

The Princeton Theological Review

APRIL, 1923

THE ORIGIN OF THE IDEAS OF DANIEL

Before entering upon the discussion of the origin of the ideas of Daniel, several fallacies must first be considered.

Thus it is claimed that it is possible to determine the time of a revelation from its ideas in the same manner as we would determine that of a mere human production. But, for those who believe in a thinking God who has made the universe including man it is impossible to deny the possibility of a revelation to His creatures of Himself and of His plans up to the capacity of those creatures to receive such a revelation. How and why He makes such a revelation it may be impossible for the objects of it to determine or to understand: but that He can reveal what He desires to reveal must be admitted.

Further, to all who believe that God has begun to make such a revelation it is clear that no limits as to the time and manner and order and emphasis, extent and subject-matter, of such a revelation can be set by the creatures who receive it. These are matters for the Revealer to determine and not for the persons to whom the revelation is made.

To those who accept these premises (and we take it that all Christians must accept them), all objections against the book of Daniel on the ground of the character of the revelation that it contains may safely be looked upon as beyond the legitimate realm of discussion. Whether God saw fit to reveal these truths in the sixth or in the second century B.C. must be a matter of comparatively little importance. What is of importance for us is, that He has revealed them.

To object to the fact of a certain alleged revelation that it is too detailed, or that it is written in veiled language, or in an unusual rhetorical style, or in a novel literary manner, is

ENEGETICAL THEOLOGY

The Psychic Health of Jesus. By WALTER E. BUNDY, PH.D., Associate Professor of English Bible in DePauw University. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1922. Pp. xviii, 299.

In the first part of his book Professor Bundy has given an informing account of the attempts which have been made to represent Jesus as an ecstatic, an epileptic, or a paranoiac. And certainly the reader finishes the perusal fully assured (if he needed any assurance) of the puerility of these attempts. If Dr. George Lomer, for example, who is (or was) head-physician at the Holstein Provincial Institute for the Insane at Neustadt, is no more scientific in his diagnosis of contemporary cases than he is in his "pathograph" of Jesus, one can only be sorry for the patients committed to his care. And the question may well arise whether experts, simply because they are experts, are as omniscient as recent legislative proposals might seem to imply. As for the four-volume work which Dr. Binet-Sanglé, Professor in the School of Psychology at Paris, has devoted to *La Folie de Jésus*, the calm and objective summary of Professor Bundy will probably relieve most of us from the necessity of complete perusal. For that relief we desire to render most hearty thanks.

Nevertheless Professor Bundy has not yet quite finished with the problem of Jesus' psychic health. Back of all the absurdities of the modern pathographs there lies at least one solid fact. It is the fact that Jesus certainly regarded Himself as the Messiah. This category of Messiahship, moreover, appears in Jesus' consciousness not in some lower, political acceptance, but in the stupendous form designated by the title "Son of Man." What shall be thought of a human being who thought that he was a heavenly Person destined to come with the clouds of heaven and be the instrument in judging the earth? It is no wonder that modern students of psychology, when they reject Jesus' claims, have found in the Messianic consciousness of Jesus an example of megalomania.

Against such a diagnosis it is of course easy to point to many facts in the life of Jesus. Professor Bundy shows very conclusively that there was in Jesus none of the indifference to real conditions, none of the selfishness, none of the intellectual and moral deterioration which appears in true paranoiacs. But such proof does not really solve the problem at all. It shows not that Jesus' assumption of Messiahship was normal and natural, but that the abnormality of this element in the life of the "liberal Jesus" is in marked contradiction to the normality and sanity of His life as a whole. It shows no doubt that the liberal Jesus cannot be placed in any of the well-recognized categories of insanity, any such diagnosis being contradicted by well-attested elements in His life. But if it shows that the liberal Jesus is not insane, it does not succeed in showing that He is real. He presents a moral and psychological contradiction at the centre of His being. He was sane and humble and healthy; yet He thought that He was the heavenly Messiah. Could such a person ever really have existed upon the earth?

There are two ways of defending the psychic health of Jesus. One way is to admit that the presentation in the Gospels of Jesus' lofty view of His own person was founded upon sober fact, that Jesus really was a heavenly Being to whom has been committed the destinies of the world. This way is rejected by Professor Bundy. Or rather it would be more correct to say that it is ignored. The other way is to deny that Jesus ever regarded Himself as the Messiah. This way has been chosen by Wrede and others; and, although our author is not able to follow it to the end, he does follow it just as far as he possibly can. He cannot deny that Jesus came to regard Himself as Messiah, but he puts the Messianic consciousness completely in the background in Jesus' experience. The solution thus proposed seems to be that although Jesus did come to regard Himself as the Messiah yet He preserved His sanity in that (1) He so modified the notion of Messiahship that His acceptance of the Messianic title was practically annulled (p. 223) and (2) He refused to allow His Messiahship to dominate His life. His Messianic consciousness, in other words, is thought to have been a private and personal matter without essential influence upon His proclamation of the Kingdom of God.

But how does Professor Bundy know that Jesus accepted the title of Messiah only in some reduced meaning? It is apparently admitted that Jesus spoke of the "Son of Man" as the heavenly Being who was to be the instrument in judgment. Our author is, it is true, at great pains to show that the "Son of Man" in the authentic words of Jesus was not identified with Jesus Himself. But if Jesus came to regard Himself as Messiah and if He had already spoken of the Messiah as Son of Man, must He not have applied the latter title to Himself with all its stupendous implications? Does Professor Bundy believe that when Jesus did come to regard Himself as the Messiah He believed that two figures were to be associated with the consummation of the Kingdom— (1) the Messiah, identified with Himself, and (2) the Son of Man? There is no clear answer to this question. Professor Bundy has failed to think the thing through. The truth is that the sources give not the slightest ground for supposing that when Jesus accepted the title of Messiah He degraded the title at all.

Equally little justification is there for supposing that Jesus' Messiahship was a private and personal matter without influence upon His message. This solution of the problem involves at any rate an extremely negative attitude toward the sources; for in all four of the Gospels—in the Gospel of Mark as well as in the Gospel of John—Jesus clearly presents Himself, not merely as the Announcer of the Kingdom but as the object of faith. Professor Bundy is at pains to remove this element from the Gospels. But he has certainly not been successful; he has certainly not succeeded in discrediting the overwhelming mass of evidence which James Denney (see *Jesus and the Gospel*), for example, adduced to show that even according to the earliest sources detected by modern criticism Jesus presented Himself not merely as an example for faith but as the object of faith. Jesus as Redeemer of men cannot be removed

from the Gospels by any mere process of literary criticism. His presentation of His own Person is the presupposition of every word that He ever uttered—the Sermon on the Mount as well as the discourses in the Gospel of John.

But suppose our author were correct in regarding Jesus' Messianic consciousness as merely a private and pious opinion, a "personal problem" and "not a general problem of calling and career," the difficulty would not be removed. The sanity of Jesus might possibly be rescued; for an insane person with delusions of grandeur would perhaps not have been so successful in keeping those delusions to himself. But if the sanity of Jesus is rescued, His moral character is still defiled. A man who accepted the category of Messiahship because he considered it necessary to his mission in the world might be a fanatic; he might even be insane. But the moral blot upon him would in some respects be less than upon a man who, without necessary and immediate connection with his mission in the world, believed that he was to be the central figure in the Kingdom of God. One can indeed rejoice that the Jesus of Professor Bundy's reconstruction did not think Messiahship a thing to be grasped by His own efforts, but a thing to be waited for from God. But how could a mere man ever have supposed that so stupendous an honor would ever really be his at all?

The real question concerning the New Testament account of Jesus is the question of the supernatural. If the supernatural be accepted, then the problem of Jesus' consciousness does not exist; for it may then simply be said that He claimed to be a heavenly Being because as a matter of fact He was a heavenly Being. But if the supernatural be rejected, the reconstruction of the purely human Jesus becomes a serious problem. The first impulse of an untrained criticism is to reject the supernatural and nothing else, to regard even the accounts of miracles as accounts of misunderstood natural happenings, to accept the record of Jesus' words even in the Fourth Gospel as authentic and yet deny the truthfulness of their stupendous claim. Professor Bundy rightly rejects this solution, especially in the extremely crude form in which it has been revived in the recent pathographies. It is perfectly clear that if the supernatural be rejected, a great deal other than the supernatural must also go. The Fourth Gospel of course must be eliminated as a source of information about Jesus, and much of the material in the other three—material which at first sight seemed to bear upon it the self-evident impress of truth—must also be rejected. This material in itself looked altogether as though it were historical, but closer examination shows that it is connected with the supernatural and is therefore discredited. The history of modern criticism of the Gospels is the history of the process by which the supernatural is removed from the account of Jesus' life. And Professor Bundy represents a very advanced stage in the process. If the supernatural be rejected, then the lofty claims of Jesus must be rejected or kept in the background; hence Professor Bundy displays great zeal in eliminating the "egocentric" sayings of Jesus. In doing so he has been forced into an extreme radicalism in

his treatment of the sources, though he himself does not seem to understand how radical his criticism is. Thus after a criticism of the Gospels which logically involves a complete skepticism about the Gospel witness, our author says: "In the Synoptics Jesus is not forever discouraging upon himself and his dignity in the monotonous repetitious way that he does in the Fourth Gospel, but neglects his own person entirely in his preaching and teaching the kingdom of God, and in a way that causes even modern pedagogy to marvel at its simplicity and effectiveness" (p. 248). That sentence is quite untrue even on Professor Bundy's own showing. The radical and detailed elimination of the "ego-centric" words of Jesus in the Synoptics, which our author has found necessary, itself shows that it is not the Synoptics which present a Jesus who "neglects his own person entirely," but only a reconstruction which is in direct contradiction to the Synoptics. In view of this radical treatment of the sources it is very astonishing to read (on p. 128) the reassuring words: "Over against all of these historical limitations and handicaps, we can say that we nevertheless possess as full and reliable information concerning Jesus as we do of any other great men of that early date." These words are in marked contradiction to the rest of the book. The truth is, the only Jesus known to history is the stupendous Person of the Gospels. If that Jesus be rejected, we really know nothing about Jesus at all.

Thus Professor Bundy has not solved the problem of the Messianic consciousness of Jesus. But he is not to be blamed for that; for, if the supernatural be rejected, the problem is insoluble. There is only one way of solving the moral and psychological problem presented by Jesus' lofty claim; it is simply to accept the claim as true. Professor Bundy does not even mention that solution; what he mentions as representative of the "conservative camp" is the position of Loofs, who thinks that "if an understanding of the historical person of Jesus is to be reached at all, this possibility can be realized by faith alone"—not by history (quoted on p. 214). The true "conservative" view, of course, is very different; it refuses to separate faith from history, and finds in the supernatural Jesus of the Gospels the best attested fact which history records. Professor Bundy's account of Jesus is really produced not by a mere elimination of details from the Gospels, but by complete reversal of the Gospel witness. We are far from depreciating the acuteness of the modern "quest of the historical Jesus," and Professor Bundy is not wanting in acuteness. But despite its acuteness the whole process has resulted in failure. Modern criticism has succeeded neither in separating the natural from the supernatural in the Gospels, nor in combining the natural elements into any believable account of a purely human person. The Jesus of modern reconstruction is really the product not of history but of conjecture. Very different is the New Testament picture of our Lord. That picture is stupendous. But it has the advantage of being true.