

THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

No. 4—October, 1903.

I.

OUR LORD'S TEACHING CONCERNING HIMSELF.

THIS is a subject of fundamental importance, the subject which underlies and determines every other portion of our Lord's teaching—His teaching concerning God and concerning man. For if we admit His claims in regard to Himself, we know that through Him alone we can come to the knowledge of the Father, and that by Him man's place and character and destiny are determined.

Moreover, it is a unique subject. The theme is identical with the Teacher. This is unparalleled. A true teacher keeps himself in the background. Whenever he refers to himself, it is as to one who is himself a disciple, and whose place is always subordinate to the truth to which he bears witness. But our Lord identifies Truth with His own Person. He makes Himself the supreme Subject of His teaching and the sole medium through whom Divine Truth can be revealed or apprehended. His words were, as the disciples recognized, "the words of Eternal Life"—not merely promises of life, but vehicles of life, for in them His life energizes and quickens those who receive them. As Hort says:

"His *ῥήματα* were so completely parts and utterances of Himself, that they had no meaning as abstract statements of truth uttered by Him as a Divine oracle or prophet. Take away Himself as the primary (though not the ultimate) subject of every statement and they all fall to pieces."*

The self-assertion which would be a mark of weakness and egotism in other men, in the man Christ Jesus impresses us with reverence

* Hort: *The Way, the Truth and the Life*, p. 207.

for His transcendent personality and brings home to us the uniqueness and greatness of His self-consciousness. The substance of Christ's teaching, the key to it, is to be found in His own personality. It is the personality which gives both character and power to His teaching. The religion of Jesus is bound up with the person of Jesus. In the truest and most absolute sense it can be said that "Christianity is Christ."

The teaching of Christ concerning Himself is, I think I may say without exaggeration, the subject which to-day looms up above all others in Theology. Christ is acknowledged, as perhaps never before, to be the Supreme Person of history; the records of His life are subjected to the keenest scrutiny; and in all theological work, whether it be constructive or destructive, the significance of His claims and teaching is the great determinative. No one can fail to note the remarkable change which has taken place in this regard. The emphasis which was laid on the work of the Redeemer is now placed upon His Person. This change has not been unproductive of good in some directions. We have come to know Christ under the actual historical conditions of His life, its precedent conditions, its social and religious environment; as He was never before known. This is an attainment for which we ought to be profoundly grateful, and from which there cannot fail to flow eventually the most fruitful results in Christian life and work.

When, however, we come to inquire into the causes of this revolution, we find indications of the dangers that press upon us at this epoch. The critical spirit has too frequently degenerated into a sceptical spirit. Critical methods have to a large extent been dominated by a philosophy of history which seeks to eliminate the supernatural. Hence the motive that has impelled many students of our Lord's life has been their hope and endeavor to account for Christ on the basis of natural development without any supernatural intervention, to find the secret of His power in the conditions of His earthly life, and to explain His person and His works in the terms of the laws of psychological and historical evolution.

Like every other assault upon the great citadel of the Christian faith, the present rationalistic movement is already manifesting its inherent weakness. The more accurate and complete our knowledge of the national, social and religious conditions of our Lord's life, the more apparent does it become that these do not and cannot explain His personality. The outcome of these researches will furnish, on the one hand, the confutation of all merely naturalistic theories of Christ's person and origin; and on the other hand, they

will contribute, reluctantly it may be, a most powerful factor to the strengthening and enrichment of Christian faith, giving the people of Christ a worthier apprehension of their Lord, inspiring them with a higher and purer devotion, and binding them together in the unity which alone has reality and perpetuity—"the unity of the faith and knowledge of the Son of God." Now it is to the Gospels that we must go as the only accessible source for our knowledge of Christ's teaching concerning Himself. In this paper I proceed upon three assumptions.

(1) Recent criticism has done nothing to impair our confidence in the genuineness and historicity of the Synoptical Gospels. On the contrary the weight of sober New Testament criticism tends strongly to support the traditional belief of the Church, notwithstanding the strange recrudescence of radical scepticism, which was nothing more than what was to have been expected, when the methods and theories of the dominant school of Old Testament criticism came to be applied logically and consistently to the problems of the New Testament. In the face of this reaction, New Testament scholarship in its best forms has made very decided advances toward an agreement as to the authorship and date of the Synoptical Gospels.* The change here is not yet complete, but in its extent it is remarkable; and the return from second century theories to the acceptance of a date between A.D. 78 and 93 concedes so much, that the position of those who maintain the earlier date, prior to A.D. 70, has been greatly strengthened. We are confident that before long what we regard as the true position will be generally admitted.

(2) With equal confidence it may be claimed that the tendency of scholarship is to reaffirm the genuineness and historicity of John's Gospel and its accord with the Synoptical Gospels in its presentation of our Lord's person and teaching. This is clearly seen, for example, in Wendt's recent book on the fourth Gospel. It is true that he brings out a very artificial and complicated theory of the composition of the Gospel, and that he detracts from the significance of the Evangelist's words and fails to do justice to the great conceptions of the Gospel, just as in his previous work on *The Teaching of Jesus* he brings down the teaching of the Synoptics to at least an equal extent; but he maintains what is of special moment in connection with our subject, that "the testimonies of Jesus Him-

* "There has been a steady withdrawal from the later dates of the Tübingen school toward the traditional position" (R. J. Drummond: *Relation of the Apostolic Teaching*, etc., p. 6).

self (in St. John's Gospel) carry the very stamp of historicity."* Moreover, he asserts the harmony of John's presentation of Christ with that of the Synoptists. He shows, in regard to the discourses in St. John's Gospel, that with all their divergence in form, they present the same fundamental truths as the Synoptics. In these discourses he declares that our Lord's claims are only more frequent, explicit and emphatic than in the Synoptic testimonies.

The Jesus of John does not differ from the Jesus of the Synoptics. It is admitted that the Jesus of Matthew and Luke is to all intents and purposes the very same Jesus that St. John depicts. Wrede argues that St. Mark's presentation of Jesus is the same as St. John's; in fact, as he puts it, that it is a life of Christ written from the standpoint of the later Church. We need not discuss the position taken by him as to Mark. What we note is the admission of the harmony of St. John with the Synoptics, notwithstanding the striking differences between them.

We do not ignore those differences, nor do we need to resort to any such makeshift expedients as that of translation from the Aramaic or a filtration of the words of Jesus through the personality of John. True, St. John had pondered those gracious words for half a century, but he did not change them. A comparison of John's first Epistle and the Gospel prologue with the rest of the Gospel shows us that St. John carefully refrained from putting his own words into the mouth of Jesus. And can we believe that the apostle could have invented such striking phrases as "I am the Light of the world," which characterize the fourth Gospel? Or, that he gave to our Lord's presentation of Himself the vast variety of form and boldness of attitude which we find in it? If St. John's Gospel be the most transcendental, it is the most personal and historical. It bears water-marks of time and place and circumstance, inwrought into its texture, which exclude all possibility of counterfeit.

The true solution of the problem seems to be this. Two types of our Lord's teaching can be distinguished: the one exoteric and popular, predominately practical and ethical; the other esoteric and mystical, in which were brought out the inner secrets of Christ's being and His relations with the Father. The former was of an Evangelistic character. It was naturally the chief subject of the Apostles' testimony in their public preaching of the Gospel, and

* Weiss maintains the absolute historical trustworthiness of John's Gospel; and even appears to set it above the Synoptics in this regard (*Life of Christ*, I, 108-131).

was first put into writing. The latter was spoken by Christ in the inner and sympathetic circle of the Twelve, especially when, in the stress of opposition and hatred, or under the shadow of impending death, he unbosomed his inmost thought and life and gave out to those who alone were able to receive them the deep things of His being and His mission. St. John was the one in closest intimacy and completest sympathy with Jesus. Upon him these teachings would make the deepest impression. He was specially fitted to receive and record them. His very style of speech and thought may have been, probably was, moulded by his contact with Jesus, and through the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, who worked in and through His chosen instrument, St. John was enabled to recall and reproduce accurately and faithfully the words of life.

(3) Through the New Testament there is given one and the same representation of Christ. Whatever date be given to the Gospels, the Epistles of St. Paul are among the earliest writings of the New Testament. The Christ of St. Paul is a Supernatural Being, the Incarnate Son of God, as manifestly as the Christ of St. John.* Thus at the beginning and at the end of the period in which the New Testament originated there is the same conception of our Lord absolutely unchanged. At whatever point in the interval the Synoptics appear, whether prior to A.D. 70, as I believe, or subsequently, the very same Christ appears in them. They do not vary from the Pauline presentation which preceded them, nor from the Johannine which followed them.

Moreover, the Gospels themselves are of apostolic origin, and thus stand on common ground with the Epistles. The latter do not narrate in detail Christ's words and acts, not only because it was unnecessary but also because even there the right understanding of what Christ said and did for us required that view of His Supernatural Person, His Incarnation, Death and Resurrection, which is the great purpose of the Epistles to set before us. The appeal of the Apostles was not merely to Christ's words as though He were a teacher and nothing more, but to His whole Preëminent and Supernatural Personality.

It can be abundantly demonstrated that there is nothing in the Epistles, in the apostolic teaching about Christ, which is not, at least seminally, in Christ's own words and in the Gospel records. Throughout both we have absolute loyalty to Christ's teaching, and between both we have complete harmony. If there is develop-

* "Here (*i.e.*, in St. John's Gospel) we have portrayed . . . a speaking, acting, Pauline Christ" (Harnack: *History of Dogma*, I, 97).

ment, it is legitimate development. There is nothing in the apostolic exposition which is not in the Gospels, which contain in germ the whole complete revelation of Christ.* There is nothing in the Gospels which we do not owe to apostolic testimony. In neither Gospels nor Epistles can we reach Christ except through the Apostles. Both are of apostolic origin, and both present one and the same Christ to us.†

Our Lord's teaching concerning Himself naturally falls into two divisions: His teaching concerning His *Person*, and His teaching concerning His *Mission*. The former may be grouped around His two great titles—the *Son of Man* and the *Son of God*. The latter comprises three great functions or works—*Revelation*, *Redemption* and *Judgment*.

FIRST—OUR LORD'S TEACHING CONCERNING HIS PERSON.

All this revolves around two foci, two coördinate and complementary designations of Jesus which determine His origin and nature.

I. *Jesus is the Son of Man.*

This designation occurs sixty-nine times in the Synoptics, eleven times in St. John, eighty times in all. It is uniformly the self-designation of Jesus, always used by Him of Himself, and never used by anyone else, except in one case which stands outside the Gospel history in the mouth of the dying Stephen (Acts vii. 56). The frequency with which our Lord used the term indicates the place it had in His consciousness and its importance to us.

1. The *origin* of this designation has been the subject of much discussion. An attempt has recently been made to identify it with the indefinite Aramaic term *barnasha*—"a son of man"—which is alleged by some to have been the Galilean vernacular for "man" and to have had no other meaning. Wellhausen

* "The latest, most mature, and most transcendent developments are the nearest approach to the original thought of the Divine Prototype" (Drummond: *Apostolic Teaching*, etc., p. 256).

† The Apostles were, as Hort shows, "essentially personal witnesses of the Lord" (*The Christian Ecclesia*, p. 230). "Ye shall be witnesses," said our Lord to them, "after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you." And after they had received the Divine gift, they said, "We are witnesses." The Lord spoke in and through them, so that their testimony was that of Christ Himself. See Meyer's interpretation of Rom. x. 14: "How can they believe on Him whom they have not heard preaching?" Sanday and Headlam urge that "it must be so translated, and what follows must be interpreted by assuming that the preaching of Christ's messengers is identical with the preaching of Christ Himself." The Apostles regarded Christ as the one supreme authority and themselves as absolutely dependent upon Him. He was not only their Teacher but their Message.

assumes that Jesus said "man," where the Gospels make Him say "The Son of Man." Here he follows Lietzmann, who argues that *barnasha*, although it is literally "the son of man," in actual usage means simply "the man"; so that the distinction in the Greek between $\delta \ \alpha \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi \omicron \varsigma$ and $\delta \ \nu \iota \delta \varsigma \ \tau \omicron \upsilon \delta \ \alpha \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi \omicron \upsilon$ could not have existed in Aramaic. Hence he concludes that Jesus never applied to Himself the title "Son of Man" at all. This conclusion Driver admits to be in conflict with all the direct evidence we possess on the subject, although he hesitates as to the philological argument. Dalman affirms positively, and justifies his affirmation, that the conclusion of Lietzmann and Wellhausen "is a grievous error, which careful observation of the Biblical Aramaic alone would have rendered impossible."*

The term "Son of Man" occurs in two Apocryphal writings, the Book of Enoch (Similitudes' Section) and second Esdras, whose author was evidently dependent upon the Book of Daniel. If we accept these as pre-Christian in date (which is much disputed)† they could not have had any wide currency, and their influence must have been slight. Certainly "son of man" was not in use among the Jewish people of our Lord's time as a designation of the expected Messiah.‡ This was probably one reason, a minor one,

* See Dalman's *Words of Jesus*, p. 239.

† Even those who contend for the earlier date of the Book of Enoch admit that it has been interpolated with Christian phrases. Drummond considers that the original Book of Enoch was written in the latter half of the second century before Christ, but says that its integrity cannot be relied upon. He concludes that the Messianic passages in the Similitudes are of unknown but probably Christian origin; and that we cannot safely appeal to them as evidence of pre-Christian Jewish belief (*The Jewish Messiah*, pp. 17-73). With him agree Hilgenfeld, Keim, Oehler, etc. Charles, who maintains the pre-Christian origin of the passages in question, yet not only ascribes the Similitudes to a different authorship from the rest of the book, but also points out that the Messianic doctrine is not merely different from that contained in the other portions, but also unique in apocalyptic literature. These considerations serve to show how precarious are any deductions based upon the theory of its Jewish authorship. Stalker, in an instructive dissertation appended to his *Christology of Jesus*, is of the opinion that Drummond's arguments outweigh those of Charles. He says, "The Book of Similitudes is, obviously and confessedly, a perfect patchwork of interpolations." He concludes that it is hopeless to build any structure of history or speculation on such a foundation. (See also Schürer: *Jewish People*, etc., Div. II, Vol. III, 68, who leans to the pre-Christian view, but admits its uncertainty).

‡ That "Son of Man" was not a current Messianic title is maintained by Baur, Hilgenfeld, Wendt and others. "The sense attached by Jesus to the title is peculiar to Him alone and is no mere counterpart of the idea in Enoch and second Esdras" (Dalman: *The Words of Jesus*, p. 266). "This expression was not familiar to the great mass of the people as a title of the Messiah" (Wendt: *The Teaching of Jesus*, 2, 140). See also Beyschlag: *New Testament Theology*, I, 65, and Weiss: *Bib. Theol. of N. T.*, I, 74.

why our Lord adopted it. It concealed in great measure the truth which, as we shall see, it certainly affirmed. It was a veiled designation; so that while it was, as Beyschlag says, "penetrated with Messianic meaning," it concealed its Messianic significance from those whose idea of the Messiah was altogether alien to our Lord's conception of His Messiahship.

We must find the source of the title either in the Old Testament or in our Lord's own consciousness. It is probable that the truth lies between these two views.* There can be no doubt, I think, that we have in the Old Testament the germ from which it sprung, and which grew to its completeness and rich significance in the consciousness of our Lord. Then where in the Old Testament is this germ to be found? Several passages have been suggested, and with all of them it has affinities. In the Book of Ezekiel the phrase "son of man" occurs some ninety times. It is always applied to the Prophet himself, and is used to recall to him his weakness and dependence upon God. In Psalm lxxx (verse 17), which the Jewish Targums interpret Messianically, the Deliverer whom God would raise up is thus described:

"Let Thy hand be upon the man of Thy right hand,
Upon the Son of Man Whom Thou madest strong for Thyself."

In the Eighth Psalm the Psalmist, impressed by the magnificence of creation and the greatness of the Creator, and moved by his own insignificance, cries:

"What is man, that Thou art mindful of him?
And the son of man, that Thou visitest him?"

In Dan. vii. 13, in the vision of the four world-empires, likened to four beasts coming up out of the sea, there appears at the climax one "like the Son of Man" Who "came with the clouds of heaven," and to Whom "there was given dominion, glory and a kingdom, that all people, nations and languages should serve Him; His dominion is an everlasting dominion which shall not pass away, and His kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." This passage was regarded by the Jews as referring to Messiah personally. As the Book of Daniel became a model for later apocalyptic literature, it is possible that the use of the title "Son of Man" in the Book of Enoch and in second Esdras was derived from this source. There are distinct traces of this passage in not a few of our Lord's words,

* Bishop Westcott takes a somewhat different view. He says: "The title is a new one, not derived from Daniel vii. 13; and it expresses Christ's relation, not to a family nor to a nation, but to all humanity. There is nothing in the Gospels to show that it was understood as a title of the Messiah."

noticeably in the great eschatological discourse in Matt. xxiv: "Then shall appear the sign of the Son of Man in heaven; and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn; and they shall see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory"; and in the words addressed to the High Priest at the trial: "Hereafter shall ye see the Son of Man sitting upon the right hand of power and coming in the clouds of heaven" (see also Matt. xiii. 41, xvi. 27, 28, xix. 28). It seems, then, highly probable that we have in Daniel* the source of the self-designation of Jesus as the Son of Man; and were it true, which seems exceedingly doubtful, that in Daniel there is no mention of a personal Messiah, but that the description, "One like unto the Son of Man," is a collective phrase for "the people of the saints of the Most High," to whom in the explanation of the vision the power is given, this would not deprive it of its Messianic character. Just as "the servant of Jehovah" in Isaiah is primarily a designation of Israel collectively, and then of Him in whom alone Israel's vocation was realized and fulfilled, so also the primary reference here to the reign of the Saints does not preclude an interior and ultimate reference to Him in whom, by whom and with whom they reign.

While the vision of Daniel may be rightly claimed as the most immediate source of the title, "Son of Man," a reference to the other passages cited is not precluded. The oft-repeated synonym for Ezekiel's weakness has its application to Him who had not where to lay His head. The Man of God's right hand, the Son of Man who was made strong to carry out God's purpose of deliverance for His people, finds its fulfillment in Him who came to seek and save. The Eighth Psalm is given a Messianic interpretation in the second chapter of Hebrews, where He who was "made lower than the angels for suffering and death" is "crowned with glory and honour" and "all things put in subjection under His feet."† In these Old Testament passages are the foreshadowings of the conception of the Son of Man which our Lord so marvelously enlarged and enriched; but as a designation of Jesus it is used exclusively by Himself. While the Synoptics bear witness to His usage, they never themselves adopt the term. Jesus alone calls Himself "Son of Man"; no one else ever did. It was never used by the

* "Daniel is pointed to not only by definite later expressions, synoptical and Johannine, but by all the elementary points of Jesus' teaching" (Keim: *Jesus of Nazara*, Vol. 3, 86).

† The Eighth Psalm is also Messianically applied in chap. xxi. 16; 1 Cor. xv. 27; Eph. i. 22. Keim says that the objections to its Messianic meaning are very weak (Keim: *Jesus of Nazara*, III, 87).

Apostles; nor did the Church ever invoke Jesus as "Son of Man." The reason for this abstinence on the part of the early Church is not far to seek. The expression, especially as interpreted in a Greek sense, might seem to imply simply the human side of Christ's nature as descended from man; in the Semitic sense it implied much more.*

2. Let us now inquire into the *significance* of the name as used by our Lord. Of this some indications have already been given us, but it is to our Lord's own application of it that we must look for its complete interpretation. It asserts that He who assumes it is truly man, but it implies, as we shall see, that He is a man beyond all others, yea, that He is more than man. Three things at least are involved in the title—that our Lord's manhood is real, is unique and is representative.

(1) The *reality* of our Lord's manhood. This had come to be disputed even in St. John's day. There were those who contended that Jesus Christ had not come in the flesh, and who taught that He only assumed in appearance or for a time that which was foreign to Him and with which His personality had nothing in common. According to a well-known Hebrew idiom, the son of anything is that which embodies the idea of that to which it is thus described as related. "The Son of Man," then, means one possessed of the reality of humanity, one who is verily and indeed man.†

Throughout the Gospel story this is abundantly attested. Our Lord possessed all the qualities of manhood, both bodily and spiritual. After His Resurrection He gave many incontrovertible proofs that He was truly and actually, and not merely in appearance, man—in all things made like unto us, with one extraordinary exception. Thus Christ's grace and condescension are magnified in His assumption of our nature with all its limitations and infirmities. That the name "Son of Man" declared his identification of Himself with us was one reason why He delighted in it.

(2) The *uniqueness* of our Lord's humanity. This appears, negatively, in His freedom from sin; positively, in the ideal which He embodied.

* "The Church was quite justified in refusing, on its part, to give currency to the title; for in the meantime 'the Son of Man' had been set upon the throne of God" (Dalman: *Words of Jesus*, p. 266). "As the consciousness of the Church became more and more completely engrossed with the subject of the essential divinity of Christ, this name, in spite of its associations with images of majesty, failed to express the thoughts which were uppermost in men's minds" (Stanton: *The Jewish and the Christian Messiah*, p. 244).

† Bishop Westcott says: "The idea of the true humanity of Christ lies at the foundation of it."

(a) The sinlessness of Jesus, although disparaged by some as a merely negative character, separates by a great gulf the consciousness of Jesus from that of all other men. Not only is this sinlessness demonstrated by His actions and words and in the whole conduct of His life, the detailed evidence for which it is not possible even to glance at; not only is it attested alike by friends and foes, and these not only among His contemporaries but all along the ages, so that to-day the verdict of Pilate, "I find no fault in this man," is the verdict of mankind; but the strongest attestation of the sinlessness of Jesus of necessity comes from within, not from without—from His own consciousness, rather than from the testimony and conviction of others. He Himself dared to utter the challenge, "Which of you convicteth Me of sin?" He declared His complete conformity to the Will of the Father—"I do always the things that are pleasing to Him." The Evil One, He affirms, "hath nothing in Me"—no weakness, no taint of selfishness, no tendency to evil, which Satan could lay hold of and bend to his purpose. These utterances are marked by a dignity, a simplicity and a genuineness which impress even those who are hostile.

No consciousness of sin! Such is the great gulf which separates the consciousness of Jesus from that of all other men. As Keim says: "The conscience of Jesus is the only conscience without a scar in the whole history of mankind."

Here is a man without sin; and He knows it and affirms it. And He knew what sin is. He had been trained in the disciplinary institutions of Israel, whose chief aim was to impress upon the conscience the sinfulness of man and the holiness of God. He had been instructed in the Old Testament, throughout which run those two determinative truths of Revelation. He realized as no one else ever did the breadth and spirituality of the Divine law and how searching and absolute are its requirements. He was keenly conscious of sin in others. He knew its prevalence and its power. He laid bare the inmost secrets of human hearts. No disguise could cover up from Him the malice, pride, self-will and impurity of man. It is emphatically said of him that "He knew what was in man."

He lived in closest fellowship with God; but the vision of the Divine purity did not awaken in Him, as it did in other men—a Job, an Isaiah, a Daniel, a Paul, an Augustine, an à Kempis, a Luther—a sense of unworthiness. Our Lord was humble; as He Himself says, "Meek and lowly in heart." Now wherever we find deep humility among men it is accompanied with self-distrust and self-accusation. But such was not the attitude of Christ. In

Him there was complete absence of self-reproach. As R. H. Hutton notes, Christ's humility was "not of conscious unworthiness, like St. Paul's, but of conscious submission to filial perfection." No physical miracle that was ever wrought approaches in significance and grandeur this moral miracle of the absolute sinlessness, the spotless purity and goodness of the Man of Nazareth.

(b) Our Lord's sinlessness was not of a merely negative nature. There was positive and active goodness shown in character and conduct. In Him "whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honourable, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report" meet together. In Him the ideal of humanity is embodied. But not only did He embody it; He first disclosed it. Not merely was it never elsewhere found in actual being; it never existed in theory or in imagination. No philosopher had ever conceived it. No poet had ever pictured it. Certainly it had not existed among our Lord's contemporaries, as even Strauss admits. The Jewish ideal of the time was a poor beggarly artificial creation of legalism, set forth in the dreary religionism and formalism of the Pharisees which our Lord denounced, and seen at its best in the devout and fanatical intensity of one Saul of Tarsus who persecuted unto the death the followers of Jesus.*

And if this ideal cannot be found in Judaism, it certainly cannot be found outside of it. Neither the dreamy mysticism of Eastern sages, nor the loftiest speculations of Greek philosophy, nor the political activities of Roman imperialism could be its birthplace.

Nor could our Lord's character and claims have been constructed by an idealist out of the Old Testament, or wrought out by some process of conscious imitation of Old Testament prophecies. The unity of the Messianic portraiture in them was not discoverable by man. That portraiture is so complicated, it is given in details so numerous and so diffused, it abounds in traits so diverse and apparently contradictory, that no ingenuity of research, no vividness of imagination could ever construct it, could ever combine its elements into one self-consistent personality.

"It has been reserved for Christianity," says Mr. Lecky, "to present to the world an ideal character, which through all the

* A feeble attempt has been made to make the Essenes the soil from which Jesus sprang, in spite of the glaring contradiction between their monkish asceticism and His fundamental teaching. It has been more than refuted by Bishop Lightfoot, who concludes: "We may dismiss the statement as mere hypothesis, unsupported by evidence and improbable in itself" (*Com. on Colossians*, pp. 148-179).

changes of eighteen centuries has filled the hearts of men with an impassioned love." There have been many great men, and among them those who are revered and esteemed, but not one of them inspires men with this passion of love. Those who have most influenced men for good have confessedly drawn all their power to influence from Jesus Christ. It is this mighty influence of Christ exercised to-day which corroborates the Gospel testimony to the uniqueness of His humanity. "Never man spake like this Man." Never man lived like this Man.

(3) The *representative* character of our Lord's humanity. There is yet a third consideration involved in the title "Son of Man." It not only emphasizes the reality and uniqueness of Christ's humanity—that He is truly Man, and Man such as never was—it also sets forth the representative character of his humanity.

Our Lord is the Representative Man, not only because of the perfection of His humanity, by virtue of which He is the type and pattern to which all should be conformed; but also because His title—"Son of Man"—has a distinctly representative character. As we have seen, its origin in the Old Testament gives it unquestionably a Messianic implication, and it was practically equivalent to Messiah, although it was not recognized as such in our Lord's time. The Messianic force of the title is sustained by two considerations.

(a) Our Lord *claims that He came to fulfill the Law and the Prophets*. He found and expounded "in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself." "They were all," He says, "written . . . concerning Me." "They are they," He affirms, "which testify of me." He then is the Goal of the Old Testament, the Subject of its utterances, the Object of its promises and predictions, the Consummation of all its revelations. What a stupendous claim! The lowly Jesus stands at the end of those centuries of Divine work and speech, and says, I am the end and climax of it all. In Me God's purpose is fulfilled, God's plan completed, God's promises kept. I am the One for whom the ages have longed, and prayed, and waited.

(b) Then again our Lord *claims Messianic attributes and powers*. The name Messiah, Christ, was repeatedly applied to our Lord by others. On three occasions He expressly accepted it for Himself: first, when in answer to the Samaritan woman's eager question, "Art Thou the Christ?" He answered, "I am"; then when He approved the confession of St. Peter as divinely taught—"Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God"; and then again, toward the

end of the awful tragedy when placed upon His oath, in solemn answer to the High Priest's interrogation, "Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?" He said, "I am." Thus explicitly, as Harnack notes, He called Himself Messiah.* It was in the synagogue at Nazareth, at the threshold of His Galilean ministry, that, reading out Isaiah's delineation of Him who was to come, He testified, "To-day has this Scripture been fulfilled in your ears."†

Now when we examine the use of the title "Son of Man" in the Gospels and classify its applications, we find that they fall into two well-defined groups, exclusive of some passages which cannot be definitely assigned to either. These two groups correspond to the chief correlative representations of Christ in the Old Testament—the lowly and suffering servant of Jehovah and the Prince and Lord of all.

Correspondent to the Old Testament representations of the Messiah in His humiliation, His sorrow and pain, is found a group of passages in which the title "Son of Man" is associated with the sufferings and death of Jesus: "The Son of Man must suffer many things"; "The Son of Man hath not where to lay His head"; "The Son of Man came . . . to minister"; "The Son of Man must be lifted up on the cross."

Correspondent to the Old Testament representations of the majesty of the Messiah, we find a second group of passages in the Gospels in which the title "Son of Man" is associated with our Lord's power and prerogative and with His second coming in glory to judge the world: "The Son of Man hath authority on earth to forgive sins"; "The Son of Man is Lord even of the Sabbath"; "The Son of Man shall come in His glory; shall sit upon the throne of His glory; shall be seen coming in the clouds with great power and glory." He has "authority to execute judgment because He is the Son of Man."

* "Some critics have called in question the fact that Jesus called Himself Messiah. But this article of evangelical tradition seems to me to stand the test of the most minute investigation" (Harnack: *History of Dogma*, I, p. 63n.). "Historically considered the calling which Jesus embraced, and with which was bound up His significance for the world, was and could be no other than to be the Messiah of His people" (Weiss: *Life of Christ*, I, p. 295).

† Our Lord's self-restraint in speaking of His Messianic claims was not due to any uncertainty in regard to them, or to any perplexity in His own mind. He must first give to His disciples a true conception of the Messianic calling, before He could announce Himself as the Messiah. Otherwise the disciples would have attached to his utterances the false and worldly conception prevalent among the Jews. Even His favorite self-designation, "Son of Man," was seldom, if at all, used until St. Peter's great confession—"Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God"—showed that His disciples had attained to such a knowledge of His Person and His nature that He could do so without fear of misunderstanding.

The designation "Son of Man" has therefore a double* reference, viz., to service and to lordship. He retains and perpetuates His lordship through service, and His lordship is such as none other can share, because His service is such as none other can render.†

One of the great paradoxes of Messianic prophecy was the startling contrast between the two sets of attributes with which the Coming One was clothed. And it is certainly remarkable to find the same contrast in connection with our Lord's chief designation of Himself—"Son of Man." Surely nothing more is required to place it beyond doubt that our Lord chose this name for Himself, not only because it indicated His acceptance of the humble place to which He had stooped as the suffering servant of Jehovah, and His sense of brotherhood with us, His complete identification of Himself with our nature and our need; but also because it kept before Him and before us His vocation to be the Fulfiller of the Divine Promise of Salvation, the Saviour of sinners. Not only does it assure us of His fellow-feeling with us in our temptations; but also of His power to save and bless. Not only does it continually remind us that He is truly man; but it intimates that He is more than man, One endowed with superhuman powers as well as with human sympathies. He is, as He said to Nicodemus (John iii. 13), the Son of Man that "descended out of heaven." (Compare John vi. 62.)

The designation "Son of Man" has thus a double reference: first, to our Lord's nature, and, secondly, to His work. In regard to His *nature*, it primarily emphasized His humanity, His voluntary subjection to the infirmities and experiences of ordinary men; at the same time, it suggested the uniqueness of His humanity, that He is one separate from and preëminent above all other men. In regard to His *work*, it clearly implied his Messianic vocation, but lifted it up above its Jewish limitations and gave it a world-wide application. While our Lord generally avoided the term "Messiah," because of the false ideas associated with it by the Jews, He found in the designation "Son of Man" a true expression of His own Messianic consciousness and mission which it at once asserted and con-

* Keim maintains that the title has a double aspect, that it expressed Jesus sense, on the one hand, of His human lowliness; on the other hand, of His Messianic dignity (*Jesus of Nazara*, Vol. 3, 90). "By this name He did not wish merely to bring into prominence and intensify the paradox involved in the coexistence of His weak, lowly humanity and His lofty Messianic dignity, but rather sought to explain and solve it. The use of this name was a solution of this paradox given *in nuce*, through reference to the testimony of the Old Testament Scripture' (Wendt: *The Teaching of Jesus*, 2, 148).

† Forest: *The Christ of History and Experience*, p. 65.

cealed. Thus, as Holtzmann says, "it was a riddle to those who heard it, and served to veil, not to reveal, His Messiahship."

II. *Jesus is the Son of God.*

1. In considering the application of the title "Son of God" to Jesus, let us first glance at *the usage* in the Synoptic Gospels and then in St. John's Gospel.

(1) In the former there is no passage in which Jesus explicitly calls Himself "Son of God." Nevertheless He does so by implication, and He accepts the title when given to Him by others.

He names or addresses God as "The Father" in Matthew twenty-one times, in Mark thirteen, in Luke twelve. It is remarkable that in regard to His relations with God, Jesus never classes Himself with other men. He says "My Father" and "your Father," but never "Our Father," except when He bade the disciples pray "Our Father." Nor is there a single instance in which Jesus includes men with Himself as alike "Sons of God." Certainly these things point to a uniqueness in the Sonship of our Lord.

In two parables, that of the Vineyard and that of the Marriage Feast, Jesus represents Himself as the Son and by implication as "The Son of God."

The title is applied to our Lord under very different circumstances and doubtless with considerable variety of significance. Thus, the demoniacs addressed Him as the Son of God with some perverted sense of His power; Satan challenged Him to prove Himself the Son of God; the Centurion, moved by what he saw at the cross, declared Him to be the Son of God, perhaps with his heathen conception of a hero or demi-god.

All the Synoptics relate the testimony of the Father, given in varying form at the Baptism and at the Transfiguration, "Thou art My beloved Son."

There were two notable occasions upon which Jesus accepted the title: first, when St. Peter made his first confession, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of God," and our Lord approved it as a truth divinely taught him,* and, secondly, when, to the High Priest's solemn interrogation, "I adjure thee by the living God that Thou tell me if Thou be the Christ, the Son of God," our Lord replied, "I am."

* There is clearly a reference to Peter's confession in our Lord's question about the Temple-tax (Matt. xvii. 25). The Temple was His Father's house: "The sons are free." Our Lord claims exemption on the ground of His Sonship, although in His forbearance and self-repression He pays it, "lest we cause them to stumble."

There were also two remarkable occasions when our Lord, at least by clear implication, asserted His Sonship. The first was when He confounded the Pharisees with the dilemma they refused to face, "If David called Him Lord, how is He his Son?" (Matt. xxii. 41-45). Even Strauss is compelled to admit in the words, "The presupposition of a higher nature existing in the Messiah, in virtue of which He was indeed, according to the flesh, a descendant of David, but according to the Spirit a higher essence, proceeding directly from God." The second was when our Lord gave utterance to the remarkable words recorded in Matt. xi. 27 and Luke x. 22: "All things have been delivered unto Me of My Father; and no one knoweth the Father save the Son; neither doth any know the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal Him." Some like Renan, unable to evacuate these words of their profound significance, set them down, in the teeth of all testimony, as a later interpolation. The words, as Bruce affirms, "take us out of the historical, incarnate life of the Speaker into the sphere of the Eternal and Divine" (*Expositor*, VI, 79). They express, as Fairbairn notes (*Studies in the Life of Christ*, 193-4), not simply a figurative but an essential, filial relation to God.

Another indication that it was well known that our Lord received and accepted the title is given in the taunt of the Scribes before the cross: "He trusted in God, let Him deliver Him now, if He desireth Him: for He said, I am the Son of God" (Matt. xxvii. 43).

(2) Let us now turn to St. John's Gospel. Here we find Him calling God "Father" (34) and "the Father" (70), in all 104 times. Here also (chap. xx. 17) we find our Lord's express discrimination of His own relation to the Father from that of others in His message to the disciples by Mary Magdalene: "Go unto My brethren and say unto them, I ascend unto My Father and your Father and My God and your God" (John xx. 17).

The title "Son of God" is frequently used of our Lord both by Himself and by others. John uses *υιος*, "Son" of Christ alone; believers are called *τεκνα*, "children."

Twice our Lord calls Himself "the only begotten Son of God," the strongest assertion of His unique relationship to the Father (John iii. 16-18). The name is also given Him by the Evangelist (John i. 14-18).

2. Let us now inquire into *the origin* of the title. This, without controversy, is allowed to be in the Old Testament.

Passing over its casual application to the angels and to men as

God's offspring made and sustained by Him, we find a twofold use of the title, the one ethical and the other official and typical.

(1) The ethical use of the title. God's relationship to Israel is thus described; for it was a relationship of grace, an undeserved favor. This was the message Moses bore to Pharaoh: "Thus saith the Lord, Israel is My son, even my firstborn; and I say unto thee, Let My son go" (Exod. iv. 22). And Jehovah's words to Hosea (ii. 1) emphasize the grace shown to Israel: "When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called My son out of Egypt." Israel then was God's son as the object of His love, the people whom He chose and trained for Himself; and this sonship placed the nation under the obligation of obedience. On this account Jehovah, through Malachi (i. 6), pleads with His people: "The son honoureth his father, and a servant his master; if I then be the Father, where is mine honour? and if I be a Master, where is My fear?"

From the nation as a whole, which failed in its filial affection, it was natural that the title should pass to individuals who walked in the fear of the Lord and rendered Him true filial reverence and obedience. And thus, in the New Testament, it came to be the designation of Christians whose sonship depends upon their relation to the only begotten Son of God.

(2) The official use of the term seems to have been limited to the Kings of Israel. To some of them at least the title was expressly given.

It is probably with reference to David that the Lord says: "He shall cry unto Me, Thou art my Father, My God and the Rock of my salvation. Also I will make Him My firstborn, higher than the kings of the earth" (Ps. lxxxix. 26-27).

And of Solomon God spake: "I will be his Father, and he shall be to Me a son." And so far as the Second Psalm refers to any prototype of Him who was to come, it is to Solomon that the reference must have been made. But if such a reference existed, the type is merged at once in the great Ideal which never was and never could be realized except in One. It is noteworthy that in this Psalm the divinely chosen ruler is called both the Son of God and the Lord's Anointed. This of itself determines the original Messianic application of the designation. This passage stands in the same relation to the "Son of God" as Dan. vii. 12 stands to the correlative designation, "Son of Man."

The use of "Son of God" as a synonym for Messiah in the late Jewish apocryphal books is doubted by some, while confidently affirmed by others. The evidence at the best is very scanty.

3. We are now in a position to discuss *the significance* of the designation "Son of God," as applied in the New Testament to our Lord. Is it official or ethical or metaphysical? Is it anything more than a synonym for Messiah? Or does it express, in addition, His pre-eminent goodness, and the singular favor and love God had toward Him? Or, back of this, does it express that which is the ground and reason both of His mission and of the good pleasure of Him who sent Him—a certain unique, incomparable, mysterious and eternal relationship of life and being with the Father—in a word, what we may conveniently designate a metaphysical relationship?

Now there is no doubt that the designation "Son of God" was used by the Jews as the equivalent of Messiah, but this does not exclude its higher and unique meaning. The Jews understood our Lord to claim something far beyond the Messiahship when they charged Him with blasphemy. They, on one occasion, we are told, "sought the more to kill Him, because He not only had broken the Sabbath, but said also that God was His own Father, making Himself equal with God." And upon another occasion, "the Jews answered Him saying, For a good work we stone Thee not, but for the blasphemy; and because Thou, being a man, makest Thyself God" (John v. 18, x. 33). At our Lord's trial before the Jewish Council His enemies were forced at last to the great issue, and it was for blasphemy, and because He declared Himself to be the Son of God that He was condemned (Matt. xxvi. 63). And before Pilate, with all their pretexts and false accusations set aside, the Jews were forced to the same issue: "We have a law, and by the law He ought to die, because He made Himself the Son of God" (John xix. 7).*

The Jews themselves then clearly perceived the difference between their conception of the Sonship of Messiah and the claims of Jesus. Their meagre idea of the Messiah will not, Dorner says, justify us in reducing the Christian conception of the Divine Sonship to the same narrow limits.†

* "It was on that they condemned Him, because they counted it blasphemy. That shows at once what they understood and what Jesus understood by 'Son of God.' It was a relationship to God of such a kind that for any ordinary man to claim it was to impinge upon the sacred prerogatives of God and to bring them into contempt. It was, in other words, to claim to be Divine. That was what they meant and what Jesus meant" (Drummond: *The Relation of the Apostolic Teaching to the Teaching of Christ*, p. 243).

† Dorner: *Person of Christ*, Div. I, Vol. I, p. 53. "Though the Jews certainly understood the title 'Son of God' as a traditional attribute of the Messiah, they yet by no means found the essential principle and significance of the Messiahship in the filial fellowship of the Messiah with God, but in His splendid and powerful

It could easily be shown that the inadequacy and erroneousness of the Jewish conception of the Messiah and their rejection of Jesus were due to the externalism of their idea, to its narrow and formal officialism, and their disregard of the ethical character of the Sonship of the Messiah. He is the Holy One of God, the Sinless Man, in whom the divine law is perfectly manifested and by whom the divine will is completely fulfilled; and it is because of His perfect goodness that in Him God the Father is well pleased. The perfect holiness of Jesus, His absolute submission to God's will, His supreme love for the Father and for sinners had their great and crowning manifestation on the cross. "Therefore," He says, "doth My Father love Me, because I lay down My life that I may take it again" (John x. 17).

But as the ethical is the basis of the official Sonship, so it in turn demands a foundation broader and deeper than humanity itself could yield. The sinlessness of Jesus is not compatible with any humanitarian theory of His being. The sinless Son of Man can be none other than the Son of God. As the official Sonship rests upon the ethical, the ethical rests upon the metaphysical, without which it cannot be explained and could not exist.

Jesus was not the Son of God merely in an ethical sense, because He was man perfect and sinless. The very fact that He was such proclaimed Him to be divine. Nor was He Son of God in any mere official sense, as the term was applied in the Old Testament to men divinely called and appointed to office. He was not Son of God simply because He was the Lord's Anointed, the Messiah. This term declared His vocation, not His nature. He was not Son of God because He was Messiah. On the contrary, He could not have been Messiah unless He had been Son of God. His vocation was founded upon His personality. It was His divine-human Person that gave Him the right to be the Messiah.

This supreme and essential Sonship of Jesus is not a mere inference; it rests upon the self-revelation of our Lord, upon His manifestations of Himself in His incarnate life and teaching. Let us glance at some of these. Consider

(1) *Christ's claim to pre-existence.*—Conversing with Nicodemus He describes Himself as the Son of Man who had come down from heaven. In the synagogue at Capernaum He calls Himself the

Davidic Kingship" (Wendt: *Teaching of Jesus*, 2, 153). In regard to Christ's idea of the Kingdom, it is recognized that it far surpasses the highest Jewish conception of it. Why then should our Lord's idea of the King be accorded the very opposite treatment and restricted to the narrowest Jewish views? See Drummond: *Apostolic Teaching*, etc., p. 215.

Bread of Life which had come down from heaven; and He repeats this again and again in various forms. When the Jews objected that they knew His father and mother and caviled at His claim to have come down from heaven, He answered that they needed divine teaching in order to receive Him, and went on to reassert His preëxistence in the same terms as before. When the disciples complained of our Lord's teaching, He appealed to His coming Ascension as a corroboration of His preëxistence: "What and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where He was before?" "The Living Father," He declares, "sent Me." "I am from Him, neither came I of Myself, but He sent Me." "I proceeded forth and came from God." "I know whence I came and whither I go; but ye cannot tell whence I came and whither I go." The Discourses in John vii-x contain remarkable assertions of our Lord as to his preëxistence and His relations to the Father. In answer to the Jews' inquiry, "Who art Thou?" Jesus sets forth with great plainness His origin and claims: "I came out of God Himself, and am now here; nor have I come of Myself, but I am His Messenger."* It was with this marvelous consciousness of His origin and dignity that He humbled Himself to the most menial of services: "Knowing . . . that He was come from God and went to God, He . . . began to wash the disciples' feet" (John xiii. 3).

Wendt would interpret all these assertions in a figurative sense, and compares them with our Lord's words to His disciples: "Ye are of God"; "begotten of God," and such like. But as Stevens points out, Jesus never applies to Himself this language about being begotten from God which He applies to others; and He never applies to any others the descriptions which He gives of His own coming from God. When Wendt seeks to apply his canons of interpretation to what we may regard as crucial passages, their failure is evident. Turn first to the great Intercession recorded in John xvii: "I have glorified Thee on the earth"—not in sentiment and thought merely, but in the activities of a life of perfect love and obedience;—"and now," He prays, "glorify Thou Me with Thine own self, with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was." It was, as Westcott notes, glory which He had in actual possession, and not merely as the object of the Divine thought. Clearly the words express Christ's expectation of His return to a mode of existence which He had before the world was.

* John viii. 42, as translated in *Twentieth Century New Testament*, a book which, with distinct defects, will prove very helpful in getting at the rich significance of Christ's words.

Now Wendt admits that the language naturally bears this meaning to us, but he describes this as a modern mode of thought, which he distinguishes from the New Testament mode. He says that "according to the mode of speech and conception prevalent in the New Testament a heavenly good, and so also a heavenly glory, can be conceived and spoken of as existing with God and belonging to a person, not because this person already exists and is invested with glory, but because the glory of God is in some way deposited and preserved for this person in heaven"; just, he illustrates, as treasure was said by Jesus to be laid up for the disciples in heaven.* There is no evidence that New Testament language ever confused a past participation with a promise of future blessedness. No instance can be shown of the application of such language to disciples as our Lord uses with reference to Himself. Moreover, in this passage our Lord does not speak of the existence of a glory destined for Him, but He speaks expressly of His own existence in a past condition of glory—"the glory which I had with Thee before the world was."

Let us next turn to what is perhaps the most conclusive assertion of our Lord's preëxistence: "Before Abraham was, I am."† The Jews had reproached Jesus with claiming to be greater than Abraham. So far from disavowing the claim, He maintains it and brings it out at last in the most startling form: "Before Abraham was born, I am"; not "I was," but "I am." "I was" would have expressed simply priority; but "I am" expresses what is beyond all limitations of time. It draws the contrast between the temporal and the eternal, between the creature and the uncreated, between Abraham and Abraham's Lord. To interpret this as a mere ideal existence in the thought and counsel of God obliterates the distinction between "I am" and "Abraham was." Besides, such an unconscious, impersonal existence could have been predicated of Abraham and of other men. The Jews, instead of taking up stones to stone Jesus, might have said, "So also were we." Such an idealistic interpretation would make our Lord to be an empty visionary giving needless provocation by an unintelligible jargon. Unlike the critics, the Jews took our Lord in earnest, and

* Wendt: *The Teaching of Jesus*, Vol. 2, p. 169.

† "All attempts to explain away the force of this are hopeless" (Drummond). "There can be no doubt as to this final answer, which follows as a natural climax to what had been said before. Abraham died; Christ was the giver of life: Abraham was the father of the Jews; Christ is the centre of Abraham's hope; Abraham came into being as a man; Christ is, essentially, as God" (Westcott: *Commentary on John, in loco*).

grasping the significance of His utterance stamped it as blasphemous. And blasphemous it must be, unless it is, as we believe, the "I am" of ancient Israel, who here unveils His consciousness of Eternal Being.

(2) The *self-assertion* of Christ is one of the most startling features in the Gospel portraiture of His life and teaching. He confronts all the sorrow and weariness of the world and points men for help and comfort, not to God, but to Himself: "Come unto Me, and I will give you rest." "I am the Light" which shines forth into the dense darkness of sin and ignorance that broods over the world. "I am the Truth"; not merely one perfectly truthful, but the very substance of the truth itself. "I am the Way"; the only way by which men can find God and happiness and safety. "I am the Life"; not merely as having life, but as dispensing it, the only source of life without which men must die eternally.

He claims to be the one Way of Access to God: "No man can come to the Father except through Me." He offers Himself as the Supreme Object of men's trust; men are to believe in Him, as they believe in God; to honor Him, as they honor God; to love Him, that they may be the objects of God's love.

The mere enumeration of Christ's claims would compel us to traverse the whole extent of His utterances; for they came forth naturally, inevitably, out of His self-consciousness. He claims to do in His own name and by His own authority works which are competent to God only. He claims to control alike the forces of nature and the powers and existences of the invisible world. He claims absolute knowledge of the human heart and power to forgive sins. He claims that He alone knows God, and that He is the only medium of that knowledge to others. He claims absolute and binding authority and perpetuity for His own words.

In John's Gospel our Lord makes five remarkable claims to equality with God—the equality of coöperative agency and coördinate power: "My Father worketh until now and I work"; "What things soever the Father doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise"; the equality of commensurate knowledge: "As the Father knoweth Me, even so know I the Father"; the equality of mutual indwelling: "I am in the Father, and the Father in Me"; the equality of common possession: "All Mine are Thine, and Thine are Mine"; the equality of essential being: "I and My Father are One," not One in a mere unity of will and affection, but a unity of life and being, a substantial Oneness of essence. Certainly such a unity, if not expressly asserted, is implied. As Reynolds observes, "the ξ , the

one reality, if it does not express actual unity of essence, involves it." The complete ethical unity of will and purpose, which is the lowest meaning the words could bear, carries with it the underlying implication of the unity of being.* Combine the Lord's assertions of Eternal Preëxistence with His claims to equality with God, and the demonstration is complete that He is no created being, but the only begotten Son, very God of very God.

The two designations, Son of God and Son of Man, are closely related. Each is unique and exclusive. There is but one Son of God as Jesus was; and there is but one Son of Man. Each implies the other; each helps to explain the other. The significance of "Son of Man" began with the lowliness of His humanity; it rises up to its sinless perfection and its representative uniqueness. The Son of Man is the Messiah, the Messenger and Archegos of Salvation. The significance of "Son of God" starts from the climax of the Son of Man and explains the mystery of Christ's sinlessness and the secret of His Messianic fitness. He could not be Son of Man unless He were more than man. He could not be known as Son of God unless He had become Son of Man. There is but one Person, but with a twofold relationship. "Son of Man" expresses the earthly manifestation of the Word which became flesh and tabernacled amongst us. "Son of God" expresses and affirms His eternal and essential being. The two together give us a complete definition of His Person.

Wycliffe College, Toronto, Canada.

J. P. SHERATON.

* "The Lord declares that He can bestow Eternal Life and blessedness upon those who stand in close, loving relations with Himself, and between whom and Himself there is mutual recognition and the interchange of love and trust. He bases the claim on the fact that the Father's hands are behind His, and the Father's eternal power and Godhead sustain His mediatorial functions, and more than all, that the Father's personality and His own Personality are merged in one consciousness and entity. If He merely meant to imply moral and spiritual union with the Father or completeness of revelation of the Divine mind, why should the utterance have provoked such fierce resentment?" (Reynolds' *Commentary on John*, x, 35).