

millions in the past. But with the personal presence of Mr. Parker, the chief element of his power over men has passed away, and in a little time his works may be known only, as the works of Celsus are known, by the few fragments preserved in the writings of the defenders of the faith.

ARTICLE IV.

THE SON OF GOD.

BY REV. W. S. TYLER, D.D., PROFESSOR IN AMHERST COLLEGE.

It has been well said, that there are only two great subjects of human thought and inquiry. One of these is man, and the other is God. These two subjects meet in Christ, who was both God and man united in one person.

Ellicott has remarked in his *Life of Christ*, that in the portraiture of our Lord, the first Gospel presents him to us mainly as the Messiah; the second, chiefly as the God-man; the third, as the Redeemer; and the fourth, as the only-begotten Son of God. This distinction may, perhaps, be just, if it is not too rigidly applied. Certainly it is very interesting to a curious mind, and not a little encouraging also to the faith of the believer, to remark the different points of view from which the several evangelists observe and contemplate Christ, and yet how manifestly they all describe the same person; how wonderfully some of them diverge from others in the general track which they pursue, and, at the same time, how certainly, whenever they come together, they do not come in collision, but harmonize in their representations.

The express design of the apostle John in writing his Gospel, as stated by himself (xx. 31), is that his readers might believe that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of God. And in this Gospel he is called the Son of God more fre-

quently than in the others. Indeed in Matthew, Mark, and Luke the Redeemer never calls himself directly by this name, but it is chiefly in the testimony which the dispossessed demons and the wondering spectators are constrained to bear that he is spoken of as the Son of God; whereas in John he calls himself the Son of God and, in abbreviated but no less definite terms, the Son more frequently than by any other title. But in Mark also he is announced as the Son of God in the very first verse, as if the author meant to have it understood at the outset that this was the theme of *his* Gospel. And Matthew and Luke both record those words of Jesus touching his intimate knowledge of the Father, so strikingly similar in style¹ as well as in sentiment to many passages in John's Gospel, that the hearer can hardly persuade himself that he is not listening to the words of that evangelist: "All things are delivered unto me of my Father; and no man knoweth the Son but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him" (Matt. xi. 27; Luke x. 22; cf. Isa. i. 18; iii. 35; vi. 46 et pass.) This single passage lends the sanction of the other evangelists to all that the fourth has recorded of Christ's teachings concerning his mysterious relations to the Father.

Jesus Christ is not the only person who is called son of God in the scriptures. Angels (Job i. 6; xxxviii. 7), kings and rulers (2 Sam. vii. 14; Ps. lxxxii. 6), the righteous and their families (Gen. vi. 2, 4), and especially believers in Jesus (1 John iv. 2 et pass.), are all so called to express their high rank or their relation and resemblance to the Most

¹ This coincidence is sufficient to prove (what is denied by Renan and others) that John is true to the style in which our Lord spoke of these profound mysteries in the divine nature; while the other evangelists are no less true (as is generally conceded, even by writers of the sceptical school) to the style in which he discourses to other auditors on other themes. A single striking resemblance is admitted by all candid critics to outweigh many points of difference in proving identity of authorship. And why should it be thought incredible that the all-sided and all-comprehensive mind of the great Teacher should discourse in very different styles to suit widely different circumstances.

High. But Christ calls himself, and is called by the sacred writers, not a son of God, but **THE SON OF GOD**, ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ¹ (John i. 34 ; xi. 4 et al.), and what is, if possible, still more distinctive and complete, "THE SON." There is something altogether unique and peculiar in the way in which the title is appropriated to him. In most of the passages in which the title is applied to others, it occurs in the plural number, or, if in the singular number, without the article,² as when God says to Solomon: "I will be his father, and he shall be my son (2 Sam. vii. 14). The passages in which magistrates and angels are called sons of God, are not only plural and indefinite, but they are found only in such poetical books as Job and the Psalms, and are manifestly the language of poetry. Moreover these, and also those in which the title is applied to Adam (Luke iii. 38) and Solomon, are solitary passages, not only peculiar to certain writers, but occurring only once or twice in those writers. Christ, on the other hand, calls himself the Son of God, or the Son, habitually in the Gospel of John, and is frequently called by this distinctive name in all the writers, historical, doctrinal, and poetical, of the New Testament. Furthermore, these casual applications of the titles to men and angels in the Old Testament are often alluded to in the New as justifying and *foreshadowing* the appropriation of the name as the proper prerogative of him who was the King of kings and the Lord of men and angels. The occasional use of the titles "son of man," and "son of God," in a subordinate sense in the Old Testament, therefore, so far from militating against their appropriation in a peculiar and far higher sense in the New, was, in fact, only the *prepara-*

¹ The article is sometimes omitted in the Greek (e.g. John x. 36 ; Rom. i. 4 ; 2 Cor. i. 19) without any difference of meaning, because (according to the well-known law of the article) it is sufficiently definite in itself or in its connexion, and so does not require the article. So the article is sometimes omitted in the phrase "the Son of Man," e.g. John v. 27. And so with proper names.

² With the indefinite article, sometimes, in our version ; e.g. 2 Sam. vii. 14, as quoted in Heb. i. 5 : "He shall be to me a son."

*tion of suitable language*¹ to express that high peculiarity—only the type and prophecy of the coming of him who *was* truly and emphatically **THE SON OF MAN** and **THE SON OF GOD**, and so was a fit Mediator between God and man, even the God-man Christ Jesus.

THE SON OF GOD. What is the import of this title, expressed in the words themselves, illustrated by the usage of the sacred writers, and sustained by the general teaching of the scriptures?

1. This name, so emphatically and exclusively appropriated as the distinctive name of our Lord, imports peculiar nearness and dearness to God, a singular mutual affection, union, *oneness*, between him and the infinite Father. A son naturally has the same views and feelings with his father, the same aims and ends, one and the same interest. A son loves his parents, and is loved by them, beyond any other person. He stands to them in the nearest and most endearing relation, and that more fully and perfectly as he more fully and perfectly sustains the character and realizes the *idea* of a *son*. To say of a person he was near and dear to me as my own son, is to express the utmost intimacy and affection. The relation of an *only* son is especially near and endearing. An only child is the very symbol of affection, of union, of oneness of interests, and almost of life, in all languages and to all hearts. When, therefore, our Lord is habitually distinguished and emphasized in the scriptures as the Son of God, the only-begotten Son, or the Son, thus much at least must be expressed, his singular nearness and dearness to the infinite Father.

Much has been written and printed, and perhaps more preached and argued, of the sonship and the eternal gene-

¹ This we believe to be the explanation of very much of the Old Testament in its relation to the New, and of most of those passages which the old expositors interpreted in a double sense, and which many modern expositors explain as a mere accommodation. This principle underlies, for example, the argument of our Lord in John x. 34-36, and that of Paul in Heb. i. 5 seq., and in Heb. ii. 6 seq.

ration of Christ. Perhaps there is no theological topic in the discussion of which there have been more infelicities of language on the one side, and more flippancy in exposing and ridiculing those infelicities on the other. If, letting alone creeds and theological systems, we consult the scriptures touching the questions, for what reason, and in what respect, Jesus Christ was called the Son of God, we shall find that it was partly because of his miraculous conception by the virgin Mary without a human father. The angel gives this reason to the virgin herself at the annunciation: "the Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." In his human nature Jesus of Nazareth was the Son of God as well as the Son of man; for in his human nature God was his father in a different sense from that in which he is the father of any other human being. God was his only Father. God was the immediate as well as the ultimate author of his human body and human soul. As man, the Second Adam, as well as the first, was the Son of God.

But in a higher and yet more peculiar sense he was the Son of God in his higher nature and his pre-existing state. So we are expressly taught by the apostle Paul in the very beginning of his Epistle to the Romans—an exordium as comprehensive and sublime, and as instructive in regard to the person of Christ, as the introduction to the Gospel of John:¹ "Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle, separated to the gospel of God concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, who was made of the seed of David *according to the flesh*, but declared [or determined] to be the Son of God with power *according to the spirit of holiness* [or as to his holy, spiritual nature]," that is, he was the Son of God even as to the miraculous way in which he

¹ The Epistle to the Hebrews opens with the same lofty theme, treated in a similar manner; and this resemblance, while it is most instructive in its doctrinal bearings, affords presumptive evidence of the apostolic, if not of the Pauline, authorship of that epistle.

was *made* the son of Mary and of the seed of David ; but he was the Son of God in a far more sacred and mysterious sense in that holy, spiritual nature and existence in which he was in the beginning with God, and in which, after his resurrection, he returned to the glory which he had with the Father before the world was. Of course, when we speak of the Son of God, either as to his human or his divine nature, either before or after his incarnation, we cannot understand by sonship just what we do in human relations. We cannot suppose any literal *begetting* even of the human nature, still less any literal *generation* of the divine nature. But if divine things are to be revealed to men, they must be expressed in the language of men. And as there is no word which expresses the relation of Christ's human nature to the universal Father so nearly as the word "Son," so no other word could express so nearly, so clearly, that intimate relation and endearing affection which subsisted between God and the Word from eternity : "Thou *lovedst* me *before* the *foundation* of the *world*." Our Lord often refers to the mutual love and fellowship and the common glory of the Father and the Son in his pre-existent state (cf. John xvii. 5, 24) as essentially the same to which he returned at his ascension ; and that state cannot be better expressed in human language, cannot be more perfectly imaged in human relations, than as that of a son in the bosom of his father.

In the beginning, when God began to create the worlds, the *Λόγος*, the divine and eternal Word, was already existing, and existing continually (*ἦν*) with God. With this lofty announcement, so strikingly in unison with the beginning of the most theological of the Epistles, does the most theological of the Gospels open in its very first verse. And so much importance does the evangelist attach to the doctrine that he repeats it in the next verse, thus emphasizing in the very annunciation of his theme the nearness of the Word who became flesh to God, as one who *dwelt* in his *presence* (*πρός*) ; his union and communion with God as one of like nature and attributes (for he "*was* God") through

all those ages of eternity in which as yet no creature existed. His forerunner announced him to the world as "the only-begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father" (John i. 18), that is, the Son of God in a sense in which no other person is, the only one of all his sons that fairly deserves the name, since he alone partakes of the divine nature, and whose very being always was and is and always is to be¹ in this peculiarly near and dear filial relation. The apostle Paul sets in a striking light this same eternal union and communion of the Son with the Father, prior to the creation, by calling him "his dear Son," literally the Son of his love or complacency (*ἀγάπης*), "who is the first-born of every creature," that is, who existed prior to the whole creation, and was nearer and dearer to him than the whole creation, which he made by him and for him.² The favorite epithet by which the relation of the Son of God to the Father is emphasized in the writings of John, is the only-begotten (*ὁ μονογενής*); in those of Paul, it is the first-begotten or first-born (*ὁ πρωτότοκος*, cf. Col. i. 15; Heb. i. 6). Taken literally, these expressions are inconsistent with each other, as well as contradictory to the divine nature. But the first-born son, and the only-begotten son, are alike in the pre-eminent honor and favor in which they stand with their father; and those otherwise contradictory expressions find their obvious and harmonious meaning, their highest spiritual significance, in that singular, nay sole honor and favor in which, in his pre-existence, during his incarnation, and since his ascension, the eternal Son of God has always been and always will be in the bosom of the Father.

The various ways in which this more than filial relation is expressed and manifested during his humiliation are truly

¹ *ὁ εἶναι* in classic and in New Testament Greek denotes real, essential, perpetual existence.

² Thus only can this passage be interpreted consistently with the context and the constant teaching of the Scriptures, that "all things were created by him and for him, and he is before all things"; and this interpretation is corroborated, if not directly affirmed, by the subsequent clause: "that in all things he might have the pre-eminence," Col. i. 15-18.

wonderful: "The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hands." "The Father loveth the Son, and showeth him all things that himself doeth." "The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do; for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise." "And he that sent me is with me: the Father hath not left me alone; for I do always those things that please him." "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work." What a sublime consciousness does such language indicate, not only of the entire approbation and complacency of his Father, but of perfect harmony, nay unity, of action and oneness of spirit with God. The same wonderful consciousness, so unlike the conscious imperfection and separation from God, or want of nearness to him, which has always characterized the greatest and best of human kind — the same wonderful consciousness is apparent in the whole doctrine and life of this mysterious being; and we do not see how any candid, thoughtful person can contemplate such a character and life without the conviction which, on more than one occasion, forced itself upon those who saw and heard him: "truly this is the Son of God!" In the earliest recorded manifestation of his conscious life and character, at the age of twelve, we see him drawn away from his earthly parents to the house and the business of his heavenly Father, and, in answer to their expostulations, expressing his wonder that that they should expect to find him anywhere else or otherwise employed: "Wist ye not that I must be in the places and the things of my Father" — *ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μου*; that is, found in the house of God and absorbed in the interests of his kingdom? At his baptism the Father, in turn, expresses his affection and complacency for his well-beloved Son. At his temptation the tempter assails him again and again at this very point of his filial relation: "If thou be the Son of God"; and he proves his claim to that sacred name by the truly filial spirit in which he answers the tempter wholly out of the word of God, and desires to feed and live on nothing else, trusts implicitly in the provi-

dence of God, cleaves to his worship and service alone, and resigns himself entirely to his will. Even while he weeps and prays at the tomb of Lazarus he retains the full assurance that his Father hears him always. When he agonizes in the garden and shudders at the bitter cup which he was about to drink, his will is never for a moment at variance with his Father's, but he says, over and over again: "Not my will, but thine, be done."

And how *like* a Son who had always been at home in heaven with God, and knew he was soon to return thither, he *talks* of his Father, and his home, and the glory which he had with the Father before the world was, and which awaited him again on his return home, and the many mansions in his Father's house, and the place there which he was going to prepare for his disciples, and his will that all who believe on him and love him should be with him where he was so soon to be, and behold his glory. How like a son absent from home, his thoughts and words centered in that home, hovered over it, revolved about it. How manifestly his treasure, his heart, his home, his kingdom, were all in heaven! And how he communed with God as with a Father who was absent, and yet ever present, like a son who was alone, and yet not alone in the world! Yes, that was no ordinary son of no ordinary father; a perfect Son of a perfect Father, without an interest, a desire, or a thought separate from his Father in heaven. And that Father, in turn, manifested and expressed the same entire sympathy and complacency with his Son, and, more than once, by a voice from heaven, acknowledged him as his "beloved¹ Son, in whom he was well pleased." Thus they walked and talked² and worked together, in the perfect, mutual

¹ This *ὁ ἀγαπητός* is doubtless the definition and the synonym of the *ὁ μετὰ πάντων* and the *ὁ πρωτότοκος* of John and Paul.

² It is worthy of notice that, in Mark and Luke, the words of approval spoken by the Father at the baptism are addressed to the Son: "Thou art," etc. So in John xii. 28 the Father responds directly to the Son. There is, however, a climactic order in regard to the persons by whom the voice from heaven was heard. At the baptism it seems to have been heard only by himself and per-

love and fellowship of Father and Son, while our Lord tabernacled in the flesh. And after his resurrection he ascended directly to the presence of his Father, and sat down at his right hand,—the place of honor and power, the place of favor and affection,—where he ever liveth and reigneth King of kings and Lord of lords; far above all the principalities and powers in heavenly places, the partner of the Father's counsels and of his throne, the co-equal, co-eternal Son of God.

2. The Son of God is the image of God. The same idea, essentially, is expressed in various forms in the scriptures. He is the Word of God. He is the personal revelation, expression, manifestation, of God. He is God manifested in the flesh, or Divinity embodied and revealed through humanity.¹ A son is not only near and dear to his father, but he is like him. He is a copy of him. When the resemblance is striking, we say, he is the perfect image of his father; and those who have never seen the father may see him in his son, and all who are acquainted with the son, know the father through him. So the sacred writers speak of Christ as the image of the invisible God (Col. i. 15), and that, not in the secondary and subordinate sense in which man is also said to be the image of God, but the express image of his person, or the impress of his substance (*χαρακτήρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ*), the form of his essence, the counterpart of his being, and the reflection of his glory (*ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης*, Heb. i. 3). And our Lord himself declares: "he that hath seen me, hath seen the Father," "and from henceforth ye know him and have seen him" (John xiv. 7, 10). God is invisible to mortal eyes, and he reveals himself, manifests himself, only in the person of his Son. "No man hath seen God at any time; the only-begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father,

happens the Baptist; at the transfiguration, by the disciples who were with him, and are commanded to hear him; and at his last public discourse recorded by John, by the multitude, some of whom mistake it for thunder.

¹ The Greek words for these various forms of expression are, *εικόν*, 2 Cor. iv. 4, Col. i. 15, et al.; *λόγος*, John i. 1 seq., Rev. xix. 13; *ἀποκάλυψις*, Matt. xi. 27, etc.; *ἑξήγησις*, John i. 18; *φανερωσις*, 1 Tim. iii. 16.

he hath *declared* or *expressed* him (*ἐξηγήσατο*, John i. 18). God is unknowable in his moral perfections by any personal acquaintance, or direct exercise of the human intellect: "No man knoweth the Father, but the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will *reveal* him" (*ἀποκαλύψαι*, Matt. xi. 27, etc.). We have some faint analogy to this in those courts, especially of the Eastern world, where the sovereign is too sacred, too nearly divine, to appear in his own person, and his will is made known only through his ministers; and if any communication of special importance is to be made, perhaps he sends his son to represent him, to speak and act for him, to impersonate his government and, as it were, himself: "last of all, he sent unto them his *son*." It is for this reason that Christ is called the Word of God, the **ETERNAL WORD**, through whom, in all ages, he has been *expressing* himself in the creation and providential government of the world (John i. 3; Heb. i. 2), and speaking, living, shining, in the reason and conscience of every man that cometh into the world (John i. 45); the revealing Word, wherein God appeared in the theophanies and spoke in the prophecies of the old covenant, giving promise, in the very name by which he revealed himself to his peculiar people, of a future coming and a fuller manifestation in the latter days; and especially the Incarnate Word of truth and life to men lost in ignorance and dead in sin, living in human form on earth, speaking to the eyes and ears and sympathies of men as never man spake, warning, beseeching, bleeding, dying, that men might be reconciled to God, and all this with such authority and yet such tenderness that it is manifestly **GOD** beseeching us, through him, to be reconciled and live. What a revelation of the holy love of God! Or rather, what a perfect *image* of that God who *is* love; not blind and doting fondness, but pure, holy, sin-hating and yet sin-forgiving, law-sustaining yet self-sacrificing, love! How his discourses re-echo and interpret the voice of God in nature, in the rain and the sunshine, in the lilies of the field and the fowls of the air; how they re-affirm and en-

force with new sanctions the law of God in the Old Testament; how they transcend the light of nature in clearness and the law of Moses in strictness, while at the same time they discover vast realms of thought, lay open wide fields of vision, reveal profound mysteries in the being, providence, and grace of God, on which nature sheds not a ray of light, and the law and the prophets afford only faint shadows and promises of the light that was to dawn upon the world! How his parables gathered up all the analogies and harmonies which God has constituted between himself and man, between heaven and earth, between the material and the spiritual universe, and concentrated them as the truth and wisdom of God, the light of God's own countenance and the life of his own heart of infinite love, upon the understandings, the consciences, and the hearts of his hearers! In such miracles as the feeding of the multitudes, the turning of water into wine, walking upon the sea, and commanding the winds and the waves, we see imaged forth the creative power of God and his providential control over nature, so manifestly that the beholders were constrained to cry out: "Truly this is the Son of God"; while in healing the sick, raising the dead, casting out devils, and forgiving sins he demonstrated, or rather exemplified, God's forgiving love, *recovering* grace, and *new-creating* power. His very person, even in his humiliation, was at times radiant with divine glory, the glory of divine power and justice and holiness, as well as divine patience, love, and mercy. When he came as a refiner and purifier to purify the temple, at the beginning and at the close of his ministry, it was manifest to all that the Lord of the temple had come; and the traffickers who had made his Father's house a house of merchandise and a den of robbers could not abide the day of his coming. At his transfiguration his divinity shone through the veil of his humanity as the sun, and his very raiment was white as the light, and while the voice out of the cloud proclaimed him to be the beloved Son of God, he appeared to his disciples as the brightness of the Father's glory and

the express image of his person, and they fell on their faces and were sore afraid. When his enemies came upon him with an armed multitude to arrest him, in the full knowledge of all that awaited him, he presented himself voluntarily before them as the object of their search; and they, overwhelmed by the more than human majesty of his presence, went backward and fell to the ground. Through all the painful and humiliating scenes of his mock trial he seemed not so much a culprit as a king and a God who had power, to lay down his life and power to take it again, and who had only to speak the word, and twelve legions of angels would rush down from heaven for his deliverance. But, with that same patience and long-suffering with which *God* bears with a world of unbelievers and ungodly men, he would not speak the word, but chose rather to give himself an offering and a sacrifice for human sin, and thus to exhibit to the universe a new revelation of the stupendous self-sacrificing love of God. On the cross he opened the gates of paradise to the penitent malefactor who was crucified with him. "His death was the death of a God." In saying this, we only repeat the language of an unbeliever,¹ extorted from him by the moral grandeur of the sufferer himself, while the scene, as it is painted by eye-witnesses, shows us the sun darkened, the earth quaking, and the graves opening—all nature sympathizing with him as nature's God, and the very dead owning him as the Lord of life. His disciples felt that in seeing him they had seen God; that in seeing and hearing and touching him, they had seen and heard and handled that Word of life which was from the beginning, that Eternal Life which was with the Father and was manifested unto us (1 John i. 1, 2). The doubting Thomas beheld him after his resurrection, and cried out: "My Lord and my God." The beloved disciple lay upon his bosom, and, to the close of his long life, in his Gospel and his letters, he testified that "the Son of God is come, and that this is the true God and eternal life" (1 John. v. 20). The apostle Peter never

¹ Rousseau, in his "Confessions."

lost the impression of the scene on the mount of transfiguration: in his last Epistle, when he was just ready to put off his earthly tabernacle, the "honor" and "power" and "majesty" and "glory" of which he was an "eye-witness," still fill his vision (2 Pet. i. 16, 17). Paul saw him shining with heavenly light above the brightness of the midday sun, and ever after he conceived of him as "the image of the invisible God," and declared that "the same God who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, he it is [such is the emphasis of the true reading in the original], *he it is* that hath shined in our hearts to give us the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face [or person, *προσώπῳ*] of Jesus Christ" (2 Cor. iv. 6). And when we consider the wonderful analogies and harmonies which exist between his kingdom of grace and God's kingdom of nature and providence, when we contemplate the marvellous purity, beauty, grandeur, and glory of his character, and observe the supernatural power and progress of his religion, it would seem that no candid and reflecting mind could resist the conclusion that he is the image of God, and his kingdom is the kingdom of heaven. As the Son of man is the model man and the living exemplification of what man should be, so the Son of God is the image of God and the personal manifestation of what God is.

3. The Son of God is the representative of the Father. He is not only associated with God, or united to him, in the most intimate and endearing relations, he not only is the reflection of the Father's glory and the express image of his person, but he acts for him, and so represents him in the world. So the son of an earthly sovereign may not only resemble his father so fully as to be the perfect image of himself, but may also act as his representative in foreign lands, or in the administration of the government at home. The late Dr. Lyman Beecher once began a sermon which he preached in the Theological Seminary at Andover, by saying that Jesus Christ is the acting Deity of the universe. This statement seems to be justified by express declarations

of the scriptures, and is fully sustained by their general sentiment. As the Father is seen only in the Son, so he works everywhere by and through him. The work of creating, upholding, and preserving the universe is ascribed to his agency in the most explicit and emphatic terms: "All things were made by him," says John (John i. 3), "and without him was not anything made that was made." "By him were all things created," says Paul (Col. i. 16, 17), "that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones or dominions, or principalities or powers; all things were created by him and for him. And he is before all things, and by him all things consist [or continue in existence]." In other passages, God is represented as making the world, and creating and upholding all things by Jesus Christ (Eph. iii. 10; Heb. i. 2, 3).

The government is upon his shoulders (Isa. ix. 6): "Unto the *Son* he saith, Thy throne, O *God*, is for *ever* and *ever*." (Heb. i. 8). And this explains those numerous and striking analogies which are so often observed between the reign of Christ in the church and in the hearts of men and the realm of nature and providence. The realm of nature and the kingdom of Christ are only different parts of the same general administration. We cannot but infer that anonymous books which embody the same great thoughts in the same characteristic style have the same author, and the same laws and principles of government imply the same law-giver and king. It were not difficult to draw out in detail a rational argument of this kind which would confirm and establish the doctrine of revelation which we are considering. The traditions or the intuitions of the old Greeks taught them to believe in a trinity of divine personages, and that the direct administration of the government, rested not upon the universal Father, but upon his son and daughter. And imperfect conceptions, obscure revelations, shall we call them, of this great truth, are found in scattered rays throughout the heathen world. There are indications not a few which have convinced the Fathers in all the best

ages of the church that it was the Son of God, the Eternal Word, who appeared to patriarchs and inspired the prophets, who went forth with the armies of Israel as the Angel of Jehovah's presence, and who reigned as King of the kings of Israel under that peculiar name which foreshadowed his future coming in the flesh. During his incarnation, as rays of divinity shone through the veil of his humanity, so acts of creative power and exercises of authority in the material and the moral world often revealed him as the Lord of both; and in all these acts and exercises he appears as the agent and representative of the Father. His works and words all proceed from the Father as their original source. Or they are the joint acts of the Father and the Son, and the Son is the acting partner. "The works that I do in my Father's name, they bear witness of me" (John x. 25). "The words that I speak unto you, I speak not of myself; but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works" (John xiv. 10).

The same order is observed in the entire work of redemption. The Father is represented as the author or source, and the Son as the agent in the work. *Of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption*" (1 Cor. i. 30). And this agrees with our Lord's intercessory prayer: "As thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us, that the world may believe that thou hast sent me" (John xiv. 21). "All things are of God [that is, from him as their original source, ἐξ τοῦ Θεοῦ], who hath reconciled us to himself by [or through] Jesus Christ." "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself" (2 Cor. v. 18, 19); this is the whole history of our world as related to the providence and government of God, a history of redemption and reconciliation to God, proceeding from the Father as its original source, and carried on through the agency of his Son Jesus Christ. The ministries of angels centre in his person. They all worshipped him as the Son of God when he came into the world (Heb. i. 6); they

were continually ascending and descending upon him as the Son of man while he dwelt on earth; and it is only through him that the heavens are opened for their ministrations (John i. 51). He shed forth the Spirit on the day of Pentecost (Acts ii. 33); and all heavenly influences have ever since flowed down to the church and the world through the same channel. The first Christian martyr fell asleep saying "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit" (Acts vii. 59); and dying Christians in every age commit their bodies and their souls to his keeping. It is the voice of the Son of God that is to raise the dead at the last day (John v. 25, 28); and in proof that this power is given him, he called Lazarus forth from the grave, and when he gave his life a ransom for many, many bodies of the saints arose and came out of the graves as the first-fruits of a general resurrection (Matt. xxvii. 52, 53). He is to judge the world at the final judgment; "for the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son; that all men should honor the Son even as they honor the Father" (John v. 22, 23). In short, all power is given to him in heaven and in earth (Matt. xxviii. 18). When God raised him from the dead, "he set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come. And hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the church" (Eph. i. 20-22). And thus he must reign, the *representative* of the church, the representative, in some sense, also of mankind, but more than all, and above all, the representative of the Father, till the church is triumphant, the world reconciled and redeemed, and all things subjected to his dominion (1 Cor. xv. 25).

4. The Son of God is God—really and truly God—very God, to use the language of some of the early creeds, clothed with all the attributes and prerogatives of proper Deity.

This is the natural import of the name. A son is usually

understood—is at least presumed—to be of the nature and rank of his father. We are surprised if in any case we find it to be otherwise. And when our Lord Jesus Christ habitually calls himself, and is habitually called by the apostles and sacred writers, the Son of God, as his characteristic name, this fact alone certainly creates a strong presumption that he is a truly divine person. If he is not so, we must learn it, in spite of this fact, from other facts and teachings of the scriptures.

But the facts in the case and the general teachings of the scriptures, so far from removing, greatly strengthen and confirm the presumption that Jesus Christ is truly divine. He is often called God in the scriptures (e.g. John i. 1; Rom. ix. 5; Heb. i. 8 et passim); and lest it should be supposed that this name also was to be understood in a subordinate sense, the attributes and works of God are ascribed to him in the same connection. Thus, in the oft-cited prologue to the Gospel of John, while he is declared to *be* God, co-existence with God from the beginning and the work of creation—the attribute and the work which especially distinguish the Eternal and the Almighty—are expressly affirmed of him who became flesh and dwelt on earth as the only-begotten of the Father. Nor is this a solitary or singular passage. On the contrary, the sacred writers, with one accord, with great frequency, and in a great variety of ways, ascribe to him the names, the attributes, the works, and the worship which are the characteristic and the prerogative of supreme divinity. And they not only assert this formally and dogmatically, but what is more remarkable and more convincing to some minds, they are constantly implying it, taking it for granted, acting upon it, showing practically that they look up to him and love and trust him as their Lord and their God, and actually honor the Son even as also they honor the Father. So that if Christ is a mere man, or even the most exalted of created beings, it is not easy to see what the sacred writers could have said or done more than they have said and done to

mislead the church into the idolatry which it has always practised in rendering to a creature the glory which is due only to the Creator, and which God has said he will not give to another.

Furthermore, while he dwelt in the flesh, with his divinity veiled in humanity, Jesus of Nazareth actually exhibited divine knowledge, exerted divine powers, exercised divine attributes and prerogatives. In his miracles, he not only healed sicknesses and forgave sins in the exercise of an authority which belongs to God only, but he controlled nature and imparted life; he *created* and *raised from the dead* by a word of power like that which in the beginning created the heavens and the earth, and which said: "Let there be light; and there was light."

If any choose to question the authenticity of these evangelical narratives, still the character of Christ, as it lies on the face of the Gospels, is not only too great to be exhibited by a mere man, but too pure and grand to be conceived by any human imagination, certainly by the humble fishermen of Galilee. He showed superhuman wisdom and virtue. His teachings were superhuman. His mission was totally unlike any one ever undertaken by any human being. He undertook and accomplished a superhuman work. Comparing him with the highest human standards, some of the greatest men that have ever lived, with the widest acquaintance with human capacities and attainments, — such men, for instance, as Webster and Napoleon, who were not predisposed to believe in the supernatural, and to whom nothing within the range of human possibilities would seem superhuman, — have declared that he could not possibly have been a mere man. He *was* a *man*, as we said in our Article on the Son of Man. He was the generic and absolute man. He was the model man, and the representative man. But there was something over and above all this. Beyond the utmost stretch of human capabilities and achievements there were divine powers and prerogatives. United in the same person with that universal comprehension of and sym-

pathy with man which proved him to be a complete and perfect man, there was an entire sympathy and absolute union with God which proved him to be very God; and that, too, without resting the argument chiefly, or at all, on his frequent assertions of equality and oneness with the Father — assertions so strangely at variance with his remarkable humility and modesty if he were a mere man, but which so befit his whole character and life on the supposition that he was also God. When a being of such marvellous humility and meekness, yet such matchless purity and dignity of character, claims to be at once the Son of man and the Son of God, and calls himself habitually by the one or the other of these names, according as he contemplates his relations to God on the one hand, or to man on the other, the presumption arising from this single circumstance is strong that he is both God and man. And if our former Article showed him to be in the *truest* and *highest* sense man, after the loftiest ideal of humanity, the considerations brought together in this should suffice to prove that he is in the *truest* and *fullest* sense God, according to the best conception we can form of divinity. If the only-begotten and well-beloved Son of God, who always was and is to be in the bosom of the Father, in the nearness and dearness of an eternal fellowship and an eternal sonship; who is the manifestation, the expression, the perfect image of God, such a reflection of his glory and express image of his person, that whoever has seen the Son has seen the Father also; who is the agent and representative of God in the creation and preservation of the material and the spiritual universe, in the redemption of the church and the reconciliation of the world and the government of both, in the general resurrection of the dead and the final judgment of men and angels, in all divine attributes and acts, so that he is manifestly the acting Deity of the universe, — if he is not God, there is no actual or possible evidence that there is any God.

Behold, then, in conclusion of this whole discussion —

behold our perfect type and pattern, the Son of man and also the Son of God, the Son of man and the Son of God in one person. Behold the true ideal of humanity, the Son of God as well as the Son of man, man reconciled and united to God, man on his own scale and in his own sphere the image and representative of his Maker. This is what Christ is, and what man was made to be. He who was originally the Son of God, in his infinite condescension became the Son of man, that they who are by nature the children of men might by grace become the children of God. This is what every man should aspire to be — a true son of man in all his relations to man, a true son of God in unison and sympathy with the infinite Father. This is what every man who is united to Christ is destined to become. This is the paradise which was lost in Adam, and regained in Christ.

Behold also in the person and the religion of Christ the medium through which this ideal is to be realized, the means by which this end is to be accomplished. The idea of *religion* which is contained in the etymology of the word is, that it *binds back*, restores, reconciles, reunites, man to God. The religion of Christ answers exactly to that idea. That is its very definition. And that definition is fully expressed, that idea is embodied, in the person of Christ. He is himself the Son of man and the Son of God, the God-man, and thus, in nature as well as in office, the Mediator between God and man, the days-man for whom the nations and ages have so long sighed, who *can* lay his hand upon us both. He is the bond of union as between man and his fellow man, so also between man and his Maker, the blessed *at-one-ment* whereby God is reconciling all things unto himself, whether they be things in earth or things in heaven, wherein especially *men* of all classes and conditions, nations and ages, who believe in Jesus, shall become one in Christ and God, agreeably to our Lord's intercessory prayer, "that they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they may be one in us." He is the divine-human channel of communication between heaven and earth, reaching

up to the eternal throne, extending down to the lowest and remotest subject, through which every sigh of humanity may reach the ear and touch the heart of the infinite Father, and through which, in return, all heavenly and divine influences may flow down into the bodies and the souls of his earthly children. To deny either his human or his divine nature were to break up the communication, were to sever it in the very midst. The channel would then reach only half way from earth to heaven, or only half way from heaven to earth. The religion of Christ manifestly is, what any religion must be to deserve the name, a divine-human religion. Its central idea is the reconciliation of man to God, and its central life and power is in the person of a divine-human Redeemer.

Finally, behold in him the pledge of the ultimate realization of this grand idea, the final consummation of this blessed and glorious end: *see* divinity on the cross of reconciliation; *see* humanity on the throne of the universe. And is this stupendous sacrifice and this amazing exaltation all for nothing? Had it no object? Can it be of no avail? The Son of God has lived and died for men on earth; the Son of man lives and reigns for him in heaven. Heaven and earth are reconciled. God and man are united in one person, and that person *reigns* head over all things to the church, King of kings and Lord of lords, having all power in heaven and on earth at his disposal. Surely then the church is safe. The religion of Christ will triumph. The interests of humanity are secure. Mankind will yet be one in Christ and God. The golden rule will yet regulate the hearts and lives of men, for it governed the life of the Son of man. The will of God shall yet be done on earth as in heaven, for that is the *Lord's* prayer. Men and angels shall unite in singing the song: On earth, peace, good will to men, glory to God in the highest. That will be heaven begun on earth. And then to be with Christ where he is, in the bosom of the Father; to see him as he is in his mysterious person, absolute man, yet perfect God; to behold

his glory, the glory of the only-begotten of the Father, Light of light, God of God, the perfect image of the Invisible, the Eternal, the Infinite One; to be like him, the purified and perfected children of men, and also the adopted and glorified sons of God; to be *in* him even as he is in the Father — that will be the perfect blessedness of heaven.

ARTICLE V.

FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE.

BY REV. J. M. HOPPIN, PROFESSOR IN YALE COLLEGE.

FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE was born in the year 1805. He was educated at Cambridge University, entering Trinity College, but ending his course in the smaller college of Trinity Hall, which he joined in 1823, together with his future brother-in-law, John Sterling. Being at that time a dissenter he did not take a degree, although he had a fellowship offered him. Two years after leaving Cambridge, having then become a member of the Established church, he took a degree at Oxford. He was for a short time editor of the "Athenaeum," and since that period has been almost constantly before the public eye. He has written largely upon theological and practical subjects; has originated charitable and educational institutions for the working-classes; and for three years he held the chair of divinity at King's College, London, which he was compelled to resign for alleged heterodox views upon the doctrine of eternal punishment. At the present moment Mr. Maurice is rector of the church at Lincoln-in-fields, London, which is a peculiar ecclesiastical organization, holding a somewhat anomalous relationship to the Established church. As a preacher he is without action or any of the graces of delivery, and has a decidedly sing-song tone. He has nothing to