented their curing

the epileptic boy, and He sent them out to perform similar healing works.

As regards His mental endowments there is exactly the same evidence that He was in no sense abnormal or supernatural. He grew up so naturally and normally that of His boyhood and early manhood hardly a single event was regarded as calling for record. His visit to the Temple is evidence of the early development of that quick spiritual insight which so distinguishes His ministry, but there is nothing abnormal about it. In His teaching there is no trace of any claim to omniscience, or of a knowledge of either science or literature which can in any sense be described as in advance of His time. On the contrary, what may be called His mental outlook, in all matters other than the religious, is the mental outlook and standpoint of His time. It may, of course, be said that though He said nothing on any of these matters, yet He knew all that there is to know, and that His silence was due to the fact that His mission was entirely different. Such a claim, however, is a pure assumption for which there is not the slightest evidence. Moreover, it involves us in moral difficulties which seriously affect that unique spiritual character which is the distinguishing feature of His life. What untold misery and suffering due to ignorance might have been prevented, if even a fraction of the knowledge thus claimed for Him had been

given to the world. The relief of human misery which His works of healing afforded pales into insignificance before the prevention of suffering which a single word from Him might have effected if He really knew merely a few of the common-places of present-day science. To imagine a Jesus possessed of such knowledge and silent in the face of the appalling needs of humanity is to present a Jesus as unlike the tender and compassionate figure of the Gospels as it is possible to conceive. Like many another Jesus of the imagination it falls very much below the Jesus of reality.

While His mental endowments, therefore, must be regarded as quite normal to His age and race, there are indications here of that blending of the ordinary and the extraordinary which we have already noticed in His works of healing. While He evidently shared in the limitations of His age and nation, there was nothing of that narrow and prejudiced view which characterised the particular race in which He was born and grew up. His horizon was limited as that of other men of His age, but His vision was normal to humanity, and showed none of those congenital defects which are peculiar to races and distinguish them from one another. Jesus was born a Jew, but He was least like what we call a born Jew as can be conceived. It would be impossible to conceive of Confucius as other than a China-

man, or of Buddha as other than an Indian, or Mahommed as other than an Arab. Of Jesus, however, it is impossible to conceive of Him as other than a Son of Man. No one has ever shown less of racial peculiarities or national characteristics than Jesus. Born in the midst of a people more distinct and separate than any other nation, known throughout their history as a peculiar people, as distinct and separate to-day as in any past period of their history, Jesus stands out isolated and alone, the Man and not the Jew. This does not make Him superhuman, for it is this essential humanity which is His distinctive feature, but it indicates a something about Him which we must call extraordinary. It would have been ordinary if He had been a born Jew; that He was not, but a true Son of Man, is an indication of the extraordinary. In this respect therefore, His works and His words answer the one to the other. They cannot be described as unnatural, nor yet can they be fully described as natural; both transcend the natural as we know it. For a true realisation of the freedom of Jesus from the limitations of the Jew we have to compare Him in this respect with Paul. It is to Paul that Christianity owes its liberation from the slavery of Judaism, but it was to Jesus that Paul himself owed his deliverance. Of all the apostles Paul is at one and the same time the most distinctly Jewish and yet the most distinctly

cosmopolitan. He was a born Jew, a Hebrew of the Hebrews, yet he became the Apostle of the Gentiles and the Emancipator of Christianity from the thralldom of Judaism. He became so, however, because, more than all the others, he caught the spirit of his Master and interpreted the mind of Jesus.

When we come to the moral qualities and the ethical constitution of Jesus we come to a sphere where the ordinary and the extraordinary are blended as in the physical and mental spheres, but where the extraordinary is far more pronounced. The ethical transcendence of Jesus remains for all time that distinctive characteristic which distinguishes Him, as nothing else does, from humanity as known from past history and present experience. It is the moral grandeur of Jesus which so transfigures that common humanity which He shares with us, that we feel irresistibly that we have seen the light of the very glory of God in the person of Jesus. In this sphere His sovereignty is indisputable, and all nations bow in lowly obeisance before Him. Men may dispute the Divinity of Jesus, and decline to regard Him as a second Person in a Trinity, but they instinctively bow down in the deepest reverence of which they are capable before His moral grandeur. The intellect may not be satisfied as to His Divinity in a metaphysical sense, but the moral nature recognises it and bends in lowliest worship. If

the glory of God is moral beauty and the essence of God is moral worth expressed in pure and holy love, then there is no question that the supreme manifestation of that nature, of which we have any record, is that which confronts us in the character of Jesus. This aspect of His Divinity is unquestionable, for it is not dependent upon any argument; it is the judgment of the moral nature as it stands in the presence of Jesus. The higher the moral height attained, the keener is the appreciation and the deeper the reverence. The keener the sense of our own natural frailty and moral defect, the deeper is our realisation of the transcendent ethical purity of the Divine Man.

While the moral greatness of Jesus lifts Him to a height of Divine glory never before attained, the very fact that it is moral greatness links Him to humanity in the closest bonds of kinship. His ethical greatness is not and could not be a supernatural endowment; it was an acquisition. He was made perfect through suffering. It was through the stress and conflict incident to finite humanity that He learned the obedience which produced that perfection of moral character by virtue of which He is the author of an eternal salvation in those who yield through the power of His spirit a like obedience. His real humanity, therefore, is the essential condition under which His ethical greatness was alone possible. If the

ethical greatness to which He attained carries Him over that gulf which seems to separate Man from God, and reveals a Godlikeness we find nowhere else, the fact that He attained it, and attained it by the path which we all have to take, links Him to humanity by bonds which no theological considerations must be allowed to dissolve. To take away this essential condition of His transcendent moral greatness is to rob Him of His indisputable right to be regarded as the supreme revelation of God. Of absolute goodness, unconditioned holiness, and impeccable purity, as they may be supposed to exist in God, we have and can have no knowledge. If we are to know these qualities at all they must be manifested under those conditions of limitation and relativity in which we ourselves exist. A real humanity is the sole medium through which such a revelation can be made. The fact that such a revelation has been made in Jesus is the foundation of all our theories to explain His person.

The older theology concerned itself with the implications this fact suggested as to the nature of God. The newer theology is concerning itself with the implications suggested as to the nature of Man. If Jesus is the revelation of Divinity, He is equally the revelation of humanity. The first may be a justifiable inference, but the second is an indisputable fact. All religion and all theology centre in the explanation of the relation

between Man and God. The true nature of that relation is seen in Jesus, for He is supremely the highest expression of humanity the race has seen. The explanation, therefore, of the person of Jesus is the centre around which Christian theology must for ever gather. Christianity, however, must accept the fact of the personality of Jesus with its implications both as regards Man and as regards God. If the truth underlying Vedantic thought, which finds imperfect expression in the declaration of the identity of God and Man, is ever to receive its justification, it will probably be through a true interpretation of the personality of Jesus. The Vedantic declaration is contradicted by the whole moral experience of humanity, and yet the ethical sense in humanity recognises the moral transcendence of Him Whose consciousness of oneness with God found expression in the declaration: I and the Father are One. The personality of Jesus offers to Vedantic thought the one concrete reality without which its fundamental principle is a mere abstraction, a thought-form with no reality to fill it. Western theology waits for a more accurate and a more profound exposition of the personality of Jesus. When Vedantism finds the realisation of its ideal in Him Whose moral consciousness is the only one which is not violated by its declaration, it may give that interpretation of the person of Jesus for which theology is still waiting.

The ethical transcendence of Jesus, like the greatest work of Art, can be felt, but cannot be described. His character makes its appeal to the ethical sense by which alone it can be rightly appreciated. All attempts to describe its greatness in the current terms of morality do but succeed in belittling it. Our expressed appreciations are but a pricing of it in a currency to which it bears no relation. You cannot truly appreciate a work of Art by stating the number of guineas at which it is entered in the catalogue. In the presence of the work of a great artist silent admiration is the only fitting appreciation. In the presence of the ethical perfection of Jesus worship is the only true expression of worthship. While this is true there are certain contrasts which it presents to the realisation of the moral ideal in ourselves and in the race, which enable us to render that homage of the soul which is the best appreciation of which we are capable.

First among these contrasts is what is called the sinlessness of Jesus. There is, however, a good deal of misunderstanding as to what is implied when we speak of the sinlessness of Jesus. Sinlessness is a purely negative term, it is true, but it is a single negative which stands confronting a positive in humanity which is universal. It denotes the absence of flaws where universal experience leads us to expect them. It is not a question, therefore, of trying to prove a negative; it is a

question of accounting for the absence of a very positive and universal characteristic of humanity as we know it in ourselves and in the race. If we are told that we do not know enough about the life of Jesus to justify us in asserting that He was sinless, the reply is that we know enough about Him to show us that He was so perfectly human that there is plenty of room for the flaws to appear. It is the absence of the expected flaws which is emphasised in the assertion of the sinlessness of Jesus. Sinlessness does not mean impeccableness, though it has sometimes been confounded with it. What is really meant is that just in the very circumstances where we should expect the flaw or the failure, they are entirely absent and their place is taken by the perfect expression of the ethical ideal. We describe a man as honest, not because he has experienced every conceivable temptation to which honesty can be exposed, but because he has been subjected to a test which reveals that particular ethical quality and in which he might reasonably have been expected to fail. The combination of circumstances in which a temptation to dishonesty is possible is infinite, requiring an eternity in which to experience them. The character of the moral nature, however, is such that the liability to fall, which is essential to a true moral probation, passes by means of that probation into incapability of falling. Ethical freedom, that is, becomes ethical necessity. The

statement that Jesus was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin, does not mean that He experienced every temptation to which we are liable, but that temptation assailed Him in those parts of His nature which were vulnerable, just as it assails us. This is especially brought out in the accounts of the Temptation.

The question is sometimes asked, whether the Temptation is to be regarded as fact or allegory? The true answer is that it is both. The reality of the Temptation is the fact, but to convey that reality to less sensitive moral natures the allegory is needed. The allegorical form in which the event is described renders it almost certain that it was from the lips of Jesus Himself that the account was derived. The restrained simplicity of the imagery, combined with the wonderful insight it affords of the extreme subtlety of the Temptation and the delicate moral sensitiveness of Jesus, make it practically certain that it came from the same mind to which we owe the inimitable parables. An examination of the nature of the Temptation shows how extremely difficult, if not impossible, it must have been to convey to the unrefined moral sense of the disciples in any other than allegorical form the reality of the moral testing to which Jesus was subjected. Perhaps nothing gives, or can give us, such an insight into the extreme delicacy of the moral nature of Jesus as the character of the moral evil which His soul

detected, and against which it successfully struggled. It is hardly too much to say that, while the ordinary moral sense might regard failure in such a test as a flaw or defect, it would hardly regard it as sin. In the first Temptation, for instance, the evil from which the soul of Jesus recoiled is the use of personal power and endowment for purely individual ends. The good which He chose as alone consistent with the moral ideal is the renunciation of personal gain in the interests of the service of others. Is it too much to say that the evil which Jesus rejected is the very conduct which the moral consciousness of Society stamps with its approval as it sees it exhibited in the careers of those whom it characterises as successful men? While Society may profess a certain amount of admiration for the good which Jesus considered as alone consistent with the moral ideal, does it not in its heart of hearts regard it as more truly quixotic, and utterly repudiate it in the case of its own sons and daughters? Society will patronise and liberally subscribe to work in the slums, but it will regard with absolute horror and even indignation the idea of one of its own sons or daughters sacrificing a great career or a high position for the purpose of devoting talents and ability for work in the slums. This is not merely the case in the mammon-worshipping West; it is equally true in the ascetic and less materialistic East. India will readily yield honour and praise to the Sanyasi

or Fakir, provided he chooses the path of the anchorite in order that he may reach the power and position of the Saint. Let the high-caste Brahmin, however, renounce all in order to devote himself to the uplifting of the despised Pariah, and she will repudiate him with even greater scorn and contempt. In the answer of Jesus—Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God—we have the true ethical conception of life, the slightest departure from which leaves a stain upon the soul. Life cannot be interpreted in terms of the material ; it must be described in terms of the spiritual. Man is not a collection of atoms ; he is an incarnation of a word or thought of God, and he only truly lives as he manifests that special thought of God of which he is the expression. He is not, however, an isolated word, but a word in a sentence, and the true meaning of his life is in the relation he sustains to the other words of God, and the place he occupies in the sentence. To sustain that true relation and to fill that divinely appointed place is to realise the moral ideal. To swerve by a hairsbreadth is to fail in the realisation of the ideal.

The second Temptation, graphically described as the suggestion to throw Himself down from the pinnacle of the temple, is that subtle temptation to which only the noblest souls are exposed. It consists in a flattery based upon the recognised

high ideals of life, which form the mainspring of the soul's action, and manifests itself in the suggestion that the exceptional character will justify a departure from the path of obedience marked out for the crowd, especially if it partakes of the nature of a daring faith and sublime confidence in God. The temptation represents that easy transition from exalted religious faith and fervour into an arrogant presumption and a fanatical self-assertion. The history of the noblest lives furnishes abundant evidence of the subtlety of the temptation and the ease of the transition. The case of Savonarola and the ordeal by fire is a striking illustration of this. Who can draw the line which separates childlike trust in God from that desire for a sign of Divine favour, within which lurks the hidden doubt? How easy to deceive oneself that the rash and impatient act which precipitated events, and ruined the cause, was an act of exalted faith, when all the time it was dictated by spiritual pride and ministered to self-advertisement. The heights of the spiritual life have their dangers no less than the levels have their pitfalls. A sacred profession no less than a secular calling has its temptations, and those of the former are generally far more insidious. To wait for the revelation of God's Will is far more difficult than to attempt its accomplishment. To keep one's head on the height is a greater strain than to keep one's feet on the plains. The patient

and willing endurance of the martyr's daily cross may be the true path of obedience, while the impatient snatching at the martyr's crown by some precipitate act may but reveal the unsuspected flaw in an otherwise noble soul. It is the evidence of this careful and delicate balancing of the moral issues of life, revealed in this second Temptation, which gives us an insight into the fine moral texture of the character of Jesus. His answer—Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God—is a revelation, not only of the clearness with which He detected the lurking evil but, of the depth of religious feeling which it called forth. To submit God to a test as to His faithfulness and love was an idea from which Jesus' whole soul shrank with abhorrence. It implied not merely doubt on the part of the Son as to the Father's character, but a usurpation of His position. It was a dictation of the terms upon which alone the Son will consent to walk in the path which the Father has chosen. It was the substitution, therefore, of the human for the Divine will, and as such it involved the destruction of the whole moral nature. Such a suggestion allows of no argument ; it demands from the moral nature the emphatic negative—Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.

The strength of the third Temptation lies in its appeal, not to the ambition for personal success, but to the nobler ambition for the success of the cause. Under the allegorical form of a vision of

universal sovereignty to be obtained by a single act of obeisance to the paramount power, there is graphically portrayed the temptation to sacrifice the ideal by a compromise with the actual. The real sacrifice of the ideal, however, is disguised by representing it as a mere concession of a momentary character involving nothing more than the sacrifice of a personal feeling, which ought not to weigh against the success of the cause which is secured thereby. It is the insidious suggestion that the duty of personal sacrifice involves a concession which is really the sacrifice of duty. It is an attempt to delude the soul into believing that the duty of compromise involves what is essentially a compromise with duty. The nature of the temptation is such that only the greatest souls can feel its seductiveness. It is the man who has sacrificed everything and has nothing left who can alone be tempted to sacrifice his soul. For the sake of the cause he has given up everything which others hold dear. One thing, and one thing only, has he held back—his absolute loyalty to the ideal. A trifling concession, a momentary submission, and the goal is won. Can he not make the last and only concession which is demanded for the sake of the cause which means so much to the world? The success for which he has striven is within his grasp; the vision of the triumph of the cause for which he has sacrificed everything is spread out before his eyes. Shall he allow a purely personal

feeling of reverence for an unseen ideal to stand in the way of the accomplishment of the very end and purpose of His being? The high mountain, which in the allegory is the scene of the third Temptation, is suggestive of the moral height where such a Temptation is alone possible. The fierce exclamation, "Begone, Satan," reveals the vividness with which the sin is perceived, and the strong resentment of the moral nature which the Temptation called forth. Evil, stripped of all its seductiveness, stands revealed in horrible nakedness, a loathsome figure coming between the soul and God. The moral nature, in a white heat of indignation at the attempted outrage on its stainless purity, vouchsafes no other answer than an imperious "Begone." That which comes between the soul and its loyalty to God is unalloyed evil, whose instant dismissal is the sole answer which the moral nature can vouchsafe.

The accounts of the Temptation are their own guarantee of the reality of the event. In the ethical realm the power of the mind to imagine falls short of the power of the soul to experience. To attribute the accounts of the Temptation to the imagination of the disciples or of still later writers is not merely to attribute to them the greatest creation of Art; it is to attribute to them a moral insight which transcends that of their Master. To dethrone the Master in this case involves enthroning the pupil. As a creation of

Art, however, the Temptation scene is singularly deficient in technique. The artist who could have created such a scene out of his imagination would never have left it so inartistically executed. The last thing that can be said of the Synoptists is that they are literary artists. They deal with a figure which has furnished Art with its greatest subjects and its highest inspiration ; yet their presentation of the scenes can hardly be described as artistic. This characteristic is specially obvious in their treatment of the Temptation. If ever there was a scene which lent itself to the finest and most delicate treatment, it was this great scene in the life of Jesus. The Johannine writer, who is distinctly a literary artist, apparently so felt the difficulty of treating it adequately that he left it entirely out of his portrait. Its presence, especially in the form in which it appears in the Synoptics, is the strongest evidence that we have here the reality of fact and not mere imagination.

The importance of the Temptation in a delineation of the personality of Jesus arises from the fact that it calls attention to the absence of defects in just those places where and where only we might reasonably expect them. A great soul is incapable of, because he is above, the petty meannesses which characterise lesser souls. His temptations are not those of ordinary men. If the mountaineer falls it will be in scaling the inaccessible height, not in making those easy ascents

which content the man of the plains. Belief in the ethical transcendence of Jesus is due, not to the fact that He was free from the common sins, or that He possessed the ordinary virtues but, to the fact that we can discover no flaw where a flaw is not only possible, but reasonably to be expected. He walks on those dizzy heights which have been fatal to the noblest souls, and no vertigo attacks Him. He scales those peaks of the moral life which have caused the destruction of the finest moral characters, and He does not fall. The sinlessness of Jesus is no argument based on the silence of the evangelists; it is based upon the moral achievements which they record. The Temptation shows us the moral evil He resisted; the life shows us the ethical qualities He incarnated.

In the first Temptation we see Him deliberately resisting the seductions of personal ambition. In the life we see Him daily and hourly giving Himself and all that He possessed to the service of humanity. In the second Temptation we see Him rejecting the alluring voice of flattery and the insidious suggestion of spiritual pride. In the life we see Him steadily avoiding every tendency to court popular favour or to encourage the flattering adulation of both priests and people, while at the same time He waits patiently for the revealing of the Father's will. When the people desire to make Him a king, He retires into the desert. When the opposition of the religious leaders

tempts Him to precipitate events in expectation of a Divine interposition in His favour, He withdraws into retirement. It was only when it was clear that no other course than that of the Cross was open to Him that He set His face steadily to return to Jerusalem and endure the Cross which He knew awaited Him. He never courted a violent death in the desire for the martyr's crown. He was as solicitous to save His people from the crime of His crucifixion as He was ready to ask for forgiveness for the crime they committed. In the third Temptation we see Him rejecting the secretly offered bribe of compromise and declining to tread the smooth but fatal path of a betrayal of the ideal. In the life we see Him offering the most resolute opposition to the false religious ideals which occupied the seat of authority and the throne of power. No overture from Pharisee or Sadducee, Herodian or Zealot, is allowed to influence His absolute loyalty to the ideal He represented. He will sacrifice for the truth even His life, but He will not sacrifice the truth even for His life. To Evil, whether arrayed in the regal garb of religious authority, or in the imperial purple of political power, He never bends the knee. To God, the alone Good, He will, in the loyalty of service, bow the head in the agony of death and yield up His spirit.

Another equally remarkable contrast which the personality of Jesus presents is the entire absence

of all sense of sinfulness. This is not due to any indifference in regard to the place sin holds in human life, nor to any attempt on His part to relegate it to a subordinate position in the thought of men. The reality of sin and the absolute necessity of an entire change of mind and disposition in regard to it occupy the highest place in His teaching. Of the consciousness of personal guilt, however, there is neither trace nor hint. Here again we are not dependent upon the argument from silence. The negative aspect of the question arrests the attention because the ethical sense in Jesus is so highly organised that the lack of its universal accompaniment, the sense of failure, is so remarkable. It is not that He makes the bold challenge to His enemies, "Which of you convicteth Me of sin?" that astonishes us the most. It is rather that when rebuked by scrupulous Pharisees for companying with publicans and sinners He replies, "They that are whole have no need of a physician, but they that are sick. . . ." In the presence of sufferers from a universal complaint He calmly announces not merely that He has no fear of contagion, but that He is its physician. The deliberate exclusion of Himself in such statements as, "If ye, being evil, know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more shall your Heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask Him," coupled with the careful inclusion of the petition for

forgiveness and deliverance from evil, in the prayer He taught His disciples, is so extraordinary that we are compelled to ask whether this lack of the universal consciousness of moral failure does not imply a consciousness of moral perfection which is unique in the history of the race?

This conclusion is supported by the positive statements, made not once nor twice in the Gospels, but frequently, that He categorically affirmed the forgiveness of sins. On these occasions He speaks with an authority which is without parallel. The very majesty of the moral law within our breasts which pronounces our own condemnation imposes an unbreakable silence in regard to the question of Divine forgiveness. Man has hoped that such forgiveness was possible; he has even believed that it was attainable; he has been willing to adopt any and every means to procure it, but he has never felt himself capable of declaring authoritatively and categorically that sin is forgiven. To do so has seemed to him a usurpation of the prerogative of God. To the charge of blasphemy which this declaration of forgiveness brought upon Jesus He gave the only possible reply by delivering the paralytic from the physical consequences of his sin. It was the precursor of that true test which Jesus has given ever since—the deliverance from sin itself. The only true guarantee of the forgiveness of sin is freedom from the sin which has been forgiven. It is sin,

in its theoretical aspect as an affront to God, which occupies the important place in much theological literature. It is sin, in its aspect of self-inflicted injury to the moral nature, which is supreme in the deeper thought of Jesus. There is a sense, indeed, in which it can be said that sin cannot inflict any injury on God, and probably the last thing that can be truly said of the sinner is that in sinning he has any consciousness of affronting God at all. Its injury, however, to the moral nature is manifest, and if this injury is repaired there can be little doubt as to the Divine attitude to the sinner. It is possible to conceive of forgiveness apart from the moral recovery of the sinner, but it is impossible to conceive of the moral recovery of the sinner apart from Divine forgiveness. The forgiveness, that is, may or may not ensure the recovery, but the recovery guarantees the forgiveness.

The point, however, which is here urged is concerned with the categorical declaration which Jesus claims to be authorised to make. If it is not blasphemy, and the whole character of Jesus negatives such a hypothesis, then it implies such an intimate knowledge of the ethical nature of God as justifies and guarantees the pronouncement. That Jesus was conscious of declaring absolute truth in thus declaring the forgiveness of sin is consistent with but one hypothesis, namely, that there was an ethical oneness between Himself and

God; that a mistake in this matter was impossible. The least shadow of doubt would have rendered such a declaration impossible. The religious experience of Christendom confirms the reality of the forgiveness of sins by the witness of renewed moral natures, the result of a belief in the power and authority of Jesus. A miraculous moral healing is still the accompaniment of the declaration of the forgiveness of sins. The paralysed moral nature is healed and restored, and the reality of the forgiveness is guaranteed by the miracle of healing. It is doubtless still possible to deny the authority of Jesus to forgive, but it is impossible to deny His power to save.

There is a final aspect of the personality of Jesus which remains to be noticed, apart from which, indeed, His religious significance for humanity is entirely misconceived. It is what we may call His consciousness of God. All mysticism bears witness to the fact, conceive of it as we may, that there is a knowledge of God which is as direct and independent of all reasoning as the consciousness of self. It is sometimes described as religious feeling rather than religious knowledge, but the description is quite inadequate, and the contrast between feeling and knowledge fails to indicate the fundamental conception underlying the claim of the mystic. To the mystic the difference between the higher and the lower knowledge of God, the difference, that is,

between the mystical and the ordinary knowledge, may be illustrated as the difference between the knowledge of the beautiful possessed respectively by the man who can see and the man who is blind. The one is direct knowledge; the other is an inference. To the mystic there are supreme moments when the eyes of the soul are opened and he catches a fleeting vision of God. The knowledge gained in these rare moments of ecstasy is that direct and immediate knowledge characteristic of sight as applied to the beautiful, in comparison with a knowledge of the beautiful which is the result of inference and the descriptions of others. This soul-vision, as it is called, is, however, the extraordinary and the exceptional. It is usually obtained when the ordinary conditions are suspended and is lost when they are re-established. Jesus cannot be regarded as a mystic in this sense. Of ecstasy, as understood by the mystic, there is not a single trace in His life or teaching. His knowledge of God, however, in its directness and immediacy is essentially that higher knowledge upon which mysticism lays emphasis. The explanation of this remarkable likeness and difference may be found in the fact that the exceptional experience of the mystic seems to have been the ordinary and normal experience of Jesus. The ecstatic state of soul seems to have existed side by side with the ordinary and regular sense perception. In the

case of the mystic, the opening of the inner eye of the soul is usually conditioned by the closing of the outer eye of the body. In the case of Jesus the inner and the outer eye were both open at the same time. His ecstasy never involved a trance. He lived at one and the same time in both the natural and the spiritual worlds, between which, instead of finding any contradiction, He found the most wonderful correspondencies.

The parables of Jesus furnish a remarkable confirmation of this. The parables are the distinctive feature of the teaching of Jesus, and they stand unrivalled as expositions of parabolic art. Though they are pre-eminently artistic, they are never artificial. He did not create the correspondencies which He depicted; He perceived them. His pictures are not fantastical or allegorical; they are interpretations of Nature rather than mere representations of Nature. The exquisite parable of the Prodigal Son, for instance, is not an allegory setting forth a conception of Divine love and forgiveness; it is an interpretation of human love and forgiveness revealing their essentially Divine character. Jesus does not invent the correspondencies which the parable reveals; He calls attention to the correspondencies which actually exist. The selfishness of the younger son and the utter disregard of his father which are described in the story are not mere figures of speech or fanciful representations of sin; they are

sin itself. The treatment of the father by the son is not something which the imagination invents as something similar to the treatment of God by the sinner ; it is the actual treatment. Sin, that is, can only affect God in that way. We violate our relations to God in the violation of our relations to our fellows. Similarly the father's love and yearning after his erring child are not mere resemblances ; they are actually the love and yearning of God expressed in and through humanity. Human love does not suggest to the mind that there may be something corresponding to it in God ; it is the revelation to us of the actual love of God. Human forgiveness does not inspire us with a faint hope that there may possibly be such a thing as Divine forgiveness ; it is a manifestation, however imperfect, of Divine forgiveness itself. It is this note in the teaching of Jesus which gives it its authority. He taught with the certainty of one who sees what actually is, not with the hesitancy of one who imagines what may possibly be.

It is this direct consciousness of God, this normal and abiding inner vision, which explains that absolute assurance which marks both His conduct and His teaching. He never wavers in His walk, nor hesitates in His talk. No teacher was ever more positive, yet He was never merely self-assertive. He does not hesitate to place His own *ipse dixit* in direct contrast to the declarations

of the inspired and venerated scriptures of His people, and to preface them with words which are not arrogant only because they are imperial. In these striking contrasts between what He has to say and what has been already said, Jesus does not assert the correctness of His own conceptions ; He assures us of the accuracy of His perceptions. He speaks that which He knows or perceives ; He testifies of that which He sees. The possession of the knowledge gives Him the right to assure ; the fact that He sees necessitates the categorical form of the witness's statement.

It is not merely in the form of His teaching, however, that this special character of His knowledge of God is evident. The whole of His religious attitude is the outcome of this intimate, constant and immediate consciousness of God. To Jesus, God is not a Being in Whom He believes ; He is the Father Whom He knows and with Whom He is in constant fellowship. God is as real and in such direct communication with the soul of Jesus as the Universe is with the bodies and minds of others. He is never isolated or cut off from communion with God, any more than men are isolated or cut off from communication with the Universe. He speaks of Divine things with the intimacy with which other men speak of material things. He looks into the face of God with the naturalness with which others look into the face of Nature. The name Father

as applied to God is not peculiar to Jesus ; it is found in Judaism and in other religions. To Jesus, however, the term is in no sense a name which may be applied to God ; it is the expression of a conscious relation between Himself and God. He calls God Father because He feels that He is Himself Son. His consciousness of sonship is the ground for His conception of the Divine Fatherhood, and not *vice versa*. God is not a conception to Jesus ; He is a perception. This consciousness of God is as clear and definite in the case of Jesus as the consciousness of the self. There is, however, never any confusion between the two. The consciousness of the essential relation between Himself as Son and God as Father is fundamental to the whole of His thought, but He never identifies the self with God. The reason is the very important one that His knowledge of oneness with God was not a deduction of logic, but a conscious experience. The writer of the Fourth Gospel has made this fundamental consciousness of God the dominating thought in his account of the teaching of Jesus, but he has not invented it ; for it is as necessary to the religious thought of the Synoptic Jesus as it is conspicuous in the Johannine discourses. The Sermon on the Mount is unintelligible in its authoritativeness apart from this underlying God-consciousness, and the parables which are the distinctive feature of the Synoptists are unaccountable without it. Express

declarations in regard to it are not wanting in the Synoptic Gospels. The statements in Matthew and Luke, "All things have been delivered unto Me of My Father"; and "No man knoweth Who the Son is save the Father"; and "Who the Father is save the Son"; and "He to whom the Son willeth to reveal Him," are as emphatic in this respect as anything to be found in the Fourth Gospel.

A study of the personality of Jesus leads us up to a mystery which it is as foolish to deny as it is presumptuous to pretend to be able to explain. The Divine and the Human element are so blended in the character of Jesus that the old antithesis, implied both in the orthodox and unorthodox positions of the older theology, can no longer be recognised. That antithesis was the outcome of a Deistic standpoint which both parties equally occupied. The unorthodox party assumed that if Jesus were real Man He could not be really Divine. The orthodox party assumed that if He were really Divine He could not be really Man. Modern theological thought has moved completely away from the Deistic standpoint of a transcendent God to the Theistic position of a God Who is both transcendent and immanent. The theological aspect of the subject does not here concern us. We have here to do with the facts which the personality of Jesus reveals. If we are to arrive at any true conception of the personality of Jesus we must study it not from the theological, but

from the historical side. The facts which such a study reveals may involve a theological doctrine of an Incarnation, but such a doctrine must be the outcome of the study of the facts. We can never arrive at a true doctrine of an Incarnation by speculations as to the nature of God. We only know God as He is revealed. The revelation, therefore, is the basis upon which we must build all our ideas of the nature of the Revealer. This is the standpoint of modern theological thought. It is necessary, however, to emphasise the fact that the basis upon which we build is not any declaration as to who Jesus was, but the actual record of what He did and said. The declaration may be quite true, but it is after all the mere label attached to the picture, while the actual record is the picture itself. It is not that the title of a great picture printed in the catalogue is official and authorised which makes it correct; it is that it expresses in a word or phrase the thought which the picture reveals with a wealth and profusion of which language is quite incapable. "The perfect humanity of Jesus" or "The essential Divinity of Jesus" are after all mere labels which we attach to the picture of the matchless face which looks out upon us in the figure of Jesus as the Gospel writers have portrayed it. Both these titles may be equally true and equally one-sided. It may be of supreme concern for the catalogue that a correct title should be given, and the discussion of the title may be of

extreme value in calling attention to the different impressions the picture produces on different minds. After all has been said and we have registered our definite vote for one or other of the titles, we all alike return to stand in front of the picture that we may perceive more clearly the glory of God as it is revealed in the face of Jesus.

CHAPTER VII

THE DIVINE INCARNATION

IN the previous chapter a study of the personality of Jesus was seen to lead up to a mystery in which both the nature of Man and the nature of God lie enshrouded in darkness. It must not, however, be supposed that the personality of Jesus is the sole creator of the mystery, and that all we have to do to avoid it is carefully to exclude everything of the nature of the supranatural from our conception of His personality. Such a method doubtless avoids mystery, but it does so by rendering the personality of Jesus inexplicable. The mystery does not confront us at the end of the study, simply because we have excluded the mysterious which confronts us in the study. The personality of Jesus leads us to a mystery because all personality is mysterious, and that of Jesus supremely so. His personality does not introduce a mystery; it emphasises the mystery already introduced by the appearance of personality itself. The nature of God is not the only mystery; the

nature of Man is also mysterious. To relate the personality of Jesus to either the one or the other is not to explain the mystery. To assert that Jesus was Divine is to deepen the mystery connected with Divinity. To assert that He was simply human is to deepen the mystery connected with humanity. Moreover, both alike ignore the fact which confronts us in the true study of the personality of Jesus, namely, that it presents us with factors which show a relation to both. We cannot avoid mystery; we can only seek to reduce the mysterious.

To declare that Jesus was an ordinary man is to leave out those very characteristics which make Him different from every known man. His moral nature, as we have seen, transcends every other; His consciousness of God is a unique consciousness. To leave out these two factors is to omit those very elements which have given Him a supreme place in the religious life of the world. To admit these characteristics of Jesus and to seek to account for them involves us in a consideration, not merely of that common humanity with which Jesus has so many affinities, but with the Divinity with which He has affinities so markedly in excess of ours. This contrast between Jesus and the rest of humanity must not be taken to imply that He was necessarily different in kind from humanity, but it does imply that there was such a difference

of degree as to call for some attempt at explanation.

The older theological thought looked upon these facts presented in the personality of Jesus in exactly the same way as it looked upon the appearance of Man in the scheme of creation. It regarded both as the certain evidence of a distinct act of God having no necessary connection with that which had preceded them. Man was a separate creation, not an evolution. Jesus was a Divine generation, not a Divine creation. As the Creed puts it : He was begotten, not made. The newer theological thought has by no means repudiated the facts presented in the personality of Jesus, but it has frankly accepted an evolutionary hypothesis, with this important proviso, that for the process which evolution describes, the God which the religious consciousness perceives is demanded. It does not, therefore, look upon the appearance of Man as a descent from above, but as an ascent from below, the ascent, however, demanding more imperatively God as its cause than even a descent. In precisely the same way modern theology seeks for an explanation of the facts revealed in the personality of Jesus, not by the declaration of any distinction between a generation and a creation such as the older theology emphasised but, by such an enlargement and enrichment of the conception of the cosmic process as will include, not only the appearance of

Man as we have known him in the race, but of the ideal Man, as we see him in Jesus. It seeks, that is, to extend the evolutionary process up to Jesus, but it insists that to do so the conception of evolution must be enlarged and elevated so as to be capable of including that revelation of the nature of God which meets us in the personality of Jesus.

Such a position is capable of, and is constantly receiving, great misconception and great misrepresentation. The modern theologian is often represented as though he had no eye for the Divine in his outlook upon the Universe, and no room for God in the scheme of thought by which he seeks to explain the Universe. As a matter of fact he has no eye for anything else but the Divine in his outlook, and no room for anything but God in his explanation. This, however, in turn renders him liable to misrepresentation from an entirely opposite quarter. He is by no means atheistic, say these opponents; he is Pantheistic. The charge of atheism on the one hand, and the charge of Pantheism on the other, are probably the most effective witnesses to his true orthodoxy, by showing that he really occupies that middle position of true Theism. Atheism and Pantheism are both alike reactions from that absolute separation of God and the Universe which was characteristic of the older Deism. It was a case of one being taken and the other left. Atheism

took the Universe and left out God ; Pantheism took God and left out the Universe.

The standpoint indicated in regard to the modern view of the cosmic process determines the method by which recent theological thought has sought to approach an explanation of the doctrine of the Incarnation. It regards the Incarnation as a fact, but it seeks for an explanation of the fact through the personality of Jesus which is known rather than through theological speculation as to the nature of God which is unknown. It is the personality of Jesus which explains and interprets the Incarnation, not any conception of an Incarnation which must explain and interpret the personality of Jesus. First get the principle as it is revealed in the facts, before deducing from a principle those applications which constitute the system by which the facts are explained. To the modern theologian the Incarnation is the revelation of a principle involved in the full conception of Deity, but it is so just because it is a revelation and not a speculation. It is an addition to our knowledge of God because it is an addition to the manifestation of God. The nature of that addition to our knowledge of the nature of God can only be expressed in correct terms of thought by an accurate study of the addition to our perception of God which the personality of Jesus gives us.

All the terms in which it is sought to define the difference between what is called orthodoxy

and heterodoxy are useless for the purpose in view because the difference is not so much in the result obtained as in the method employed. To contrast the Divinity of Jesus, for instance, with what is called the Deity of Jesus, is to give to the term Deity a connotation different from that which it has when applied to God. That no one, even of the most orthodox school, believes in the Deity of Jesus as that term is used when applied to God, is evident from the various kenotic theories which are introduced to emphasise the very distinction which is expressed in the contrasted terms, Divinity and Deity. The fact is that all our explanations of the person of Jesus, in whatever terms they may be couched, are descriptions of a personality which transcends our own experience. They are mere views of a glory which eludes all attempts to fix it on the canvas of our minds. Our shades of meaning and carefully compounded expression are but the mere pigments of the artist trying to paint a sunset. They are of vital importance to the theologian, just as the colours are to the artist, but the glory of the sunset and of Jesus are unaffected by them. The theological terms in which we seek to express our views of the person of Jesus are but artifices after all, important in their place no doubt, but the Divine glory which we perceive in the face of Jesus is the manifestation which secures from us all the homage and worship of the soul.

While we may repudiate the importance of the terms in which we express our conception of the personality of Jesus, it is necessary to emphasise the importance of the method of arriving at our conception. Our conceptions must be the result of our perceptions. The glory which God reveals is always far beyond the glory which Man conceives. The Logos or Word of the Fourth Gospel is a great conception, but the Life revealed in the Gospel is far greater. The exalted Christ of theology is a great conception, but the actual Incarnation of God in Jesus is greater still. The Divine would never have been conceived and expressed in human language unless it had first been perceived as it is expressed in Nature and in Man. It is a poor faith which fears that the landscape painter may have transcended the glory of the landscape. It is a mistaken faith which prefers to study the picture rather than the reality which the picture only faintly represents. The theology, even of inspired apostles, is theology only, just as the paintings of the old masters are paintings only. Religion, like Art, draws its inspiration from the presentation of the Divine, not from the representations. The conception of an Incarnation which is the outcome of our speculation as to what the nature of God implies may be a wonderful creation of theological art, but it falls infinitely below the actual Incarnation of Divine love which we perceive in the personality