

*A Dissertation on THE SON OF GOD by the  
REV. BERTRAM POLLOCK, D.D., Master of Wellington  
College, and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop  
of Lichfield; formerly Scholar of Trinity College.*

1903.

THE WELLINGTON COLLEGE PRESS :

PRINTED BY THOMAS HUNT.

## PREFATORY NOTE.

THE writer wishes to acknowledge his indebtedness in the following pages to Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible (s.v. and other articles), and to express his many obligations to Bishop Westcott. On such a subject, however, it would not be a simple matter exactly to weigh or to state how much is owed directly or indirectly to others; such obligations permeate the whole of this essay, and though the author has quoted or indicated many of the authorities on which he has rested, he has not attempted to state or trace the source of every thought or reference or expression.

B. P.

## CONTENTS.

	PAGE
The spirit of such an inquiry . . . .	1
The source of our knowledge . . . .	2
Presuppositions . . . .	3
The method of the Bible historical . . . .	4
Scope of inquiry . . . .	6
Weight of other writers . . . .	7
<hr/>	
Examination of passages in Old Testament . . . .	7—25
Passages in Genesis, Job, Psalms, Daniel 3 <sup>26</sup> , 2 Sam. 7 <sup>14</sup> , Psalm 2 <sup>7</sup>	
The Sonship of Israel . . . .	16
The Angel of the Lord . . . .	21
Conclusion . . . .	25
<hr/>	
NEW TESTAMENT.	
General survey . . . .	25
Four points differentiating Christ's Sonship . . . .	28—35
The Sonship and the Unity of the Godhead . . . .	32

<i>μονογενής</i>	. . . . .	35—45
Men's Sonship as sons of God contrasted with Christ's		35
Distinction between 'son' and 'child.'		
Four senses in which men are sons of God	. . . . .	36
<i>a.</i> created	. . . . .	37
<i>b.</i> created in God's image after His likeness		37
<i>c.</i> recreated	. . . . .	38
<i>d.</i> adopted	. . . . .	40
adoption of man as he is		
of men without sin		
fellowship		
privileges of adoption		
<i>πρωτότοκος</i>	. . . . .	45
<i>εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ, χαρακτήρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως</i>		47
<i>ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης</i>	. . . . .	49
meaning of <i>δόξα</i>		
three revelations of God made in the Son		
<i>λόγος</i>	. . . . .	55
Phil. 2 <sup>5-11</sup>	. . . . .	59
<hr/>		
Four occasions of the Divine use of the title	. . . . .	61—68
<i>a.</i> The Conception	. . . . .	62
<i>b.</i> The Baptism	. . . . .	62
<i>c.</i> The Transfiguration		64
<i>d.</i> The Resurrection	. . . . .	66
For whom was the proclamation made?		67
<hr/>		

## The title employed

A. <i>a.</i> in confessions . . . . .	69
<i>β.</i> by demoniacs . . . . .	69
<i>γ.</i> by the centurion . . . . .	70
B. in the Acts and Epistles . . . . .	70
C. by the Lord Himself . . . . .	71
<hr/>	
Consideration of some special groups of passages	76—92
<i>a.</i> Heb. 1 and 2 . . . . .	76
the Lord's Divine nature unchanged	
His human nature how changed	
<i>b.</i> Passages bearing on creation . . . . .	79
<i>c.</i> Passages bearing on recreation . . . . .	83
<i>d.</i> 1 Cor. 15 <sup>24-28</sup> . . . . .	86
<i>e.</i> First Epistle of St. John . . . . .	88
δ ἔχετε κρατήσατε . . . . .	92

## APPENDIX.

95—173

A. <i>Harnack's view of early Christologies.</i> . . . .	97
B. <i>Interpretation of Psalm 2.</i> . . . .	97
C. <i>The preexistence of the Son.</i> . . . .	98
D. <i>Dr. Moberly on 'Metaphors.'</i> . . . . .	122
E. <i>The word μονογενής.</i> . . . .	124
F. <i>The Incarnation and the Fall.</i> . . . .	125

G.	<i>υιοθεσία.</i>	.	.	.	136
H.	<i>The word ὑπόστασις.</i>	.	.	.	138
I.	<i>The Baptism of the Lord.</i>	.			141
J.	<i>The text of St. Peter's confession.</i>	.			143
K.	<i>Old Testament phrases in the New Testament</i>	.			145
L.	<i>The 'Son of God' and the Divinity of Christ.</i>				145
M.	<i>St. Matthew 11<sup>27</sup>.</i>	.	.	.	148
N.	<i>The use of the title in the Gospels.</i>				149
O.	<i>"The Father is greater than I."</i>	.			151
P.	<i>The contemporaneous meaning of the title.</i>	.			154
Q.	<i>Lack of precision in earlier Christology.</i>	.			158
R.	<i>Another view of Heb. 1<sup>1-4</sup>.</i>	.			162
S.	<i>The Virgin Birth of the Lord.</i>	.	.	.	163
T.	<i>The view of the early Church.</i>	.	.	.	168

BEFORE entering on the subject of this essay it is well to mark the spirit of humble adoration in which such a subject must be approached, not merely because the consideration of such heavenly mysteries necessarily compels a reverent inquirer to follow the example of the seraphim when they were in the presence of the Son of God, and the glory of the vision constrained them to cover their faces before Him after whom we are now to seek, nor only for the reason that, as Hooker says, "an evil moral disposition dampeth the very light of heavenly illumination and permitteth not the mind to see what doth shine before it;" but not less because of the necessary relation existing in this case, as in others, between the student and the truth which he is studying. When we are made acquainted beforehand with the equipment which we require to bring with us for our search, we are both prepared for the character of that which we shall find, and protected from disappointment at not finding that which we had no right to expect, or at the limitations which accompany our quest, or at the manner in which the result is given to us. Thus a student who is told by the lecturer that for the ensuing hour he will require certain special books, will already anticipate something of the scope of the lesson, and a man working with a telescope will not



expect to reach such results as are realised in a laboratory. When we read such words as "The things of God none knoweth save the Spirit of God" (I Cor. 2<sup>11</sup>), or "No one knoweth the Son, save the Father; neither doth any know the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him" (Matt. 11<sup>27</sup>), or the Lord's words when St. Peter had confessed Him to be the Son of the living God, "Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven" (Matt. 16<sup>17</sup>), we are already made aware that all that we can know about the Son of God is that which God Himself has been pleased to reveal to us; for the dark chamber of the Holy of Holies, and light unapproachable, impenetrable darkness and dazzling brightness, are equally fitting symbols, to convey to us an idea of God as He is to Himself.

While then we employ every means of learning that is placed within our reach and recognise that reverent inquiry and discovery in every department of truth must contribute to a fuller knowledge of Him who is the Truth, we look to God's revelation of Himself as given in Holy Scripture as our primary source of information with reference to the Son of God. There we may expect to find that which our unaided reason on the one hand could not have taught us, and which on the other it is able to welcome as true: for we are able to recognize as being true when it is presented to us, that which we should have been unable by ourselves to discover. While gladly availing ourselves of every ray of light that may directly or indirectly shine from other sources upon our inquiry, from the outset we will understand that we are in the regions of faith, which here, if anywhere, will be to

us an *ἔλεγχος οὐ βλεπομένων*. And with us we must bring a humble, reverent and devotional spirit; "We were made to recognise God and He has made Himself known."

It is not then proposed to begin our inquiry at a stage farther back, or to speak of the Reason which goes before Faith, nor will the subject be approached controversially or argumentatively, but an attempt will be made, by simply studying the pages of the Bible itself, to gather from them something of the revelation there made of the Son of God. It will thus be no part of this essay to discuss fundamental principles or assumptions,<sup>1</sup> or to deal directly with objections, but rather, from a point of view within the Catholic Church, to present our faith on this point, to examine the words of Scripture, and to try to learn the light thrown in detail by its various words and phrases on the meaning for us of the title of 'Son of God' as we have accepted it in Holy Scripture.

It would not be true to say that this essay does not in any way deal with the philosophy of doctrine: but at the same time the writer's wish is rather to approach the subject in a devotional attitude. In any case very little<sup>2</sup> will be said on the history of the development of doctrine in post-Apostolic times. A criticism of the discussions at Nicaea and Constantinople, of Arianism and Apollinarianism, as such, will not come within our range, though of course the sharper lines which have necessarily been drawn in controversy with heretics, if they do not illuminate the statements of the Bible, yet have given them such definition as at

<sup>1</sup> See App. A.

<sup>2</sup> See however App. T.

least to make the discussion of them easier; and though such limitations are, as limitations, to be regretted, they have presented in clearer outline the truths which they surround and defend, and make the apprehension of them readier though not deeper.

There is one more preliminary remark which must be made. Bishop Westcott, in his introduction to St. John's Gospel<sup>1</sup>, discussing the extent to which it is true to say that the "inspiring impulse of St. John's Gospel was doctrinal, and of St. Luke's historical," has pointed out that "Christian doctrine is history, and that the synoptic narratives are implicit dogmas, no less truly than St. John's dogmas are concrete facts;" and this important truth contains a very necessary warning as to the manner in which we shall find placed before us in Holy Scripture the doctrine of the two natures of our Lord. The Bible gives us an account of God's dealing with man; its whole method is historical; and we shall have misapprehended its method, one may almost be permitted to say reverently, its necessary method, if we hope to find in it statements of doctrine, or formal dogmas. A book written with such a method as that would probably have appealed to one time only; fixed and rigid in its form, it would have been incapable of answering to the expanding growth of the life of mankind, and to the developing apprehension of truth; the very terminology in which such dogmas can be expressed, is liable to cease to convey to a later time the meaning which it embodied to those who first used it. And more than this: if anyone entertains the wish that the Bible spoke

<sup>1</sup> p. 41.

with what he might call a clearer tone on these deep mysteries, he not only falls into the vain wish that it thus might have spoken to his age only, and none other, but such clearness and precision would by a strange paradox have exposed such exactness of definition to grave uncertainty of acceptance. Whereas now it is well-nigh impossible to misapprehend the teaching of the Bible on these mysteries, resting as it does on so broad a basis of life that there is a living bond uniting its several parts, and a doubt thrown upon some particular point does not impair the organic fabric of truth; in such a case as we are imagining, where the interdependence of parts would necessarily have been rather logical than living, and frequency of reiteration would have been the strongest support of dogmas, suspension of judgment on one part would also have tended so far to discredit the whole. Thus, had we only come to know the Divinity of our Lord from isolated declarations and dogmatic statements to that effect, then the removal or the discrediting of one such statement would by so much have reduced the evidence on which we accepted the particular truth in question; the number of such direct statements would have been all-important; a link removed might never have been made good. But, as it is, this doctrine also rests upon much wider foundations, supported by the whole tenor of Holy Scripture, constantly suggested in narrative and discourse, and by subtle touches which are all the more cogent in their drift because so many-sided and so far removed from philosophic statement. For example—probably few would maintain *θεός*, *i.e.* *θε*, to be the correct text in 1 Tim. 3<sup>16</sup>; but the loss of such a clear statement of the Divinity of the Lord is by no

means serious to those for whom that truth rests not upon isolated or fragmentary texts, but much more on the broad basis of the whole of the Gospel narrative and discourses, and the informal indications plentifully afforded by the Epistles. Evidence of this kind is not to be shaken by the removal of single passages; it would rather be necessary to change the whole character and record of the New Testament, before we could dispose of those doctrines which as it now stands, it tells us, have in the guise of "facts" entered so closely into human life.

Having said this much as to the character, limitations and scope of such an inquiry as it is proposed to make, the writer would venture now to state the arrangement of this paper.

It is proposed to investigate the passages of Holy Scripture, first in the Old Testament and then in the New, on which the actual title of the Son of God as applied to our Lord rests, and reverently to attempt to reach the bearing of those passages on His Sonship; though sometimes it will be found more convenient to give an exposition first and to look at the passages afterwards. At the same time, in accordance with what has just been said, these passages will not be treated as isolated from the broad and larger background of the Old and New Testament; it will be remembered that they are a part of God's whole revelation; and the Person and Life and Work of our Lord will tell upon and contribute to the interpretation of these more special phrases. The aim of this essay is not to prove that our Lord is the Son of God, but rather to show how the passages, as they come before us, illuminate and fill up the conception. The truth of

the conception is independent of the phrase, but at the same time the use of the phrase throws light upon the conception. It will not of course be necessary to write a note on every passage of the Bible where the phrase 'Son of God' occurs; but by examining into some of the salient texts we may attempt to reach the ideas which are suggested in them, in the confidence, as has been already indicated, that, however great the mystery of the subject may be, we may be sure that it is a 'revealed mystery,' and that step by step the truth that the phrase contains for our adoration and our strength, must have been brought within the knowledge of the mind of man so far as he is able to apprehend it.

Certain points, it may be added, of a more critical character are discussed in the notes at the end of the essay. Owing to the fundamental importance of the subject, the treatment of it offers points of contact with many authors; and in many cases where there is allusion in the text or notes to the writings of English divines, not only will the reference be indicated, but their actual language will also be reproduced.

The phrase **בְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים** is used twice in Gen. 6 as contrasted with **בְּנֹת הָאָדָם**, and various interpretations are offered of the passage; but even setting aside as necessarily irrelevant to our purpose such renderings as arise from **הָאֱלֹהִים** taken to mean "judges" or "chief men," whether we take the passage to refer to the true worshippers of God (cf. Deut. 14<sup>1</sup> **בְּנִים אֲתֵם לַיהוָה** and Psalm 73<sup>16</sup> **דֹּר בְּרִיָּה**) or to beings of a superior order (in some Greek copies it appears to be rendered *ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ*) or indeed in any other way, the plural number of **בְּנִים** seems to prevent its application in

any way to the title under consideration. Similar doubt belongs to the interpretation of two passages in the book of Job (1<sup>6</sup>, 2<sup>1</sup>) where again, however, the plural number is employed. From the occurrence of the phrase in the poetical passage Job 38<sup>7</sup>, it is not likely that we have anything to learn in this connection. The same may be said of the phrase בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים occurring in Psalm 29<sup>1</sup>, and again in Psalm 89<sup>6</sup>; the change from אֱלֹהִים to אֱלִים (which has led some even to take the word from אֵיל 'a ram' in the former passage, 'the sons of rams,' *i.e.* 'young rams') carrying us rather farther away from, than any nearer to, tracing any connection with the title 'The Son of God.' Again the passage Psalm 82<sup>6</sup> does not require much to be said upon it; the words are אֲנִי אָמַרְתִּי אֱלֹהִים אַתֶּם וּבְנֵי עֲלִיּוֹן כָּלְכֶם quoted by the Lord in John 10<sup>36</sup>. Here in a somewhat vague and indeterminate sense the title of 'Gods' and 'Sons of the most High' is applied to rulers and judges, signifying their divine office in spite of the fact that they were proving personally unfaithful to it. Our Lord's argument requires that by these titles should be indicated some connection between men and God, some foreshadowing perhaps of a future and a fuller union, and that, if in some sense the titles are figurative, a substance and reality should underlie the shadow. But in any case once more the plurality of the persons prevents the phrase throwing much light upon 'The Son of God,' and, if anything, rather points forward to the divine sonship of men realised in union with Christ, than to Christ's natural Sonship as Son of God.

A passage that needs rather closer consideration is Dan. 3<sup>25</sup>, "The form of the fourth is like the Son of

God" (Theod. ὄρασις τοῦ τετάρτου ὁμοία υἱῷ θεοῦ). The Revised Version renders the phrase 'like a son of the gods.' The words come from the lips of Nebuchadnezzar: so, as first spoken or understood, they must express *his* thought, and whatever be the correct rendering of them, in the first instance they cannot be held to convey any more direct revelation from God than comes *through* the impression which He willed to be made upon the mind of the king; we are not at liberty to colour the original meaning of the words with associations and lines of thought in connection with the phrase, which, though familiar to us, are alien to the passage as it stands. The words, as given by Nebuchadnezzar, would very likely be of only a vague and mysterious import, meaning very much what we should express by saying that the fourth presence was that of an unearthly mysterious being; it would not be a fair comparison to interpret them in connection with the martyrdom of St. Stephen (Acts 7<sup>55, 58</sup>) and to say that the Son of God first reveals Himself in the Old Testament, just as the Ascended Son of Man reveals Himself in the New Testament, as succouring those who are martyrs for His cause. At the same time perhaps we are not at liberty to dismiss the passage as wholly irrelevant to our inquiry. Though the text of the LXX is ὁμοίωμα ἀγγέλου θεοῦ, it is possible that the authority of an early parallel version of the book of Daniel underlies the text of Theodotion's revision. If that is so, the words υἱὸς θεοῦ may already have become familiar in this passage. If this was the case, the phrase would, if only linguistically, prepare the way for the thoughts which were later on to be associated with it. In this respect this verse would be different from the passages



quoted from Genesis and elsewhere: for though no nearer than they to throwing any light upon the title as given to our Lord, it may possibly in the manner suggested have tended to prepare the way for the acceptance of subsequent ideas simply because of the singular number 'Son,' occurring too, as it does, in a passage of mysterious import, the associations of which would not be antagonistic to the later development of the true idea. As regards this passage then in the book of Daniel, we may conclude that on the one hand it really contributes nothing to God's revelation of His Son, but on the other it is possible that it may have prepared the way for the apprehension of that revelation by familiarising men's minds with the words *υἱὸς θεοῦ*.

Though there is little to be learnt from the Old Testament about the actual title *υἱὸς θεοῦ*, there are some passages in it which require careful consideration, in which God is the speaker and thus 'Son of God' is signified by the words 'My Son.' The first passage is 2 Sam. 7<sup>14</sup> אֲנִי אֶדְבָרֶנּוּ לְךָ לְאָב רַחֵם דָּבָר לִי לְבִן.

These words are particularly applied by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews to Christ. The principle of such application is clearly indicated by Bishop Westcott<sup>1</sup>, where, among other points, he calls attention to the fact that "the application of prophetic words in each case has regard to the ideal indicated by them, and it is not limited by the historical fact with which they are connected. But the history is not set aside. The history forces the reader to look beyond." So it is in this case with the passage quoted. The history is concerned with the promise

<sup>1</sup> 'Epistle to the Hebrews,' p. 69.

conveyed by Nathan to David, that God would set up his seed after him, and this promise is by many links attached to the time at which it was spoken—*e.g.* “he shall build a house in my name”—for it was David’s purpose to build a temple for the Lord which in fact evoked the message of Nathan—and, “if he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men, but my mercy shall not depart away from him, as I took it from Saul.” But though the first bearing of the passage clearly relates to the occasion when it was spoken, there are words in it that could never have found fulfilment in Solomon: “I will establish the throne of his kingdom for ever,” a promise virtually four times repeated in some five verses. Thus in the Epistle to the Hebrews the passage is understood to speak of Christ, who as the Son of David and the Son of God fulfils the idea which Solomon’s position foreshadowed (*cf.* the words of Nathaniel, John 1<sup>49</sup>, ‘*Παββεΐ, σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, σὺ βασιλεὺς εἶ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ*). In Christ—the Lord’s Anointed—the title ‘My Son’ gains its perfection. But if we are to appreciate the meaning of Christ’s Sonship as so far indicated, we must look to the historic type for our guidance; and the other verses of the passage seem to indicate what is meant by the Son. God’s Son as here portrayed has these characteristics: (1) His Sonship is shewn in his eagerness for God’s honour, (2) He is the object of God’s special and lasting care, and (3) He receives the glory of exaltation to the kingdom which is His Father’s to give. We have a royal picture of mutual love and honour between Father and Son. We may compare Psalm 89, in which also are to be found other aspects of the Davidic kingdom that could only be fulfilled in

the Son of God, and others again that could not apply to Him and belong only to the earthly type. And this is equally true whether we consider this Psalm in the first instance to have a definite historic background, or whether it is presumed rather to refer to the aspirations connected with the royal and central position claimed by the theocratic nation, than to relate to the historic David or any particular king.

A similar passage<sup>1</sup> is Psalm 2<sup>7</sup> יְהוָה אָמַר אֱלֹהֵי בְנֵי יְהוָה אֲתָה אָנֹכִי הַיּוֹם יְלֻדְתִּיָּהּ which is also quoted by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews (1<sup>5</sup>), and by St. Paul (Acts 13<sup>31</sup>). The question of the authorship of the Psalm need not trouble us. The text of Acts 4<sup>25</sup>, where the Psalm is again quoted, seems to be uncertain, and quite apart from this, if we could be sure from that verse that the Psalm was attributed by the assembled Christians to the individual David, the son of Jesse, that would not be any reason why we should do the same; literary questions were not apprehended, and therefore not discussed or determined in Apostolic days. It is the words which are of importance, not the author of the Psalm. The enemies of the Lord have raged against Him, and He has triumphed over them and has set His King upon His holy hill of Zion. And then follows this verse, spoken, we may suppose, to this newly appointed King, and a similar promise to that in 2 Sam. 7<sup>16</sup> is made: "I will give thee the nations for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession." Here God's Son is represented as joining in His victory over enemies, and then appointed by his Father as vice-

<sup>1</sup> See App. B.

gerent over the conquered. Before the last words of the verse there is no distinction between this passage and that in 2 Sam., except for the difference between the work of the Son done for the Father's honour in each case, in the one the building of the temple, in the other the joint triumph.

The last words are, however, important—"This day have I begotten thee." As first spoken they must no doubt refer to the occasion of this open proclamation by God, that the Davidic King was His Son. The phrase sounds a somewhat strange one because of the word 'begotten'; if the word had been 'adopted' we should readily have followed it; it would better have harmonised with the words 'this day.' But the point lies in this bold word; the Davidic King is called the Lord's own Son, and the actual word used compels us to look further for One in whom are fulfilled, that is, realised in their fulness, the points which in this Psalm are assigned to the King, and who is also the true Son of God.

As applied to our Lord in the New Testament the verse needs some investigation. There are those who have considered that the verse, as applied to Christ, speaks of the 'eternal generation' of the Son, and take the word *σήμερον* to refer to eternity, which, as it lacks all relation to time, may be regarded as one great 'To-day,' one great present without past or future. The objection to this view is that, though perfectly true, it gives a different meaning to *σήμερον* in the Psalm and in the application of the Psalm. In the Psalm *σήμερον* appears to mark a special crisis, and to announce a special decree, very much as on the other occasion of the announcement of the Sonship of the Davidic King

in 2 Sam. 7, which occurred on a particular occasion. But if *σήμερον* is to refer to eternal generation, then the parallel with the particular 'begetting' which is described in the Psalm is lost, and it is better to seek for an application of prophetic words along the line indicated by their first use.

A second interpretation applies the words to the Incarnation; it is thought that when St. Paul says that God has fulfilled His promise (Acts 13<sup>35</sup>) *ἀναστήσας Ἰησοῦν*, it means that He did so by raising up Jesus, in the sense of the word as it is found in the Book of Judges (*e.g.* 2<sup>16</sup>) when we read that "the Lord raised up judges;" and the next verse, in which we have the words plainly written *ἀνέστησεν αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν*, is then taken to point a contrast with the *ἀναστήσας* of the previous verse: but it may equally well be taken to explain it, and St. Paul's words also tell for the application to the Resurrection, Rom 1<sup>4</sup>, *τοῦ ὀρισθέντος υἱοῦ θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει κατὰ πνεῦμα ἀγιοσύνης ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν*. Again, though one might not be able to say that *ἀνίστημι* would be an incorrect word in the sense of 'raising up' and 'calling forth,' it certainly is by association identified with the Resurrection from the dead; the LXX word in Judges 2<sup>16</sup> is *ἤγειρε*; *ἀνίστημι* would be more naturally used in a more violent disturbing sense.

The view which refers the application of the Psalmist's words in the New Testament to the Incarnation, may have been supported by a parallel suggesting itself to the mind between the 'begetting' mentioned in the Psalm and the birth of our Lord at the Incarnation. It has been pointed out<sup>1</sup> that the

<sup>1</sup> Swete, 'The Apostles' Creed,' p. 29.  
See Harnack, 'History of Dogma,' p. 194, note 1.

earliest orthodox writers connected Christ's Sonship more especially with the human life by which it was manifested, and as those who do, and those who do not consider the preexistence of the Son as Son<sup>1</sup> to be set before us in Holy Scripture, alike believe in His human birth at Bethlehem, it is only natural that in interpreting such a passage as this, with its very definite *σήμερον*, there should be a tendency to associate it with the human birth.

In connection with this view we may here observe that, granting the Lord's preexistence as Son, there is still a sense in which there is a connection between Christ's Sonship as Son of God and as Son of Man. Here we need to look with very cautious and very reverent eyes; we are coming near to the region of 'dazzling darkness' which we mentioned earlier; at the same time we can, if reverently, boldly say that we can see that it became (the *ἔπρπεεν* of the Epistle to the Hebrews) the Son of God to be born as the Son of Man. The fact that it was He who was so born, of course shows that it was God's will, but we can go further and *recognise* the fitness of it, and see that the same could not be said of either the Father or the Holy Spirit. From what we are told of the eternal relation of the Son of God to the Father, we can humbly recognise the fitness of the Incarnation of the Son.<sup>2</sup>

In favour of the view that would refer the application of the words of the Psalm to the Resurrection, taking the *ἀναστήσας* of Acts 13<sup>33</sup> to relate to that event, we may quote the words of Pearson "The grave is as the womb of the earth; Christ who is raised from

<sup>1</sup> See App. C.    <sup>2</sup> See Westcott, 'Gospel of St. John,' p. 216.

thence is as it were begotten to another life: and God who raised Him is His Father. So true it must needs be of Him which is spoken of others, who are the children (*υἱοί*) of God, being the children (*υἱοί*) of the resurrection" ... "neither is he called simply the first that rose, but with a note of generation, the first born from the dead."<sup>1</sup> And more recent writers<sup>2</sup> have pointed out that though "St. Paul did not hold that the Son of God became Son by the Resurrection, at the same time he *did* regard the Resurrection as making a difference—if not in the transcendental relations of the Father to the Son (which lie beyond our cognisance), yet in the visible manifestation of Sonship as addressed to the understanding of men." The Resurrection, leading to the Ascension and the Session at the right hand of God, openly declared Christ's Divine Sonship (see 1 Thess. 1<sup>10</sup>) and Sovereignty in a manner, of which the incident alluded to in the Psalm was truly typical. It should be noted that in the Western text (though not universally so) of Luke 3<sup>22</sup> the words *υἱός μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε*, form the voice from heaven at the Lord's Baptism.

It is now desirable to say a few words on some passages in which the Divine Sonship is attributed to Israel. Of the places where the people of Israel are called sons of God in the plural, little need be said; it has already been suggested that the difference between the singular and the plural in the use of the term is all-important. Such passages are Deut. 14<sup>1</sup>, and Hosea 1<sup>10</sup>; but they are not common in the Old Testa-

<sup>1</sup> 'Exposition of the Creed' II 33.

<sup>2</sup> Sanday and Headlam, 'Epistle to the Romans,' p. 7.

ment, considering the great freedom with which the word בן is employed in Hebrew. Some special interest indeed belongs to the verse just mentioned in Hosea יא-ל-הוּי בְנֵי לָדָם, first of all from its similarity to the words used in the great confession of St. Peter (Matt. 16<sup>16</sup>, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος), and secondly as perhaps leading on to the passage Hosea 11<sup>1</sup>.

This latter passage recalls the verses Ex. 4<sup>22, 23</sup> (cf. Jerem. 31<sup>19, 20</sup>), and in Matt. 2<sup>14, 15</sup> is applied to our Lord. It needs therefore a more full consideration. In the first instance the phrase as applied to Israel in Ex. 4<sup>22</sup> is adapted to that which is to follow in verse 23; Israel is the Son of God, His firstborn בְנֵי בְלָדִי יִשְׂרָאֵל; and if he is not allowed to leave Egypt, the son, the firstborn of Pharaoh will be slain; the parallelism between the clauses is very close. But though the exact form may be determined by the context, the truth is not a formal or surface truth—God's love and His care for Israel, the fact that Israel was to keep alive his Father's name in the world and to be His representative, that God bestowed so much attention on the education and the chastening of Israel, with the intention that in the fulness of the time the Son of God in whom the nation was consummated, should after the flesh spring of Israel, all these considerations explain the name of God's Son being applied to Israel. No doubt this sonship of Israel as a nation was "outward and independent of the individual will,"<sup>1</sup> and the term

<sup>1</sup> Even in places where the expression of God's relationship to Israel tends to become more individual and to carry personal obligations with it, this is still deduced from the national relationship Jer. 3<sup>14</sup>, Deut. 14<sup>1, 2</sup>.



is used by a figure: for how should a nation be termed the Son (singular) of anyone but by a figure? But it is not one of those figures which, like a Virgilian simile, suggests some artificial, superficial, unconnected resemblance: rather it indicates a deep and abiding truth, which it clothes in the simplest language available to express it. All language that employs words relating to subjects which do not come immediately under the cognisance of the five senses, is in some sense figurative. It used to be said that language is "a store-house of faded metaphor;" and to say that a passage in the Bible is figurative is not to say that it is unreal or untrue. Such figures may be either, as here, the easiest, or sometimes the only possible manner in which facts can be presented; of this more will have to be said later on.<sup>1</sup> Israel, then, in this passage is spoken of as God's Son, a definite and real relation between Israel and God being expressed by the phrase. The application of the words to the Lord is more difficult than in the other passage of the Old Testament which we have considered, but it rests upon the same basis of interpretation as before, by which we are led to expect to find correspondences between the Old Testament and the New Testament. This is so in the passage before us. The first point to be noticed is that the plain fact was the same in each case; God did call in each case His Son, in the one case the nation of Israel, in the other Jesus, but both entitled, though in different senses, to the name of 'Son,' and He called them both out of Egypt. One may also notice the flight by night in each case as constituting a similarity between the

<sup>1</sup> See App. D.

occasions, though in one case it was flight by night out of Egypt, in the other flight into Egypt. So far the correspondence might have been regarded, if not as a mere coincidence, yet rather on the surface than deep. But the resemblance goes deeper than this; the geographical Egypt is no doubt essential to the transference of the words spoken of the one Son to the other; if for example Joseph had fled into Asia Minor, the quotation could not have been made. But underlying the geographical parallel there is the spiritual one. In either case stress of circumstances and persecution had sent the Son to Egypt or kept him there; it was a part of the opposition of the world to the truth. In either case, his sojourn there was part of God's providential guidance of His Son; He was preparing His Son for His own purposes, and when His Son was summoned out of Egypt, it was to carry on God's plan that each Son should declare His Father to the world and be His representative among men. We thus find, by the flight from Egypt and by the deeper resemblances which are suggested by the sojourn in Egypt in each case, the Lord's life at the very commencement of the Gospel compared with the life of Israel as it began; and it is suggested to us that parts of His life were foreshown in the life of Israel, as a whole or in its parts. To be told that so early a step in His life was the fulfilment of a type given by an early step in the life of Israel, is an indication that throughout His life we may look for other such fulfilments, and that in the contents of the nation's life Israel as a whole offers us anticipatory signs of the coming Christ in real and not fanciful foreshadowings. We may put it the other way by saying that in Christ

“the race (Israel) was summed up, as it were. In Him it fulfilled its purpose and became a blessing to the whole earth. Without Him its separate existence as a peculiar people had no meaning. Thus He was not only the representative but the embodiment of the race. In this way the people of Israel is the type of Christ, and in the New Testament parallels are sought in the career of the one to the life of the other.”<sup>1</sup> “The reality and truth of the Messianic idea, as prophesied in the Old Testament and fulfilled in the New Testament, remain one of the most real and impressive facts in religious history.”<sup>2</sup> And these types of Christ to be found in the history of Israel are a part of that Messianic idea.

In illustration of this type of the life of the Son of God presented by Israel His Son we may refer to the type presented by Israel as the servant of Jehovah, as described in the second Isaiah, where it is at once plain that the great prophet of the exile is speaking of the literal nation of Israel as the servant of Jehovah, and equally plain, that as the nation really was, it did not at that time in all respects realise the description given, and necessarily pointed forward to One who should at once represent Israel, and also present the portrait of the servant of the Lord developed in those chapters. “As Israel’s ideal representative He sums up in Himself and carries out to its fullest development all that every true Israelite, every faithful prophet, every patient martyr had foreshewn, in many parts and in many fashions, of the Servant’s work. Israel was the ‘Messianic nation,’ and the

<sup>1</sup> Lightfoot, ‘Epistle to the Galatians,’ p. 143.

<sup>2</sup> Sanday and Headlam, ‘Epistle to the Romans,’ p. 306.

Messiah who came in the fulness of time was the true and perfect Servant. He was the final outcome and development of Israel, yet no mere natural product or spontaneous development, but the divinely foreshadowed and divinely given crown and consummation of the nation's history."<sup>1</sup>

The next group of passages from the Old Testament which requires our consideration is that in which the Angel of the Lord is spoken of, or the Lord Himself appears to have been present under an angelic or human form. Such passages are commonest in the earliest books of the Bible, and among them are included Gen. 22<sup>11,12</sup>: "And the angel of the Lord (מַלְאָכִי הַיְהוָה) called unto him out of heaven, and said, Abraham, Abraham: and he said, Here am I. And he said, Lay not thine hand upon the lad, neither do thou anything unto him: for now I know that thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son from me (מִפְּנֵי)". In this place the Angel of the Lord clearly speaks of himself as God. In Gen. 18 on the other hand, the first verse says—"the Lord appeared unto him (Abraham) by the oaks of Mamre;" and then there is described the arrival of three *human* visitants. Some have seen in this an appearance of the Trinity; thus Gen. 18 is read as one of the lessons for Trinity

<sup>1</sup> Kirkpatrick, 'Doctrine of the Prophets,' p. 394. In this connection, however, we must notice that it has been suggested that the phrase *παῖς* (*θεοῦ*), as directly applied to Christ in Acts 3 and 4, may have been intended in the sense of Son. Later the word *παῖς* in this connection certainly seems to have borne this sense, and indeed it appears that there was a complete confusion between the two senses. But the connection and the deep correspondence of the servant of Jehovah with our Lord is obviously independent of any allusion to that connection in these passages of the Acts.

Sunday: another supposition derived from verses 16 and 17 is that two were angelic beings, and the third God in human form. Another appearance of the Angel of the Lord is that to Hagar, Gen. 16<sup>7-11</sup>, "And the angel of the Lord found her by a fountain of water in the wilderness..... And the angel of the Lord said unto her, Return to thy mistress, and submit thyself under her hands. And the angel of the Lord said unto her, I will multiply thy seed exceedingly, that it shall not be numbered for multitude. And the angel of the Lord said unto her, Behold, thou art with child and shalt bear a son, and shalt call his name Ishmael; because the Lord hath heard thy affliction." Yet another such appearance is that to Moses at the burning bush, Exod. 3<sup>2-6</sup>, "And the angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a flame of fire out of the midst of a bush...and...God called unto him out of the midst of the bush...and...he said, I am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob. And Moses hid his face; for he was afraid to look upon God." In this passage it seems very plain that the Angel of the Lord is God Himself. Such passages might be multiplied, but those quoted afford a representative group.

The question then to be considered is, taking these appearances in the Old Testament to be appearances of God, are they appearances of the Son of God, and if so do they teach us anything about His Being? The first question is perhaps generally answered in the affirmative. It has been thought that the same eternal fitness which operated for the Incarnation of the Son, and not of the Father or of the Holy Spirit (see above p. 15), would in the same way,

if one may so speak, have led to the appearance of the *Son* of God in the Old Testament. And indeed in another case, though no doubt considerably dissimilar in kind, we have in the New Testament a certain identification of the Son of God with the Divine Person seen in the Old Testament. The connection established in John 12<sup>49</sup>, "These things said Isaiah, because he saw his glory, and spake of him" shows that the Apostle identified Him, whom Isaiah saw (Isaiah 6), with Christ. This passage affords a presumption in favour of the views just stated, that the Divine Being who appeared in these early chapters of the Old Testament, was the Son of God. A resemblance too has been noticed between the character of the action of the Angel of the Lord in the Old Testament and that of Christ in the New Testament. For example, the tenderness of consideration shown to Hagar in the passage quoted recalls the love and pity of our Blessed Lord. This however is not in the nature of proof: for we could not exclude love from the action of the Father and the Holy Spirit, which we should have to do if the presence of such tenderness were held especially to show the action of the Son.

These passages are very fully discussed by St. Augustine ('De Trinitate,' ll. II and III). He goes so far as to say<sup>1</sup> that it is rash to maintain that even God the Father may not ever have appeared in this manner, pointing out to those who on the other hand quote 1 Tim. 6<sup>16</sup>, *ὃν εἶδεν οὐδεὶς ἀνθρώπων οὐδὲ ἰδεῖν δύναται*, that these words must apply alike to the Godhead of the Father, Son and Spirit. As God,

<sup>1</sup> II 32.

each is invisible. "Visiones autem illae per creaturam commutabilem Deo incommutabili subditam factae sunt, non proprie sicuti est, sed significative sicut pro rerum causis et temporibus oportuit, ostendentes Deum. Ipsa enim natura, vel substantia, vel essentia, vel quolibet alio nomine appellandum est id ipsum quod Deus est, quidquid illud est, corporaliter videri non potest: per subiectam vero creaturam non solum Filium, vel Spiritum sanctum, sed etiam Patrem corporali specie sive similitudine mortalibus sensibus significationem sui dare potuisse credendum est"..... Later on, in the third book, he maintains the view that these appearances were of an angelic character, "antiquis patribus nostris ante incarnationem Salvatoris, cum Deus apparere dicebatur, voces illae ac species corporales per angelos factae sunt."

On the whole however it does not seem an easy thing to learn much about the Being of the Son of God from these appearances in the Old Testament. The nature of them appears too obscure for us to derive from them any elucidation of other difficulties. Supposing that in them it was the Second Person of the Holy Trinity who appeared, so far we only have a further evidence of the fitness of the Son to be 'sent.' That point, however, has been made far more plain in the Incarnation, so that these Old Testament passages do not extend our knowledge in that respect. We cannot consider that these appearances were in any full sense anticipatory of the Incarnation; there was no true *κένωσις* in them, no permanent taking of our nature, there was no adding of a human nature to the Divine; such manifestations left the Son of God as

He was before, such appearances could not fairly be described by the phrase *σὰρξ ἐγένετο*. Only they may point forward to 'the fitness' of the Incarnation of the Son: for both the appearances in the Old Testament (if they *were* appearances of the Son) and the Incarnation must rest upon a certain relation, and, we may presume, the *same* relation in the Godhead between the Father and the Son.

We have not therefore found in the Old Testament any clear statements as to the Being of the Son of God. It is indeed difficult in the Old Testament to arrive at any clear statement as to the differentiation of the Persons in the Blessed Trinity. We should, for example, find it a no less difficult matter to trace the Personality of the Holy Spirit in the Old Testament without any light thrown back from the New. In the case before us it is very true that "novum testamentum in vetere latet"; we are prepared for the fuller light of the New, prepared to welcome it, and to find that in it some light is thrown on the more obscure suggestions in the Old Testament and on passages, which, dark in themselves, seem to look forward to a future illumination: but we are only prepared for these things, they are not yet revealed to us. It is from the Person and the teaching of the Son of Man, and the impression of both conveyed by the Holy Spirit to the minds and hearts of His Apostles and expressed for us by them in their writings, that we can learn about the Son of God.

It is not now proposed to investigate the teaching of the New Testament on the subject point by point or verse by verse, but to refer to various passages as may be required. As we have seen, we are not to



look for any formulated system in the New Testament ; in it will be found the foundation, the proof, of any true system of doctrine on this and other subjects, but not a system.

There will be no need at the outset to establish by quotations the unquestioned application, both direct and implicit, of the title to the Lord. Later on there will be noted characteristic passages where it occurs or is involved, and some of the more important passages will be considered individually : at this point a more general view may be taken of the meaning and use of the title, while at the same time the passages are quoted which justify the statements made ; it will not however be necessary to refer to all the texts that would support each point.

First of all we must observe that as applied to our Lord the word 'Son' is not used in just the ordinary sense of the word. Certain associations of sonship, always attending on the idea in common use, will here be found wanting ; for example we must dismiss the thought that occurs to the mind on hearing of a father and a son, that of course the son is younger than his father. On the other hand, it would be false to say that the term, though originating in human relationships, was merely a baseless figure or an unreal metaphor,<sup>1</sup> that there was nothing in the relation of the first two Persons of the Trinity which really and as a fact constituted Fatherhood and Sonship, as we speak. It is not true either to say that, owing to the poverty of language to express thought, especially thought which transcends the human mind, when we use the

<sup>1</sup> See App. D.

word Son, we are getting as near as we can to the expression of that which defies expression, and are using the best, the nearest term available for something really different. In a sense this is true: for all that we say or think about God must necessarily be cast in the mould of human thought and speech, and our finite faculties cannot comprehend the Infinite in this or anything else. We are bringing heaven down to the measure of earth, when we speak of God as Just and Merciful, or as a Judge. So the term 'Son' is not adequate, because it does not fully put before us the truth as it is, or even as we may conceive of it; indeed if the use of the word 'Son' in its ordinary sense exactly translated into language that which is to be presented to the mind of man by the title 'the Son of God,' there would be no more to be said, there would be no limitations to be removed, or added: Christ would be 'the Son of God,' as Solomon was the son of David. But it is as true to say that Christ is the Son of God as to say that God is True; the word 'Son' is, if we may say so, not a makeshift resting on no basis of fact, not a *mere* concession to human modes of speech; so far as we may apprehend the matter, it does bring before us, if incompletely, the true relation of the Second Person of the Holy Trinity to the First. There are other relations, one of which (see pp. 55 ff) at any rate falls to some extent within our apprehension, and others no doubt that do not; but fixing our minds on this aspect of the Godhead we confess that our Lord in His Divine nature *is* the Son of God<sup>1</sup> (Matt. 16<sup>16</sup>; John 3<sup>16</sup>; Heb. 4<sup>14</sup> &c.) But He is Son without any

<sup>1</sup> See App. C.

of those accessories of sonship which, though always belonging to it as we know it, yet form no part of the essential idea of sonship, and can in thought be removed without impairing the notion of sonship. For example, eternal generation is a thing which we have never seen; but generation is not less generation because eternal, however far we may be from being able to realize it. We may describe what is necessarily meant by sonship and generation in the language of Pearson—"the most proper generation which we know is nothing else but a vital production of another in the same nature, with a full representation of him from whom he is produced.....a son is nothing but another produced by his father in the same nature with him...." and the Divine generation we must acknowledge "far more proper than any natural generation of the creature, not only because it is in a more perfect manner, but also because the identity of nature is most perfect..... In human generation the son is begotten in the same nature with the father, which is performed by derivation, or decision of part of the substance of the parent, but this decision includeth imperfection, because it supposeth a substance divisible, and consequently corporeal; whereas the essence of God is incorporeal, spiritual, indivisible, and therefore His nature is really communicated, not by derivation or decision, but by a total and plenary communication."<sup>1</sup>

It will be well to develope and explain a little more fully the contrasts between ordinary human sonship and the Sonship of Christ suggested in this passage. It has already been observed that, whereas

<sup>1</sup> 'Exposition of the Creed,' p. 243.

human sons are younger than their fathers, this is not the case with Christ; or to express it from the other side, the Sonship of Christ is eternal, for of Him it is untrue that *ἦν ποτὲ ὅτε οὐκ ἦν*.

Secondly, whereas by generation a human father transmits his nature to his son—for that is the very essence of sonship—in the Godhead this communication of nature is still more perfect “with a greater unity or identity than can be found in human generation,” because the Son of God not only has the same nature as the Father, but is also the same God; the Godhead is indivisible, and if communicated must be wholly communicated; it cannot be communicated in part, or, in Hooker’s words, “Christ hath received of the Father one and in number the selfsame substance which the Father hath.” (John 10<sup>30</sup> *ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατήρ εἶν ἐσμεν*, where we must notice the gender *εἶν*). “In Trinitate alius atque alius, non aliud atque aliud.” A man and his son have separate existences, they present two specimens of the same human nature, they are two men; not so God the Father and God the Son; They are not two Gods, “but one God.”

And thus thirdly the Son of God much more nearly resembles His Father, than a human son resembles his father. The words of John 14<sup>9</sup> *ὁ ἑωρακὼς ἐμὲ ἑώρακεν τὸν πατέρα* are shown *e.g.* by John 1<sup>18</sup>, Phil. 2<sup>6</sup>, Heb. 1<sup>1-3</sup>, to have brought down to earth a truth, a fact already true of the Eternal Son in heaven, the truth that He is the complete counterpart of the Father, that before the Incarnation had revealed the Father to the eyes of men in the Son, already (as we speak) the Father had seen Himself revealed in the Son. Indeed we must say on this

passage of St. John itself that it would not have been possible for the Incarnate Christ to be the Revelation of the Father to men, unless He were already so in His own preincarnate nature, nor was it possible that He should become more fully in Himself, as well as more clearly in the eyes of men *εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ* (Col. 1<sup>15</sup>) by the Incarnation. When the Epistle to the Hebrews speaks of Him as *ὢν ἀπαύγασμα κτλ.*, the full and absolute sense of *ὢν*<sup>1</sup> as referring to His Eternal Divine Being must be maintained.

Fourthly, as to the manner of the Son's generation. This we may at once say is beyond our human apprehension. The eternal generation of the Son is something different to any generation which we know. In all generations which we know, whether human, or animal, or vegetable, something is taken from the parent and given to produce the offspring, as of course was the case with the Lord's human nature which He derived from the Blessed Virgin. Such is the only generation known to us, and generation of this character is of course impossible in the indivisible incorporeal nature of God. It was a true sense of this impossibility which led to the denial of a Divine generation in early days, and to the application of the term *ἀγέννητος* to the Lord's Divine Sonship. "The doctrine of an eternal generation," it has been said<sup>2</sup> "was unknown to Ignatius, and any lower conception was felt to be unworthy of the Divine Essence. The conception of a Divine Sonship was realised by the Church before the conception of a Divine generation." It could not be true of the eternal and indivisible Deity

<sup>1</sup> See however App. R.

<sup>2</sup> Swete. 'The Apostles' Creed,' p. 28.

that something is taken from God the Father and given to be the source of Being of God the Son. On the other hand, we must not forget that it *is* true and necessary to maintain, that the Sonship of God the Son is *given* to Him by the Father (John 5<sup>26</sup>)—given, but without loss to the Father, *given* to the Son, if one may so say, without being *given away* by the Father. “The Father alone is originally that Deity which Christ originally is not (for Christ is God by being of God.....), it followeth hereupon that whatsoever Christ hath common unto him with his heavenly Father, the same of necessity must be given him, but naturally and eternally given, not bestowed by way of benevolence and favour.....And therefore where the Fathers give it out for a rule, that whatsoever Christ is said in Scripture to have received, the same we ought to apply only to the manhood of Christ.....to that which he hath received of the Father by eternal nativity or birth their assertion reacheth not.”<sup>1</sup>

The nativity is given, but the mode of giving we know not. And this will not surprise us;<sup>2</sup> we would not expect to understand the manner of such a mystery; our minds would not be likely to reach to the infinite Being of God. So much so, that it is scarcely worth while, even by way of distant illustration, reverently to point to the great variety of manner by which life is communicated in this world in the whole realm of nature; it is true that every such communication involves some ‘decision’ from the parent, something taken away, but the modes in which this is done are very various. Another, and perhaps, if we knew more,

<sup>1</sup> Hooker, ‘Ecclesiastical Polity,’ p. 297.

<sup>2</sup> See Illingworth, ‘Personality Human and Divine,’ p. 68, quotation from Athanasius.

a nearer illustration is the communication of spiritual life at baptism, where there is no outward material 'decision' to convey life, and yet the vital union of the branch with the vine (John 15<sup>5</sup>) is our Lord's own parable to show us the reality of the vital union with Him of those who, being born again, are in Him, and share His life, and derive their spiritual life from Him. The manner of the eternal generation we need not, we cannot explain; it is necessarily contrary to our finite experience, but not contrary to our reason, which leaves an open field for the exercise of that faith which welcomes the truth shortly but fully expressed in the *θεὸς ἐκ θεοῦ* of our Creed (John 8<sup>42</sup>, and 16<sup>28</sup>), and *φῶς ἐκ φωτός*, this latter being a phrase suggesting a communication without a loss. St. Augustine (serm. cxvii) also uses a comparison drawn from this language of light to illustrate the fact that the Son, though derived from the Father, is coeternal with the Father: "Ecce fortasse fratres invenimus aliquid in creatura quod de alia re nascatur, et tamen ex eo tempore esse incipiat, ex quo coepit illud unde nascitur..... Attende eum qui lucernam accendit. Non accensa lucerna, nondum est ignis, nondum est et fulgor qui ab igne exit..... Splendor ille ab igne existit, non ignis de splendore; ponamus ergo ignem patrem illius splendoris..... Si lucernam accendere cupio, nondum est ibi ignis, nondum et ille splendor; mox autem ut accendero, simul cum igne et splendor existit. Da hic mihi ignem sine splendore, et credo tibi Patrem fuisse sine Filio."

One point more must be noted; we must be careful to hold what is said of eternal generation side by side with what was said above with reference

to *ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἓν ἐσμεν*. Christ is and ever has been the Son of God: but that has not given Him an existence separated from the Father's. Thus, in John 16<sup>28</sup>, the Son can speak of His coming out of the Father into the world, in a way which would have been impossible if He had, so to speak, come once for all out of the Father at the eternal generation; it is as true to say that the Son on His mission to the world started *ἐκ τοῦ πατρός* (not only *παρὰ τοῦ πατρός* as in verse 27), as it is to say that He was begotten God *ἐκ τοῦ πατρός*, to which fact John 8<sup>42</sup>, *ἐγὼ γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐξῆλθον*, refers. In this connection it is interesting to note a passage of Origen,<sup>1</sup> *οὐχὶ ἐγέννησεν ὁ πατήρ τὸν υἱὸν καὶ ἀπέλυσεν αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τῆς γενέσεως αὐτοῦ ἀλλ' αἰεὶ γεννᾷ αὐτὸν ὅσον ἐστὶ τὸ φῶς ποιητικὸν τοῦ ἀπαυγίσματος*. The Son of God was from all eternity begotten the Son of God, but as we must express it, He is also ever being begotten; what was true of Him, is true, and ever will be true, and whatever manner of generation eternally constitutes Him the Son of God, that manner is not more truly eternally past than eternally present: for in eternity the distinction between past and present does not exist. The question then may be asked whether it would therefore be correct commonly to speak of the Son as *γεννώμενος*, as it is to speak of the Holy Spirit as *ἐκπορευόμενον* (present tense John 15<sup>26</sup>). To this the answer should probably be in the negative. The present tense no doubt (compare the *ὄν* in Heb. 1<sup>3</sup>) expresses an infinite absolute relation better than any other tense;

<sup>1</sup> Hom. in John 9<sup>4</sup>, quoted by Bishop Westcott, 'Epistle to the Hebrews,' p. 11, with a different reference.



but a word like *γεννώ* more sharply contrasts present as present with past and future, than does a word of process like *ἐκπορεύεσθαι*; and this in dealing with an eternal truth is exactly what one wishes to avoid. The present tense also suggests an incompleteness or a becoming in Christ's Sonship, and the thing which we have to guard, as against the Arian, is the truth that Christ has 'never not' been the Son of God; *γεννητός* or *γεγεννημένος* does this without the sense of incompleteness which might attach itself to the present. Christ's Sonship is eternal and complete, but on the other hand it does not sever Him from the Father.

We may quote the words of Hooker... "The Persons of the Godhead, by reason of the unity of their substance, do as necessarily remain one within another, as they are of necessity to be distinguished one from another, because two are the issue of one, and one the offspring of the other two, only of three one not growing out of any other. And sith they all are but one God in number, one indivisible essence or substance, their distinction cannot possibly admit separation.... The Persons of that Trinity are not three particular substances to whom one general nature is common, but three that subsist by one substance which itself is particular, yet they all three have it, and their several ways of having it are that which maketh their personal distinction. The Father therefore is in the Son, and the Son in him, they both in the Spirit, and the Spirit in both them. So that the Father's offspring which is the Son, remaineth eternally in the Father; and the Father eternally also in the Son, no way severed or divided by reason of the sole and single unity of their substance. The Son in the Father as light in that light out of

which it floweth without separation; the Father in the Son as light in that light which it causeth and leaveth not. And because in this respect his eternal being is of the Father, which eternal being is his life, therefore he by the Father liveth."

The word *μονογενής*<sup>1</sup> marks the unique character of the Divine Sonship; see John 1<sup>14</sup> *ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός*, John 1<sup>18</sup> *μονογενῆς θεός* (Western text *ὁ μονογενῆς υἱός*), John 3<sup>16</sup> *τὸν υἱὸν τὸν μονογενῆ*, John 3<sup>18</sup> *τοῦ μονογενοῦς υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ*, 1 John 4<sup>9</sup> *τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ*. The word *μονογενής* itself is better rendered by the 'only' of the Apostles' Creed than by the 'only-begotten' of the Nicene; it fixes attention on the Personal Being, not on the generation of the Son; it means 'only-born' rather than only-begotten; *γεννητός* or *γεννηθείς* is the word for 'begotten.'<sup>2</sup> The Divine Son is alone of His kind in His Sonship, and in His Divine nature He occupies a relation to the Father which no others share; the term at once distinguishes Him from the Holy Spirit and from all mankind. That he is *begotten* or *born* separates Him from the *proceeding* (John 15<sup>26</sup>) Holy Spirit; that His nativity is unique distinguishes Him from us, who are also called sons of God. It will therefore be well now to inquire what is the divergence between Christ's Sonship and our sonship as sons of God, that HE should be called and be *ὁ υἱὸς ὁ μονογενής*.

We must first note the distinction between 'son' and 'child.' It is the ordinary one that commonly

<sup>1</sup> See App. E.

<sup>2</sup> Westcott, 'Gospel of St. John,' p. 12. 'Epistles of St. John,' p. 170.

divides 'son' from 'child' among men. When we speak of a son we rather think of one who possesses a position, with whatever rights may be attached to it, as his father's offspring; while a child is one on whom his father's affection is centred, one of the family (*τέκνον θεοῦ* appears not to be found, always *τέκνα*) and one who by his likeness to his father suggests his parentage. Thus, in the New Testament, the privileged position of the son is exactly expressed in Gal. 4<sup>7</sup>, *οὐκέτι δούλος ἀλλὰ υἱός· εἰ δὲ υἱός, καὶ κληρονόμος διὰ θεοῦ*. At the same time we must not press this distinction too far: for in the passage of the Epistle to the Romans, similar to this, the word *τεκνά* is also found, ch. 8<sup>14-17</sup>, *ὅσοι γὰρ πνεύματι θεοῦ ἄγονται, οὗτοι υἱοὶ θεοῦ εἰσίν. οὐ γὰρ ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα δουλείας...ἀλλὰ ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα υιοθεσίας...τὸ πνεῦμα συμμαρτυρεῖ...ὅτι ἐσμέν τέκνα θεοῦ. εἰ δὲ τέκνα, καὶ...κληρονόμοι μὲν θεοῦ, συγκαληρονόμοι δὲ χριστοῦ*). The idea of the love that belongs to the child, is brought out in 1 John 3<sup>1-3</sup>, *ποταπὴν ἀγάπην δέδωκεν ἡμῖν ὁ πατήρ ἵνα τέκνα θεοῦ κληθῶμεν...νῦν τέκνα θεοῦ ἐσμέν...ἐὰν φανερωθῇ ὅμοιοι αὐτῷ ἐσόμεθα*. See also 1 John 3<sup>9,10</sup>. *τέκνα* looks at the family bond of birth, *υἱός* at the privileged status of the father's representative. It is proper to note the difference between *τέκνα* and *υἱοί*, which is not always observed in the Authorised Version; but in the comparison of our sonship as the sons of God with Christ's Sonship it is not of such importance that anything connected with the term *τέκνα* should be omitted from the comparison.

To return then to the distinction between Christ's Sonship as the Son of God, and ours, we may note four senses in which to us is allowed the title of sons of God; it is not to be supposed that

the four are wholly distinct from one another, but it is convenient so to group them<sup>1</sup>.

1. First, we are sons of God, as our Creator. The Creator may be said to be the Father of the things which He has created: for He has caused them to be, and without Him they would have no existence. They derive their being and support from Him. This sonship belongs to the creatures of inanimate nature, as in the poetic passage Job 38<sup>7</sup>, בְּנֵי-יַחַד פּוֹכְבֵי בֶקֶר וְיִרְעֵי כָל-בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים, and the truth is attested 1 Cor. 8<sup>6</sup> ἡμῖν εἰς θεὸς ὁ πατήρ, ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα (neuter), James 1<sup>17</sup>, though perhaps in modern days the hold on it has weakened.

2. But, secondly, man created in God's image (to grow after His likeness) has from the beginning a fuller sonship than inanimate nature (cf. Acts 17<sup>28, 29</sup> τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμέν. γένος οὖν ὑπάρχοντες [note the word, *not ὄντες*] τοῦ θεοῦ). Not only has God created man, but He made him with a son's resemblance to his Father, בְּצֶלֶם אֱלֹהִים, and a son's capacity to develop according to his Father's example (note קָדְמֵיחַנּוּ in Gen. 1<sup>26</sup>). "The child was to be like Him by coming to that expression of Him that is the true idea of child-life."<sup>2</sup> God meant men to be and to develop as His sons; they, beyond all else in His creation, were the objects of His care and His love; τοῦ Ἀδάμ τοῦ θεοῦ (Luke 3<sup>38</sup>) tells us of the privileged position of man. How this sonship would have been developed by son-like trust and obedience if sin had not intruded, it is not yet time to inquire; we need only anticipate so far as to say that it is reasonable to suppose that the Son

<sup>1</sup> See Pearson for some points.

<sup>2</sup> Phillips Brooks, see below.

of God would have been, as He is, the Head of the human race, and among unfallen men He would no less have been *πρωτότοκος ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς*.

3. But it is only in the first two chapters of Genesis that we read of man in his essential nature and calling; sin comes in in the third chapter, sadly changing man from what he was meant to be into what he at the present time is, and the fact and the potentialities of his divine sonship are obscured by its presence. "Man is very far gone from original righteousness;" without God's grace he is either careless or unaware of his sonship; there is not the open confidence of a son in his attitude to his Father, just as Adam (*τοῦ θεοῦ*) hid himself from the presence of the Lord God; there is need of reconciliation; this second sonship on man's side is obscured and needs to be restored, or rather unveiled; it is there already (cf. *ὑπάρχοντες* above), but its claims are ignored, its power lost, its very existence hidden. God's will and purpose are the same, but sin has obscured them; it now needs God's grace to make man believe that he is what he is—the child of his heavenly Father; man needs to be regenerated and put back into his proper place. This now occurs when he is adopted in Christ as God's son. Though this regeneration takes place at the time of his adoption in Christ, it will be best to consider the regeneration and the adoption separately: for in idea they are not the same thing.

That the sonship to which the regenerate are admitted is a restoration to a former position, is shown not only by the points already raised to show the second class of sonship, but also by Heb. 2<sup>17</sup> *ᾧφειλεν κατὰ πάντα τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ὁμοιωθῆναι*, where

it seems to be shown that Christ became incarnate, not to make men His brethren, but because they were His brethren, as also in verse 11, *ὁ τε ἀγιάζων καὶ οἱ ἀγιαζόμενοι ἐξ ἑνὸς πάντες δι' ἣν αἰτίαν οὐκ ἐπαισχύνεται ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοὺς καλεῖν*. A unity of source already constitutes His brotherhood with men. The following quotation<sup>1</sup> is in this connection of interest; "Man is the child of God by nature. He is ignorant and rebellious—the prodigal child of God; but his ignorance and rebellion never break that first relationship. It is always a child ignorant of his Father; always a child rebellious against his Father. That is what makes the tragedy of human history and always prevents human sin from becoming an insignificant and squalid thing. To re-assert the fatherhood and childhood as an unlost truth and to re-establish its power as the central fact of life; to tell men that they were, and to make them actually be the sons of God. That was the purpose of the coming of Jesus and the shaping power of His life."...Compare Jowett's words "He sought to create in men the feeling which absorbed His own being, that they were the sons of God."... "The best and noblest men everywhere have always been true seekers after God. That is inexplicable if Christianity is a new power, a new gift to the faculties of man, nay, as it often seems to be stated, a new set of faculties in man which he has not possessed before. But how entirely explicable, how natural it is, if what the Incarnation did was to redeem men into what was their original and undestroyed nature and privilege! What wonder that the hidden sonship

<sup>1</sup> Phillips Brooks, 'The Influence of Jesus,' p. 13 and p. 47.

should have been for ever flashing forth wherever the crust of earthliness and sensuality and selfishness was thinnest!"

Man as created, man without sin, would have needed no regeneration; he would never have fallen from his high position as God's son; his privilege would not have been obscured. But the intrusion of sin has altered the aspect of man's life and position, and, as things are, regeneration is necessary. The regeneration and restoration are effected through Christ. The conclusion of Heb. 2, quoted above, gives as Christ's motive in "taking hold of the seed of Abraham," the reconciliation of sinful man through His priesthood; and in John 1<sup>12</sup> we have ὅσοι δὲ ἔλαβον αὐτόν, ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν (*right, authority, not power*) τέκνα θεοῦ γενέσθαι, τοῖς πιστεύουσιν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ (cf. Eph. 2<sup>13</sup>), where we must again observe that the word γενέσθαι, especially when taken in connection with ἐξουσίαν, while it suggests the progressive realisation of the sonship does not require us to suppose that the position of son was wholly a new thing; γενέσθαι indeed is very often employed by Greek writers of realising something already existing potentially; thus they use ἐγένετο with a predicative adjective like the Latin *se praeberere* with an adjective.

4. Very closely allied with this restoration of man's sonship, this regeneration through Christ, is, as has been said above, the *adoption* of men in Christ to be sons of God. In the present sinful state of man regeneration and adoption are so closely connected that perhaps it is only in thought that they can be separated. We may for example observe the language of the Collect for

Christmas Day, "we being regenerate, and made thy children by adoption and grace," and the words of the Catechism "wherein I was made a member of Christ, the child of God"—the word 'made,' strictly speaking, being applicable in rather a different way in the two phrases. But it may well be that adoption in Christ is not merely the privilege of sinful man, but belongs to man as he was created without sin.

This is not the place to discuss the gospel of creation;<sup>1</sup> but so much seems clear, that the Incarnation of the Lord did not depend upon the Fall, that Christ came rather in spite of man's fall than because of it, that though, as things are, for fallen mankind He came as Redeemer as well as 'Consummator,' for mankind as created He would still have come as 'Consummator.' The circumstances of the Incarnation were determined by sin, and sin gave to it a second motive; but Christ's coming was independent of sin. Christ we may believe would in any case have come into the world, and have been the Head of humanity; He would in any case have taken our human nature and, by taking it in His own Divine Person, have united it to the Divine nature, and have thus united man to God.

But as a matter of fact man has fallen; it is fallen man who now has to be united to God; man needs regeneration as well as adoption. These two requirements are not now separated in their satisfaction, and the sacrament of our union with Christ reaches not to one but to two needs of man. Baptism, as we know it, is for fallen man, "being by nature born

<sup>1</sup> See App. F.



in sin, and the children of wrath, we are hereby made the children of grace ;” it is a “ washing of regeneration.” But this regeneration is made effective by the fact that we are made “ members of Christ,” and, like the branch of the vine, derive our new life from union with Him ; we are incorporated into Christ, made members of His Mystical Body ; “ the free gift of God is eternal life in (ἐν) Christ Jesus our Lord.” Sin actual and original being in us, we need the water of baptism for ‘ the mystical *washing away of sin* ; ’ but though, if we had been without sin, there would have been no need of restoration, yet our union with Christ<sup>1</sup> would still have been desirable, even though it would not have been a union first involving forgiveness and restoration. We cannot of course say how this would have been effected ; it is impossible for us to picture the development of man in a sinless world towards perfection, and it would be utterly idle to inquire on such a hypothetical matter whether there would have been anything analogous to baptism. We may however in passing note the two phrases used in St. John 3<sup>3, 5</sup> ; verse 3 says ἐὰν μή τις γεννηθῆ ἄνωθεν, οὐ δύναται ἰδεῖν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ; verse 5 says ἐὰν μή τις γεννηθῆ ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος, οὐ δύναται εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ. Sinful man plainly needs to be born again, before he can have the eyes which can see the Kingdom of God ; sinless man would not have had this disability, but perhaps he, no less than sinful man, would have needed something like the second birth of the Spirit before he could enter. The point on which it is desired to lay emphasis is that membership in Christ

<sup>1</sup> See Dale, ‘ Lectures on the Ephesians,’ p. 74.

would, so far as we may judge, have been desirable and accessible to sinless man, who would, though not requiring the offices of a Redeemer, have no less than sinful man have looked to union with God in the Consummator.

Be this as it may, under existing circumstances, regeneration in Christ and adoption in Christ are for us united together as a matter of fact (Eph. 1<sup>5-7</sup>).

It is this, our *adopted* sonship in Christ, which offers us the highest privilege of sonship, higher than any one of the other three; higher than the first, for God's Fatherhood to us is higher than His Fatherhood as Creator, higher than the second, because it is its consummation, higher than the third, because that is the removal of a barrier to this fourth highest sonship of adoption in the Son of God, which for us includes all the others and is the one usually referred to in the New Testament. See John 1<sup>12</sup>, ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τέκνα θεοῦ γενέσθαι, Gal. 3<sup>26</sup>, 4<sup>5,6</sup>. "A shadow of (this sonship) existed in the relation of Israel to God. But that which was in that case outward and independent of the individual will, was replaced in the Christian Church by a vital relationship<sup>1</sup>."

At the same time, though now the sonship is made individual, it is also held in fellowship with others; St. John's phrase τέκνα θεοῦ γενέσθαι is plural, and the corresponding phrase, 2 Pet. 1<sup>4</sup>, ἵνα γένησθε θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως, indicates a *joint* participation. The many individuals, as they in Christ realize their sonship, are in Him united together. In this

<sup>1</sup> Westcott. 'Gospel of St. John,' p. 9. In the next paragraph see 'Epistles of St. John,' p. 55.

connection it is interesting to observe that the brotherhood of men, as men, does not appear to be contemplated in the New Testament except as the widest scope of their brotherhood as Christians. An universal brotherhood is not to be realised as springing from men's original sonship, but from the restoration of it in Christ (2 Pet. 1<sup>7</sup>). But the love of fellow Christians, the love of the brethren, is capable of an indefinite expansion, ever reaching wider and wider to all as they become embraced, or are recognized as capable of being embraced, in this potentially universal brotherhood.

By our adoption in Christ, by our union with Him, are now given to us our heavenly and spiritual privileges; they are not independent of Him; it is as God accepts us as sons *in Him*, that we obtain the right to the privilege that He has won for His brethren. The Epistle to the Hebrews exhibits Christ to us as having won for the race the full right of access to God as His sons; and though man has not yet the position in the order of things that should belong to him as God's son, as God's vicegerent on earth (Gen. 1<sup>27, 28</sup>), yet in his great Representative all is promised to him, and the earnest has already been received. "But now we see not yet all things put under him. But we see Jesus .....crowned with glory and honour" (Heb. 2<sup>8, 9</sup>). And that which has been won by our Head (Eph. 4<sup>15, 16</sup>, Col. 2<sup>19</sup>) and received by Him in His exalted human nature, is for all mankind.

But Scripture is careful to guard the distinction between Christ's Divine Sonship by nature, and ours by adoption. It is marked in the announcement of His Ascension by the Risen Lord *ἀναβαίνω πρὸς τὸν πατέρα μου καὶ πατέρα ὑμῶν* (John 20<sup>17</sup>), where the

one article shews God as the same Father, but the repetition of the word with the second pronoun marks the different aspect of His Fatherhood to the One and the others; and again the word *υιοθεσία* itself<sup>1</sup> (Rom. 8<sup>15</sup>, Gal. 4<sup>5</sup>, Eph. 1<sup>5</sup>) indicates the distinction between the Son begotten and the sons adopted.

In these ways, then, is Christ's Divine Sonship to be distinguished from ours, and Christ can use the language of John 5<sup>18</sup>, *πατέρα ἰδίου ἔλεγε τὸν θεόν, ἴσον ἑαυτὸν ποιῶν τῷ θεῷ*<sup>2</sup>.

Having then considered the application of the word *μονογενής*, we have to inquire into the word *πρωτότοκος* (Col. 1<sup>15</sup>), which presents the same truth from another point of view.

Bishop Lightfoot<sup>3</sup> arrives at the following conclusion in regard to the force of the word. The two words *μονογενής* and *πρωτότοκος* "express the same eternal fact; but while *μονογενής* states it in itself, *πρωτότοκος* places it in relation to the Universe." In origin *πρωτότοκος* is connected with Philo's presentation of the Logos, in which however the actual term applied is *πρωτόγονος*; also it is connected with the Old Testament use of the word, in which it is applied to Israel (Ex. 4<sup>22</sup>, see above p. 17), and as the Representative of the race the term *ὁ πρωτότοκος* became a synonym for the Messiah. "As the Person of Christ was the Divine response alike to the philosophical questionings of the Alexandrian

<sup>1</sup> See App. G.

<sup>2</sup> These latter words however Bishop Lightfoot attributes to the Jews, saying *ἴσα θεῷ εἶναι* better expresses the Catholic doctrine,

*ἴσον θεῷ* would seem to divide the Godhead.

<sup>3</sup> 'Epistle to the Colossians,' pp. 146, 147.

Jew and to the patriotic hopes of the Palestinian, these two currents of thought meet in the term *πρωτότοκος* as applied to our Lord, who is both the true Logos and the true Messiah." Dr. Lightfoot goes on to shew that the term contains the two main ideas of priority to all creation, and of sovereignty over all creation. The whole context of the word, *τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἔκτισται· καὶ αὐτὸς ἔστιν πρὸ πάντων καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν* (Col. I<sup>16, 17</sup>), militates against any idea that the phrase means the first of created things (*πρωτόκτιστος*) or does not imply the absolute pre-existence of the Son of God; nor does the genitive *πάσης κτίσεως* imply that *κτίσις* includes the *πρωτότοκος* among its members. In its Messianic reference the idea of sovereignty predominated, and the phrase exactly corresponds to the *ἔθηκεν κληρονόμον πάντων* of Heb. I<sup>2</sup>. So the whole phrase means "He is the First-born, and, as the First-born, the absolute Heir and sovereign Lord, of all creation." It is further shewn that, though the Fathers of the second and third centuries correctly refer the term to the Eternal Son of God, and not to the Incarnate Christ, to His Deity, and not His humanity, in controversies with Arians this correct interpretation was abandoned by those who on the one hand may have been unaware of the history of the term, and on the other neglected the argument of the whole passage in which there is a close parallelism drawn between the Eternal Son of God *πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως* and the Risen Christ in His humanity *πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν*; the one phrase describing Him in His Eternal Being (*αὐτὸς ἔστιν* of verse 17), the other describing what He became (verse 18 *ἵνα γένηται ἐν πᾶσιν αὐτὸς πρωτεύων*).

We have now to discuss the meaning of a few special words of the New Testament which seem at once to indicate and guard the meaning of the title of Son of God as applied to the Lord, being terms used of Him in direct relation to the Father.

The terms<sup>1</sup> in question are (1) *εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ* used in Col. 1<sup>15</sup>, the passage which has just been under consideration: (2) *ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης*: (3) *χαρακτήρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως* Heb. 1<sup>3</sup>: (4) *λόγος* in John 1. Each of these terms suggests the origination of the Son from the Father, the unity of Their nature and the likeness existing between Them, and thus each in a figure suggests from a different point of view a conception of *Sonship*. It will be convenient to consider *εἰκὼν* and *χαρακτήρ* together as both containing the idea of representation, but not *ἀπαύγασμα*, which might indeed mean 'reflection,' but being joined with *χαρακτήρ* in the passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews, is more likely to introduce a different and complementary thought as explained below, and not just another view of the same thought.

Both *χαρακτήρ* and *εἰκὼν* express the idea of manifestation; the Incarnation has finally brought God before the eyes of men (John 14<sup>9</sup>). But before that and independently of that the Son eternally reveals the Father in the very Godhead itself: for so far as *εἰκὼν* goes, it is to be observed that the phrase is not *εἰκὼν τοῦ πατρός*, but absolutely *εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ*, while at the same time the relative refers back to *τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ*. But with the idea of manifestation goes that of resemblance; and though both the words imply

<sup>1</sup> See Bishop Lightfoot and Bishop Westcott on the terms discussed in these sections.

the likeness between the Son and the Father, the directness of the likeness is suggested by *χαρακτήρ*, while the completeness of it is rather suggested by *εἰκόν*. *χαρακτήρ* would be used of a likeness directly taken by an impress; for example it would be a proper word to use of a cast or moulding taken of a hand, or of the features after death. So far as it goes such a likeness is direct and accurate, but the idea of the *fulness* of resemblance is given by *εἰκόν*, meaning a portrait that is made to resemble that from which it is copied. The original is the direct source of the one, it is the pattern to be reached to by the other; both alike owe their origin to it; the likeness that exists between them and it is no accidental likeness. In itself, neither word conveys the meaning of perfect reproduction; indeed the word *εἰκόν* is also used (1 Cor. 11<sup>7</sup>) of man who was made in the image of God, which shews that in itself the word cannot mean a perfect reproduction under similar conditions. And, taken together, the two words do not exhaustively define the relation thus existing between the Father and the Son; they are rather words 'thrown out,' as Matthew Arnold would say, at the idea which is fuller than the meaning of either word, just as the word *ἐξηγήσατο* in John 1<sup>18</sup>, belonging to the vocabulary of *descriptive* representation, also falls below an adequate expression of the manner in which Christ has brought the Father before the minds of men. We must be careful to remember that both words, *εἰκόν* and *χαρακτήρ*, indicate a truth but do not express it with scientific precision. All such words, true and accurate so far as they go in bringing the truth nearer to us, are yet only guides to faith, which, starting from them, goes further towards the

truth which they have indicated and shewn from afar.

By *ὑποστάσεως*<sup>1</sup> is no doubt meant what we call essence; the word *ὑπόστασις* later came to mean what we now call Person, when the Greek writers could speak of *μίαν οὐσίαν τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις*, and it is no doubt confusing that *ὑπόστασις* should thus have changed its technical meaning while retaining its same force, "that in virtue of which a thing is what it is." The Latin *substantia* has been used to render *ὑπόστασις* in either sense. In the passage before us *ὑπόστασις* cannot mean Person: for, in the first place, that meaning is not attached to the word till a later date than the Apostolic age, and secondly, if that had been the force here, it would have described the Son in relation to the Father as being exactly what He is not. He presents not the Father's Person, but His own, for Each of the Persons of the Trinity is different from the other Two by virtue of really being Who He is, by virtue of His *ὑπόστασις* in the *later* sense. They share the same Godhead, but Their Persons may not be 'confounded,' and the Son could not with any accuracy be said to be or to present the Person of the Father. On the other hand, if we give the meaning of essence to *ὑπόστασις*, this verse makes an assertion about the Son that He "is (the) very image of (the Father's) substance," which contradicts nothing which we otherwise know to be the true.

*Ἀπαύγασμα*, which, as said above, might mean 'reflection,' in this phrase, *ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης*, probably means the 'bright beam;' not *a* bright beam, as one of several opposed to another, the absence of

<sup>1</sup> See App. H.



the article here emphasizing the quality and not suggesting a plurality. It is of course impossible, as shewn in the passage quoted above from St. Augustine (p. 32), really to distinguish between the light and the rays or brightness shone forth from it: for if it were not for the brightness coming from it we should not be aware of the light. But in thought they are readily distinguishable, especially as *ἀπαύγασμα*, from the form of the word, means properly, not the state of shining, but 'the thing flashed out.' This word then emphatically suggests to us the Unity of the Father and the Son, and indicates the Father's position as the *πηγή θεότητος*; there can be no doubt as to the origin of the beam. At the same time the word conveys the idea of the fulness of the manifestation which the Son makes of the Father; all that the light is as light, this the beam shows.

What this figure does not present to us is the difference of Persons in the Father and the Son: for from one point of view the beam *is* the light. This figure, if it stood alone, might confound the Persons. In the Godhead itself we believe the Son of God shews Himself (the Son) to the Father, and in so doing reflects back to the Father the revelation of Himself (the Father). If *ἀπαύγασμα* were the only descriptive figure (for of course it is not a definition), it would not suggest this internal manifestation between the Persons of the Trinity, and would only shew that in the Son *others* could see the Father revealed. With the addition of *χαρακτήρ*, which suggests a distinction between the image and the archetype, the case becomes different; and the complete passage as it stands probably presents the Son at once from both points

of view, as One to be seen by the Father, if we may reverently use such an expression, and to be apprehended by created beings.

By *δόξα* is meant in the fullest sense God's essential attributes so far as they are made known to men. In Ex. 33<sup>18</sup> Moses says *אֲרָאֶה-תְּכֹהֵן נֹא-וְנִרְאֶה*, and probably the LXX give the sense fairly with their *ἐμφάνισόν μοι σεαυτὸν*; the whole passage (see verses 19, 22, and ch. 34<sup>5,7</sup>) shews that by the glory of God is meant God as 'He is,' so far as He has been pleased to reveal His Being and Attributes to men in coming into their life. The pillar of cloud and the pillar of fire were a symbol of God's glory, the glory indicating to His people the presence of God (Ex. 29<sup>43</sup>) as He had so far revealed Himself with His people; and the same may be said of the glory of God (*הִתְהַלַּל בְּבָרָא*) which filled Solomon's temple. But it would be a mistake to identify God's glory with its outward tokens, and the passage in Exodus shews that the glory of God is really the moral revelation of Him; while Ex. 33<sup>20</sup> *וַיִּרְאֵהוּ אֱלֹהִים* points us naturally to John 1<sup>18</sup>, *θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακεν πώποτε*, and the end of that verse is the best commentary on *δόξης* here, *μονογενὴς θεὸς ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο*<sup>1</sup>. In John 1<sup>14</sup> we have *ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός*. Christ's glory "absolutely represented Him from whom He came"; and in John 17<sup>4,5</sup> we have *ἐγὼ σε ἐδόξασα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, τὸ ἔργον τελειώσας ὃ δέδωκάς μοι ἵνα ποιήσω· καὶ νῦν δόξασόν με σύ, πάτερ, παρὰ σεαυτῷ τῇ δόξῃ ἣ εἶχον πρὸ τοῦ τὸν κόσμον εἶναι παρὰ σοί*. *Δόξα* then includes the attributes of God as

<sup>1</sup> ὁ πατήρ τῆς δόξης (Eph. 1<sup>17</sup>) has been supposed to have a similar reference.

they have been revealed, God as His nature has been brought within the range of the minds of men; and again faith goes further, and believes that Christ is the 'bright beam' coming from God as He is in Himself *φῶς οἰκῶν ἀπρόσιτον*, as He is and has been known only to Himself in the Three Persons of the Trinity *πρὸ τοῦ τὸν κόσμον εἶναι*.

These last words make it desirable to explain a little more fully the revelations of God that are made in the Son. It must be remembered that the distinctions now to be drawn only serve to mark and group the subject in our own minds, nor are the groups mutually exclusive; and emphatically we must recognise that they do not reach to the truth itself, but merely to our apprehension of it.

First, there is the Son's revelation of the Father, as the Father comes near to and takes a part in the life of man.

Secondly, there is the Son's revelation of the Father as, with all the limitations that belong to our human apprehension, *we are taught* that the Father is in Himself apart from or rather beyond His dealings with men.

Thirdly, there is the Son's revelation of the Father as He really is, beyond the reach of human mind or knowledge. Of the third we can obviously know nothing; our highest knowledge of God can never reach to that<sup>1</sup>: but the truth, that Christ *has* made

<sup>1</sup> "Dangerous it were for the feeble brain of man to wade far into the doings of the Most High; whom although to know be life, and joy to make mention of His name; yet our soundest knowledge is to know that we know Him not as indeed He is; neither can know Him; and our safest eloquence concerning Him is our silence, when we confess without confession, that His glory is inexplicable, His greatness above our capacity and reach." Hooker, 'Ecclesiastical Polity,' I. ii. 3.

the first two revelations of God, leads faith forward to believe that in the Holy Trinity itself Christ is still the revealer of God.

The first revelation is of course the one which comes nearest to us, and, if one may say so, it is *in form* incidentally (though of course truly providentially) in the course of the first revelation that the second is also made. It is in the progress of the first revelation that the veil is so far drawn aside from the third as to constitute the second. As regards the first, we must observe that though the revelation of the Father made by the Son in the Incarnation is unique, yet it is not to be dissociated from the earlier revelations made by the Son Himself, as the Light of the World (John 9<sup>5</sup> ὅταν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ᾧ referring to time before and after His historic presence, and John 1<sup>9</sup> ἦν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινὸν ὃ φωτίζει πάντα ἄνθρωπον, ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον, rendered as in R.V.) in the Old Testament times, and made πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως by types and prophets and any other messengers in the earlier dispensations, till through various revelations the whole series was consummated in the Incarnation. In all this revelation of God as He has come into the life of man, signs also are given of what God is in Himself, and God has so far revealed 'His glory' to men. We are told, let it be repeated, very little about God except as He has dealt with men, and it is mainly through the record of that aspect of God's work that we come to know anything further about God, and even what we do thus know must fall far, far short of what God is to Himself.

When then we commonly speak of the Son as revealing the Father, this revelation is of the Father in the first two senses. Sometimes one may predominate,

sometimes the other; only of course such a distinction is merely a question of our apprehension: for God in Christ redeeming the world is the same God of whose perfections and other work we also are allowed to learn something. And God, as He is, has revealed Himself in Christ not merely in a secondary manner at the dictate of human requirements, and just according as the redemption of men and the consummation of humanity necessitated such a revelation; but it was the good pleasure, perhaps the necessary good pleasure of God, being Who He is, to reveal to men Himself *as He is*, to the extent that He has done. Thus, when in Christ we have seen the Father (John 14<sup>9</sup>), we have seen God not only as restoring humanity and consummating it and leading it to Himself, but, so far as our finite faculties are able to look towards the Infinite, we also see Him as He really is in Himself. Christ crowning all previous revelations is the revealer of God's true glory, and when we have seen Christ we have seen Him giving this larger revelation of God, a revelation, so far, 'absolute' and not merely 'economic': for, to insist on the point once more, God who has redeemed and directed the life of mankind, is the absolute God, and it is He who has, if incompletely, yet truly been made known to us through the special aspect of His dealings with men. This is not the less true because Christ has come to reveal God as the Father and not primarily as God (John 14<sup>9</sup>; John 15<sup>23, 24</sup>; John 1<sup>18</sup>; 1 John 1<sup>2</sup>).<sup>1</sup> For the aspect of the Fatherhood<sup>2</sup> is an essential aspect of God, and

<sup>1</sup> See Bishop Westcott's notes.

<sup>2</sup> See App. C on the pre-existence of the Son.

in all we learn about the Father we are learning about the One True God, even if the aspect of Fatherhood and Sonship is the aspect of the Godhead which is in this world brought primarily before us. And even if we were to suppose for the moment that the relation of Fatherhood was limited to the Son as Incarnate, yet the Father whom He has revealed would still, behind that Fatherhood, be the One Same God.

It now remains to consider the name of *Λόγος*. Without entering into the full discussion of St. John's terminology, we may say that it seems to be now made out that, even if the origin of the actual term *λόγος* is in some degree Alexandrian, in as much as it undoubtedly belongs to the vocabulary of the Judæo-Alexandrian philosophy, yet the earlier associations of the term as employed by St. John are Palestinian. The word *λόγος* has a double meaning; it means both 'reason' and 'word' *i.e.* 'the spoken word, as expressive of thought;' and while Philo seized on the meaning 'reason,' St. John's use of the term is to mean 'word.' 'The word of the Lord' is frequently used in the Targums as a periphrasis for the Lord Himself, going much further than any similar use in the poetic books of the Old Testament; and in the Aramaic original of the Targums there is not the same ambiguity as in the Greek *λόγος*, because there is no second meaning of 'reason' attached to the word. In the Targums the 'word of the Lord' is concrete, and represents the source of the *action* of God; with Philo *Logos* is a more abstract philosophical term; at most a personification, not a person. St. John uses the term as one familiar to his readers. Any one introducing new ideas on any subject is bound to use

words or terms which are already known<sup>1</sup> in some sense to those whom he addresses, and then to give the words the new or special meaning which he desires to express. The use in the Targums is not the use of St. John; but the close connection of 'the word of the Lord' with God Himself, which they shew, and the personal character which in them already was attached to the term, tended in that direction. St. John, making use of the word as far as it went, gives it a new meaning and takes it for the name of the Second Person of the Trinity.

So much for the origin of the term. We have now to consider something of what the use of the name tells us of the Son of God; and in the case of such a term our information must be derived from the writer's own and particular employment of it, that is, from its use in its own context. The term is only used (four times) in John 1, but we may compare Rev. 19<sup>13</sup> *κέκληται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ὁ Λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ*, and possibly 1 John 1<sup>1</sup>. Plainly the term Logos is of a different character to those which we have just been considering, owing to the fact that the one term 'Word' is as large as the other 'Son,' and certainly is not a partial explanation of the term Son; indeed while the term Logos speaks of an absolute relation in the Godhead, 'Sonship' is the aspect of Him, who is essentially at once *λόγος* and *υἱός*, which falls the more nearly within the scope of our apprehension; when the Word became flesh it was primarily as 'the only begotten,' 'the Son,' that we beheld Him (John 1<sup>14</sup>, 14<sup>9</sup>). The word Logos is clearly not a description

<sup>1</sup> It has indeed been held that St. John adopted this phraseology because in some sense the term was familiar to Jews and Gentiles alike. See Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible s.v.

of the 'Son of God' like the other words just considered (*ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης*, or *εἰκών*), but indicates 'absolutely' the personality of God the Second Person in the Trinity Himself. We must not then regard the term *λόγος* as bringing before us an office of Christ, or an attribute of Him, or any limited aspect of Him; the term of course arises from a particular source, but in St. John's intention it is the NAME of Him whom we most fully know as God the Son, His NAME in the fulness of His Divine Person.

We must thus be careful not to limit our idea of the Logos as merely meaning Him in whom God has spoken to men; that is true no doubt, but beyond the part which the Logos has taken in the life of men, culminating in the grand statement *ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο*, we believe that, as God is to Himself, the Logos is still the same. And the Incarnation of the Lord has not affected this Divine inter-relationship; when the Word became flesh, He was no less 'with God' in Their eternal relation.<sup>1</sup> The Word does not only reveal God, declare Him (John 1<sup>18</sup>), but He is the very expression of what God is, to God, we believe, as well as to the world, and He through whom God works; Creative, John 1<sup>3</sup> (1 Cor. 8<sup>6</sup>); Recreative, John 1<sup>12, 13, 14</sup>

<sup>1</sup> St. Augustine expresses this by an illustration (serm. 119): *De verbo aliquid ago, et verbum humanum forte aliquid simile potest; quamvis longe impar, longe discretum, ex nulla particula comparandum, tamen vobis aliqua similitudine insinuandum. Ecce ego, verbum quod vobis loquor in corde meo prius habui; processit ad te, nec recessit a me; coepit esse in te, quod non erat in te; mansit apud me, cum exiret ad te. Sicut ergo verbum meum prolatum est sensui tuo, nec recessit a corde meo, sic illud Verbum prolatum est sensui nostro, nec recessit a Patre suo. Verbum meum erat apud me et processit in vocem, Verbum Dei erat apud Patrem, et processit in carnem.*



(1 Pet; 1<sup>3, 4</sup>); Life-holding, Life-giving, John 1<sup>4</sup> (Col. 3<sup>4</sup>, John 5<sup>21, 26</sup>, 17<sup>2</sup>); Illuminating, John 1<sup>9</sup> (John 8<sup>12</sup>, in some aspects 2 Cor. 4<sup>4, 6</sup>). The Word is God's effective Voice; the Will of God (might we say the *meaning* of God?) expressed and Personally realised. He is what He reveals. In the presence of the Infinite and the Finite Christ declares Himself to be ἡ ὁδὸς καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια καὶ ἡ ζωὴ (John 14<sup>6</sup>); in this passage however He has the 'Father' and not 'God' primarily in view.

Though the meaning of λόγος is with St. John, in the first instance, the 'spoken word,' there is no reason wholly to exclude the other sense of 'reason,' if we regard the Word as the Wisdom of God (cf. 1 Cor. 1<sup>24</sup>, Col. 2<sup>3</sup>) not indeed as a Divine attribute, or personified faculty, but as a living Person who expresses the thought of God.

Such conceptions in any sense are almost beyond our reach; but they become most nearly intelligible when we look at them from the point of view that God is Love. If God is Love, God must love, and if His love is to have an adequate expression, there must eternally be a Person, not merely an object, for God to love. Nor would the love of God be satisfied (one speaks with all reverence), if God only loved Himself; and yet anyone less than Himself would not be a Person fit to receive God's love perfectly. God's love, therefore, demands a Person equal to God and personally separate from God for its exercise. Such a Person is the Word; equal to God, for He presents back all that God is to God (the First Person) Himself, yet in the Trinity not God (the First Person) Himself (in John 1<sup>1</sup>, we have not ὁ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος), but distinct from Him (as the following

preposition *πρός* marks), and in the Unity Himself Divine (*θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος*), presenting Himself to God as the object of His love (*ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν*). Thus love, so it appears to us, requires that the Second Person should be at once *θεός* and not *ὁ θεός*, while on the other hand He could not be *λόγος* (as one among many, and thus each incomplete and unable perfectly to satisfy God's love), but He is *ὁ λόγος*, unique in His Person.

There are two points more to be noticed which connect *λόγος* with *υἱός*. If the *λόγος* is at once 'the revelation and the revealer,' if He *is* that which He declares, we see how this name belongs to Him who is also called *ὁ υἱὸς ὁ μονογενής*: for it is just as the Son is not the Father, but uniquely and perfectly possesses and reproduces the Father's nature, that the Word, while not Himself the Speaker, not only brings but Himself *is* the Revelation of God. And again such thoughts of love as have been suggested above in regard to *ὁ λόγος* are most easily apprehended by our minds in connection with the aspect of Fatherhood and Sonship. It is not, however, so much the case that the terms *λόγος* and *υἱός* explain one another, or that one is subordinate to the other, as that they are 'complementary' in their description of the relation of the Second Person in the Trinity to the First.

Here we may refer to the great passage Phil. 2<sup>5-11</sup> as illustrating, in the language of St. Paul, the truth given by St. John in his words about the Logos. *ὃς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων οὐχ ἄρπαγμὸν ἠγάγατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ, ἀλλὰ ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν μορφὴν δούλου λαβών, ἐν*

<sup>1</sup> See Bishop Lightfoot's edition of the Epistle to the Philippians, p. 110, and also Bishop Moule's.

ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος· καὶ σχήματι εὐρεθείς ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτόν. With a different manner of expression, and a vocabulary sought from a different source, St. Paul's ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων relates to the same doctrine as the opening verses of St. John's Gospel; ὑπάρχων telling us of the preexistence and, by inference and association, of the eternal existence of Christ Jesus, and μορφῇ bringing before us the 'essential attributes' of God, connoting 'reality along with appearance, or in other words denoting an appearance which is a manifestation.' Thus μορφῇ from a different direction suggests ideas which have come under discussion in connection with λόγος, and from a similar direction ideas connected with εἰκῶν and χαρακτήρ. Whatever may be the exact meaning of ἀρπαγμόν, (and there is no need to dispute the 'counted it not a prize, a thing to be grasped' of the R.V.), the meaning of the clause in which it stands seems clear enough in its implication, that Christ Jesus had every right to be on an equality with God, but this He surrendered by His κένωσις, His self-emptying; the μορφῇ δούλου is clearly contrasted with the μορφῇ θεοῦ, and the one μορφῇ should be as real and complete as the other; and the ἀλλά, and the distinction between ὑπάρχων and λαβών mark the plain contrast between that which Christ Jesus might have continued had He had any thought of ἀρπαγμός, and that which as a matter of fact He became. The σὰρξ ἐγένετο of St. John is represented by the phrases of verse 7 and the first clause of verse 8, where the plural ἀνθρώπων marks, like σὰρξ, the universality of the Lord's human nature. To St. Paul's view, however, as is natural from the hortatory and ethical aspect of the passage, the humilia-

tion of the Lord is more prominent than it is in the words of St. John, who is looking rather at the Divine revelation which the Word in His historic presence made, of which St. John never loses sight, even in the record of all the humiliation of the Passion. In this passage we may observe that the repetition of the word *μορφή* guards at once the reality of the human and the Divine nature of the Lord; the word *ὁμοίωμα* also adds a tribute to His Godhead, because, suggesting a *being made* like, it shews He was not so before; and *σχῆμα*, which is expressive of outward shape, does the same, because its use implies that beneath all there was something—the Godhead—in which Christ Jesus was unlike *ψιλὸς ἄνθρωπος*.

There are four special occasions on which the Lord is entitled 'the Son of God' or 'Son of God,' which require some separate notice. These are the Conception, the Baptism, the Transfiguration, the Resurrection. The application to Him of the title on the occasion of the Resurrection has already been discussed on page 12 and following pages. The other three may be considered now. (1) On the first occasion, at the Conception, Luke 1<sup>35</sup>, the words used were *διὸ καὶ τὸ γεννώμενον ἅγιον κληθήσεται, υἱὸς θεοῦ* (cf. Gal. 4<sup>+</sup>, *ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός*) though here we must observe that the Angel says *υἱός*, not *ὁ υἱός*. A little before has occurred the phrase *υἱὸς Ἰψίτου κληθήσεται*. (2) On the second occasion, the Baptism, Matt. 3<sup>17</sup> (and parallels), the words as given in St. Matthew are *καὶ ἰδοὺ φωνὴ ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν λέγουσα οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα*. (3) On the third occasion, the Transfiguration,

Matt. 17<sup>5</sup> (and parallels), we read: *φωνὴ ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης λέγουσα οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα· ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ.*<sup>1</sup>

These four occasions, although divided in time from one another, are united by a common link. Each of them stands at the opening of a special portion of the Lord's life.

1. The words used at the Conception usher in the Lord's personal life as Man; from the beginning the Son of Man is shown also to be the Son of God. If we had no other reason for believing this, no doubt the absence of the article would make a difference; but it is not essential to have it before we can render, as R.V., 'The Son of God,' and indeed its absence may be the common one where character rather than person is to be emphasised. In this connection we must not ignore the reference in the account of the Lord's birth in St. Matthew to *ὁ θεὸς μετὰ ἡμῶν* "God with us," (Matt. 1<sup>24</sup>).

2. The Baptism<sup>2</sup> marks the commencement, if we may so call it, of the Lord's official life; He now goes forth as the Christ "anointed with the Holy Ghost and with power" to His temptation and His work, and hears the same words of authority, power, and love. The presence of the Holy Spirit (Matt. *πνεῦμα θεοῦ*, Mark *τὸ πνεῦμα*, Luke *τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον*) forms another link of connection with the Conception, where the words are without article, *πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπελεύσεται* (cf. anarthrous Matt. 1<sup>18</sup>, 1<sup>20</sup>), perhaps as representing a power or a visitation of the Holy Spirit. Thus the presence of the Holy Spirit at the Baptism is the second and not the

<sup>1</sup> St. Mark and St. Luke omit *ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα*, and St. Luke also substitutes *ὁ ἐκελεγεμένος* for

*ὁ ἀγαπητός* and transposes the last two words.

<sup>2</sup> See App. I.

first occasion in which we read of His operating in the Lord's human life. Whether there was any other effusion we cannot tell; but it would be a mistaken assumption to suppose that the Lord's conscious human life was destitute of the Holy Spirit before the Baptism. In the same way we are not to suppose that the Son of God became the Son of God at the Baptism.<sup>1</sup> Even if such words had not been used with reference to the Conception, there would be no need to suppose this to be the case; and as a matter of fact similar words, as has been seen, are repeated again on the two other occasions. To address with a title does not imply that the right to the title is only now beginning, but rather suggests that the power or meaning of the title has just been or is going to be put forth.

The descent, then, of the Holy Spirit and the voice from heaven at the Baptism implied that a new stage of the Lord's human life and work was beginning.

As to the actual words spoken at the Baptism, we may note that the heavenly voice is given as *σὺ εἶ* in St. Mark and St. Luke,<sup>2</sup> and *οὗτός ἐστιν* in St. Matthew, the one addressed to the Lord Himself, the other as those who had ears to hear could hear: for though all might hear some sound, a spiritual sense was needed to distinguish God's voice, probably miscalled here *בְּהַקְלָה*. The subjective element in the recognition of such a Divine voice does not make it less true and real. Sometimes God may speak simply by a still small voice in individual hearts, sometimes by a communication that

<sup>1</sup> See Swete, 'The Apostles' Creed,' p. 29.

<sup>2</sup> By the Western text (though not universally) the words *ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε* are given

here in St. Luke. In St. Luke alone at the Baptism and Transfiguration the Lord's prayers are recorded.

all must recognise as an expression of His will (Deut. 5<sup>22-27</sup>, 1 Kings 18<sup>38,39</sup>). Sometimes He may blend the outward and the inward in such a way, that of those who are near together some may only appreciate the outward, and some the inward also. Of this there is an instance in John 12<sup>27-30</sup>, and in the account of St. Paul's conversion, Acts 22<sup>9</sup>. In these cases something objective struck upon the senses of all who were present, but the interpretation was not given to all alike; the richness of the meaning varied with the subjective power of apprehension in the hearer or listener. A similar spiritual sense was required to see the Risen Lord; it was only by the eyes of faith and love that He could be seen (John 14<sup>22,23</sup>, Acts 10<sup>41</sup>). The Baptist in his testimony repeats the words heard at the Baptism, John 1<sup>34</sup>, *καὶ γὰρ ἑώρακα, καὶ μεμαρτύρηκα ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*, in which passage there is a Western substitution *ὁ ἐκλεκτός* for *ὁ υἱός*, bringing the words into nearer accordance with St. Luke's text at the Transfiguration.

3. If the Conception introduces the Lord's human life, and the Baptism His official life, the Transfiguration may in some sense be said to introduce the Passion; at any rate it stands at the head of the second portion of His ministry, and occurs at a point where the Lord's death, as it was, is clearly foreseen and foretold, Luke 9<sup>22</sup>, Matt. 16<sup>21</sup>. "From that time forth began Jesus (Christ) to shew unto his disciples, how that he must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and be raised again the third day." The very full and careful words and the fulness of the name of the Lord (as given in some texts) which St. Matthew has employed, shew

the importance which he attributes to the commencement of this section of his Gospel.

St. Luke's account specially appears to bring the Transfiguration into connection with the prospect of the actual end of His ministry now opening up before the Lord; in Luke 9<sup>30, 31</sup> occur the words *καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄνδρες δύο συνελάλουν αὐτῷ, οἵτινες ἦσαν Μωυσῆς καὶ Ἡλείας, οἳ ὀφθέντες ἐν δόξῃ ἔλεγον τὴν ἔξοδον αὐτοῦ ἣν ἤμελλεν πληροῦν ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ.* We notice the particularity of the words ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ; and the unusual word ἔξοδος, applicable alike to death or 'translation,' seems to mark a connection and a contrast between the manner in which the Lord left this sinful world—the exit accomplished at Jerusalem—and the different kind of exit that would have carried Him from a sinless world to heaven. It has already (p. 41) been suggested that the coming of Christ into the world was not because of the fall of man, but in spite of it. Had Christ come into a sinless world, we cannot know now what would have been the manner of His departure from it. As things are, of course through all His life in all its features, from the beginning through its progress to the end, all has been conditioned by the existence and presence of sin. But the record of the Transfiguration seems to suggest to us something of the glorious exit that might, in the absence of sin, have carried the Incarnate Son of God as the Head, and in that case not also the Redeemer of Mankind, from among 'unfallen' men, from 'here' to 'there.' And, be it observed, this talk of His exit, as now He was to fulfil (πληροῦν) it in the bitter agony of the end as it actually occurred in Jerusalem, took place with the two great men representative respectively of



the Law and the Prophets, whose death or departure from this world had been so mysterious and unlike the usual lot of mankind (Deut. 34<sup>1-6</sup>, 2 Kings 2<sup>9-12</sup>).

At the opening of this section of the gospel history it is interesting to read side by side, relating to the same period, Matt. 16<sup>16</sup> and Luke 9<sup>22</sup>, *σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος*<sup>1</sup> and *δεῖ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πολλὰ παθεῖν*, and to note that St. Peter's great confession of the Son of God is followed by the Lord's announcement in detail of the Passion of the Son of Man. Then comes the Transfiguration, in which, corresponding to the *πολλὰ παθεῖν*, it is this "decease which he should accomplish at Jerusalem," that was the theme of the conversation with Moses and Elijah; and again the Lord receives, and the disciples hear as addressed to themselves,<sup>2</sup> the Father's testimony and the repetition of His good pleasure, Matt. 17<sup>5</sup>, *ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα*, cf. Matt. 3<sup>17</sup>. Thus the voice from heaven confirms St. Peter's confession, and while St. Peter (*if*, that is, he wrote 2 Pet.) repeats his sense of the importance of the occasion as described in 2 Pet. 1<sup>17-18</sup>, where we note the word *ἐξόδος* in verse 15, perhaps a reminiscence of the word used at the Transfiguration, the Lord Himself also hears again the same words as to His Divine Sonship, which had been already used at the Baptism.

Similar words, as we have already seen (p. 15), are applied to the Resurrection, Acts 13<sup>38</sup>, Heb. 1<sup>6</sup>, (cf. Col. 1<sup>18</sup>, Rev. 1<sup>5</sup>). Though in this case there is no voice from heaven to proclaim the phrase, there is added the even more particular detail, "This day have I begotten thee," which words, as has been mentioned,

<sup>1</sup> See App. J.

<sup>2</sup> In Matt., Mark, Luke and 2 Pet. the text is *οὗτός ἐστιν*.

form a part of the Western text in St. Luke's account of the Baptism of the Lord. The Lord's resurrection life, the still continuing and eternal life of His glorified humanity, is also identified at the outset with these words declaring His Divine Sonship.

Thus, then, the Lord's human life at the opening of four great stages is marked by the proclamation that He is the Son of God, and even those who consider that the title on these, as on other occasions, primarily refers to the Lord as Incarnate and not as Eternal Son, are not in any way required by the maintenance of this view to exclude a further reference to the Eternal Sonship in these passages.

It is not perhaps for us to inquire how far this proclamation was made in each case for those who heard or understood it, and how far for the Lord Himself. Certainly at the Baptism, the words spoken as given by St. Mark and St. Luke are in the second person, *σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς μου*. In both accounts of the Temptation, St. Matthew's and St. Luke's, the first words of the tempter are *εἶ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ*, and it has been thought that the first temptation in part consisted in the suggestion to the Lord to test His powers as the Son of God, and to see whether that title really carried with it all that it surely on earth must imply. "When<sup>1</sup> He reflected He could hardly help asking Himself whether this light which had shone upon Him—this voice from Heaven—were the resuscitation of His Diviner Life or only something in His own eyes and ears. A sure test lay ready: when He had heard Himself hailed as the Son of God, a conviction had

<sup>1</sup> Latham, 'Pastor Pastorum,' p. 128.

arisen in Him that God would give effect to His commands. He had only to try whether this was so, and all doubts would be removed." We may without irreverence suppose that, both at the Baptism and the Transfiguration, the voice from heaven at the commencement of a new period or phase of the Lord's life and work, not only, as others heard it, gave the seal of the Divine Fatherhood to the Son's work, but also strengthened the Lord Himself and made the Son of Man to go forward bravely to a new stage of His work as the Son of God.

The case of the Conception is different; but in this connection, it is interesting to note that the first brief words of the Lord as a child which are recorded contain a reference to His Father (Luke 2<sup>49</sup>). His Sonship was already, from the beginning, the atmosphere in which He lived (*ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μου εἶναι*). The Resurrection too, is different again: for here it is plain that the *statement as we have it* of the Lord's Sonship in this connection is only for our benefit. What passed or passes between the Father and the Exalted Son, when the Son of Man ascended where He was before (John 6<sup>62</sup>), we do not know; we can only see the answer made and being made *on earth* (John 14<sup>12</sup>, Matt. 28<sup>16</sup>) to the Son's prayer, "Now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was" (John 17<sup>5</sup>).

But returning to the main point of this section, we may observe that, on these four occasions we clearly have instances in which there is given to us in a strict sense God's witness concerning His Son, *αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία τοῦ θεοῦ ὅτι μεμαρτύρηκεν περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ.*<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See App. K.

It would be beyond the scope of this paper to deal with every passage in the N.T. where the title 'The Son of God' is found, but a few characteristic ones should be noted. In the Gospels, after the emphatic and critical use by John the Baptist, John 1<sup>34</sup>, it is used several times in confessions to the Lord, John 1<sup>49</sup>, Nathaniel's confession; Matt. 14<sup>33</sup> (*ἀληθῶς θεοῦ υἱὸς εἶ*), when St. Peter had walked with the Lord on the water and those in the boat used the words; Matt. 16<sup>46</sup>, St. Peter's great confession:<sup>1</sup> in John 6<sup>69</sup>, which refers to a different occasion, the correct text does not include the word *υἱός*; in John 11<sup>27</sup> we have the words of Martha. Such confessions as these in fact, though not in actual expression, culminate in the words of St. Thomas, John 20<sup>28</sup>, *ὁ κύριός μου καὶ ὁ θεός μου*. The truth grasped in that form satisfied every Messianic aspiration, and in its glorious light the Incarnation has satisfied every need of man. The conclusion of St. John's Gospel (John 20<sup>31</sup>)—for such apparently in fact it once was, and it is so still in idea—shews us very plainly the necessary and paramount importance in his eyes of the truth *Ἰησοῦς ἐστὶν ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*. His whole Gospel had been written and its material selected that his readers might believe and have life in His name thus given.

Turning<sup>2</sup> to those outside the circle of the disciples, it is not easy to make much that is clear of the words of the demoniacs, Mark 3<sup>11</sup>, *Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*, Mark 5<sup>7</sup>, *τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ υἱὲ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου*, Luke 4<sup>41</sup>, *Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*: for it is difficult

<sup>1</sup> See App. J.

<sup>2</sup> In these paragraphs frequent reference is made to Hastings'

Dictionary of the Bible, s.v. 'Son of God.'

to gather the exact force of the words as so used. If we take it that the devils—as apart from the possessed men—were speaking, we know too little of the nature of this mysterious possession to argue much from words used in such circumstances. We may perhaps find in them some supernatural testimony to the Lord's Sonship, and hear in them a voice from another world speaking to His nature and in His honour. Or indeed we may suppose that the evil spirits tried to oppose the Lord's intention by making a premature and ill-timed declaration of His true nature and work (Mark 3<sup>11, 12</sup>): for in Luke 4<sup>41</sup> we read ἤδεισαν τὸν χριστὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι. On the other hand, if the words were used according to the apprehension of the human beings who were possessed, such persons can only have uttered the popular belief of the times, and meant by 'Son of God' what the ordinary peasant of Galilee would have meant at the time. "Looked at psychologically, the confessions of the demoniacs could not mean more than that they believed themselves to be in the presence of the expected Messiah." As to the words of the centurion at the Cross they are variously given, but even accepting the text according to which he spoke of the Lord as υἱὸς θεοῦ (without articles), we cannot look to him, whatever his nationality, for instruction on the theological aspect of the question, however valuable his testimony may be as to the impression that the events enacted on Calvary made on his mind and presumably the minds of others at the time.

Passing beyond the Gospels, we find that St. Paul is no sooner converted, than he preaches Jesus in the synagogues that He is the Son of God, Acts 9<sup>20</sup>

(cf. Rom. 1<sup>9</sup>, 2 Cor. 1<sup>19</sup>); the tempting illustration of Apostolic custom in the story of St. Philip and the eunuch (Acts 8<sup>37</sup>) rests on an interpolation in the text. Passages might be quoted from the Epistles dealing with the recognition (Eph. 4<sup>13</sup>) or application (Gal. 2<sup>20</sup>, Rom. 8<sup>29, 32</sup> etc.) of the doctrine; while such passages as Rom. 8<sup>3</sup>, *ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ υἱὸν πέμψας*, or Rom. 8<sup>32</sup>, *ὅς γε τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ οὐκ ἐφείσατο*, or the contrast between Moses and Christ in Heb. 3<sup>5, 6</sup>, mark the unique character of His Sonship.<sup>1</sup>

Of special interest are the places where the Lord employs such language of Himself. And here we must note in such words of our Lord's the various forms of the title expressed or implied, or, as some would say, the various stages of the use of the title. It is said 'to be contrary to the Jewish usage' to speak of God as the Father, without some qualification like 'which is in heaven'; but this is done by our Lord, who, though in some cases He conforms to the Jewish practice (e.g. Matt. 10<sup>32</sup>, 16<sup>17</sup>), yet in the Gospels as we have them frequently departs from it. Dr. Sanday thus expresses the case: "We observe in our Lord's use of the titles 'Father' and 'Son' in connection with Himself an ascending scale. First, there are the places where He speaks of God as 'His heavenly Father,' or 'Father in Heaven,' after ordinary Jewish usage. Then there are the places where He speaks of God as 'My Father' without addition, which are too numerous to need specification. Then we come to a smaller number of passages in which 'the Son' and 'the Father' are at once opposed and associated. And lastly, there are the

<sup>1</sup> See App. L.

cases in which mention is made of 'the Father' and 'the Son,' where the correlation is not expressed but implied." The passages where the Lord actually uses the words 'Son of God' are rare.

From the Lord's own words we may quote Matt. 11<sup>27</sup>, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐπιγινώσκει τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ, οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα τις ἐπιγινώσκει, εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ ὃ ἂν βούληται ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψαι;<sup>1</sup> see Luke 10<sup>22</sup>. Here we have ὁ πατήρ and ὁ υἱὸς clearly used, and we notice the use of μοι, μου with υἱός. So Mark 13<sup>32</sup> (and Matt. 24<sup>36</sup> correct text), περὶ δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ἢ τῆς ὥρας οὐδεὶς οἶδεν, οὐδὲ οἱ ἄγγελοι ἐν οὐρανῷ οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός, εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ. In the climax of this passage we see that a higher position is assigned to the Son than to the Angels, and Son is again clearly contrasted with Father.<sup>2</sup>

The passages in St. John carry us farthest, though John 9<sup>35</sup>, with its clear identification in A.V. of Jesus with the Son of God, must be omitted: for ἀνθρώπου is the reading of **NBD**. John 5<sup>17-30</sup> gives perhaps the fullest exposition of the relation between the Son and the Father; we have already had verse 18 before us. The passage is written mostly in the third person concerning the Son, but verses 17, 24, 30 are in the first person; the titles ὁ πατήρ and ὁ υἱός are each used eight times, ὁ πέμψας is used three times, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ once, υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου once. The marked preponderance of the use of the absolute names tends

<sup>1</sup> Harnack on this passage ('What is Christianity' p 128) says 'The consciousness which he possessed of being *the Son of God* is, therefore, nothing but the practical consequence of knowing God as the Father and as his Father. Rightly understood, the name of Son means nothing but the knowledge of God.' See App. M.

<sup>2</sup> See App. N.

to show that it is the absolute relation of Father and Son which is under consideration,<sup>1</sup> and the unity of their Being; at the same time the use of the term *ὁ πέμψας (αὐτόν, με)* shows that the "Son is regarded as Incarnate." In this section we have ideas placed before us either the same or closely akin to some already discussed. We have the unity of the love (*φιλεῖ* v. 20), the unity and identity of life (v. 26), the equality with the Father (v. 18); we have the Father showing Himself in action, and the Son seeing (vv. 19—20), and the consequent correspondence of the Son's action, "not in imitation but in virtue of His sameness of nature" (*ὁμοίως*); verse 19 does not express any impotence on the part of the Son, but simply the 'law' of His working corresponding to the 'law' of His Being. This law of His Being is fully and clearly given in v. 26. The Father hath life in Himself, and the Son's life is received from the Father (*τῷ υἱῷ ἔδωκε*). But the life that is given is not different in its completeness from the Father's life, for *τῷ υἱῷ ἔδωκε ζωὴν ἔχειν ἐν ἑαυτῷ*; the life is coordinate with the Father's in character, though subordinate in origination; the Son, no less than the Father, is a producer of life, a source of life both natural and spiritual. His life is not given to Him in such a way that it can be taken away or be separable from Him; He too can communicate life, *καὶ ὁ υἱὸς οὗς θέλει ζωοποιεῖ* (cf. John 6<sup>40</sup>, 8<sup>51</sup>, 17<sup>2</sup>). We have here, expressed in the simplest way, the equality of nature and the subordination of Person, cf. John 14<sup>28</sup>, *ὁ πατὴρ μείζων μου ἐστίν*.<sup>2</sup> This quickening power of the Son must be thought of in connection with what is said of

<sup>1</sup> See Westcott, 'Gospel of St. John,' pp. 85, 86 and 216.

<sup>2</sup> See App. O.



the Logos as to life, John 1<sup>4</sup>, ὁ γέγονεν ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν, where, if this punctuation is correct, we have all things represented to us as, even before their creation, being life in Him; on this however there will be more to be said in a subsequent section. The judgment which is part of the Son's prerogative, belongs to Him as *Son of Man*, because the judge must be one who is identified with the life of those whom he judges, and can enter into its conditions; but this being so, this question does not come before us now, belonging rather to the examination of the bearing of the other title.

In comparing the three phrases ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, and ὁ υἱός we may perhaps say that the first gives the full Personal title, that in the second the quality or characteristic position is rather in view than the Person, while in the third the absolute relation of the Son to the Father is rather in view than the recognition of it by man.

Other passages where the Lord used such words of Himself are John 10<sup>36</sup>, υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ εἰμί: John 11<sup>4</sup>, before the Lord set out to raise Lazarus, ἵνα δοξασθῇ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ: John 19<sup>7</sup> ὀφείλει ἀποθανεῖν, ὅτι υἱὸν θεοῦ ἑαυτὸν ἐποίησεν<sup>1</sup>: Matt. 27<sup>43</sup>, where in describing the mockery it is written εἶπεν<sup>1</sup> γὰρ ὅτι θεοῦ εἰμι υἱός: Luke 22<sup>70</sup>, where the Lord accepts the title, or at any rate does not decline it; indeed in the similar passage, Mark 14<sup>61,62</sup>, in reply to the question, Σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ; the Lord plainly replies ἐγὼ εἰμι, and then speaks of "the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power." Here

<sup>1</sup> There seems no reason here to draw any distinction between what the Lord had actually said and what His accusers said He had said.

however we must be prepared for a limitation of the meaning of the former title, coming, as it does, from the high priest's lips.<sup>1</sup> Though the Lord's answer may no doubt justly be considered to have gone further than what is necessarily involved in the question asked, the question as asked by no means need have employed the word Son in the sense which we give it, nor have alluded to what we would call the true and equal Divinity of the Son; there would, in the high priest's eyes, have been reason enough for the charge of blasphemy, which he immediately makes, without that. Indeed, it would be psychologically impossible that the high priest could have used the title in such a sense in his question, as to embrace all that in its fulness was only gradually realised by the Apostles.<sup>2</sup>

To these passages should be added the presuppositions underlying certain parables or indirect statements of the Lord. For example, the whole point of the miracle and discourse in Matt. 17<sup>24-27</sup> rests upon the distinction between *οἱ υἱοί* and *οἱ ἀλλότριοι*; and similarly the parable of the wicked husbandmen (Matt. 21<sup>33</sup>) is based upon the unique position of the Son as contrasted with the other messengers of the Lord of the vineyard. "Last of all he sent unto them his son, saying, They will reverence my son. But when the husbandmen saw the son, they said among themselves, This is the heir; come, let us kill him." A similar conception, though not in so pointed a manner, underlies such a parable as the marriage of the king's son. With this we may compare Heb. 3<sup>5, 6</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> See App. P.

<sup>2</sup> See App. Q.

Besides these passages, in which the Lord thus directly or by implication applies the term Son of God to Himself, there are one or two passages or groups of passages demanding some individual notice.

The first group is found in Heb. 1 and 2, where the work and Person of the Son are dealt with, specially by contrast with the inferior position of the Angels. Some phrases and some quotations in this section have already been before us, but the section requires notice as a whole<sup>1</sup>. In it is presented the unity of the work of the Son Preincarnate and Incarnate. Nothing is more striking in it than the unity of the Lord's Person which it shews, and all the more forcibly because it is not discussed or defined, but naturally and incidentally appears as we pass from phrase to phrase. The *ὄν* and the *φέρων* and the *ποιησάμενος*, all used side by side in the first verses, show how the Son continued without break in His Being and work as the Son of God during the period of His life upon earth; and the main verb that follows these participles deals with the position of the Lord Ascended in His human nature.<sup>2</sup> In this passage the Son is spoken of as Creator and Heir; things begin through Him, and He supports and bears all things along to their proper end; and the Incarnate Son is by us seen to bring His brethren to His Father, being uninterruptedly the Son of God. (cf. Heb. 4<sup>14</sup>, *Ἰησοῦν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ*.) Another point we have to observe is the manner in which the writer of the Epistle claims to apply to Christ words of the Old Testament, which pointed forward to Him, and could only find in Him an adequate fulfilment, developed

<sup>1</sup> See Westcott, 'Epistle to the Hebrews,' passim.

<sup>2</sup> See App. R and App. C.

from the germ of the strict meaning in which they were first used.

The quotations from the Old Testament in some cases recall the ideas expressed in the four introductory verses. Thus with *υἱῶ* we may compare v. 5; with *κληρονόμον* vv. 6 and 9; with *δι' οὗ ἐποίησεν* vv. 10, 11, 12; with *ἐκάθισεν* v. 13; with *κρείττων γενόμενος τῶν ἀγγέλων* all the following verses. Of the meaning and association of the first two quotations we have already spoken (pp. 10—16). Whatever be the meaning of *πάλι* in verse 6, the passage itself appears to deal with the second coming of the Ascended Christ, and speaks of His conquest. In v. 8 the quotation speaks of the abiding royal glory of the Son “who exercises a moral and eternal Sovereignty”; ‘God is thy throne’ is to be preferred in translating; the strength of the quotation does not lie in a vocative ‘O God.’ The Incarnate Son now Exalted has won for ever the joy of the royal position that His God bestows upon Him. In verses 10, 11, 12 the idea of v. 2 *δι' οὗ καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς αἰῶνας* is developed; the words applied to Jehovah are connected with Christ, because He through whom God finally and fully intervened in His people’s troubles, must Himself be the Lord’s Representative, One with God. Once again in v. 13, a quotation from a Psalm successively suggesting ‘The King, The Priest, The Conqueror,’ we have the Exaltation of the Son after the completion of His work on earth; He waits to gather the fruits of His conquest already won. With this last passage we may also compare Matt. 28<sup>18, 19</sup> and 1 Cor. 15<sup>25-28</sup>. The passage following in ch. 2 speaks of Christ’s fellowship with fallen man, and shows how, as the Son of Man, the

representative Man, He has, through suffering, potentially, fulfilled man's original high calling. The quotations occurring in the passage establish His brotherhood with men, showing God as the common Father, the source of confidence and the protector of those who surrender themselves to Him; and Christ as sharing with men the record, the example, the power of "the joy that was set before him." In Christ, the race has already reached its goal. Man's destiny, in spite of his present state, has in Christ been consummated. "But now we see not yet all things subjected to him. But we behold him who hath been made a little lower than the angels, even Jesus, because of the suffering of death crowned with glory and honour." This aspect of the question, however, belongs rather to the discussion of the title the Son of Man. But before leaving this group of passages in the Epistle to the Hebrews, we must again emphasize the clearness with which it brings before us the unity of the Person of the Lord. While "we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and man," we have to bear in mind that He is "not two, but one Christ." The Son of God as Preincarnate, as Incarnate, as Incarnate in suffering, as Exalted—all these aspects of His Being are placed before us in these two chapters, and we are able to distinguish between that which He has done or is in one capacity, and that which He has done or is in another. But there are no sharp lines of distinction drawn in this Epistle, in its exhibition of the phases of the work of the Son; all belongs to the One Person, Jesus the Son of God, though not of course in the sense that there is any confusion of His natures; of these

there is "a co-operation often, an association always, but never any mutual participation."<sup>1</sup>

In this connection we may ask the question, whether any change has come to the Divine nature of the Son of God by His becoming Son of Man. To this we can best reply in the touching words of Hooker,<sup>2</sup> "This admirable union of God with man can enforce in that higher nature no alteration, because unto God there is nothing more natural than not to be subject to any change. Neither is it a thing impossible that the Word being made flesh should be that which it was not before as touching the manner of subsistence, and yet continue in all qualities or properties of nature the same it was, because the incarnation of the Son of God consisteth merely in the union of natures, which union doth add perfection to the weaker, to the nobler no alteration at all. If therefore it be demanded what the person of the Son of God hath attained by assuming manhood, surely, the whole sum of all is this, to be as we are truly, really, and naturally man, by means whereof he is made capable of meaner offices than otherwise his person could have admitted, the only gain he thereby purchased for himself was to be capable of loss and detriment for the good of others."

The consideration of the effect which His Divine nature has had upon His human nature by its 'conjunction' with it, is also more closely related to the investigation of the title Son of Man than Son of God; but we may so far continue the quotation from Hooker as to add the closely following words: "If we respect but that which is common unto us with

<sup>1</sup> Hooker, 'Ecclesiastical Polity,' V. liiii, 3. 5.

<sup>2</sup> Hooker, 'Ecclesiastical Polity,' V. liv, 4.

him, the glory provided for him and his in the kingdom of heaven, his right and title thereunto even in that he is man differeth from other men's, because he is that man of whom God is himself a part. We have right to the same inheritance with Christ, but not the same right which he hath, his being such as we cannot reach, and ours such as he cannot stoop unto. Furthermore, to be the Way, the Truth and the Life; to be the Wisdom, Righteousness, Sanctification, Resurrection; to be the Peace of the whole world, the hope of the righteous, the Heir of all things; to be that supreme head whereunto all power both in heaven and in earth is given: these are not honours common unto Christ with other men, they are titles above the dignity and worth of any which were but a mere man, and yet true of Christ even in that he is man, but man with whom Deity is personally joined, and unto whom it hath added those excellences which make him more than worthy thereof. Finally, sith God hath deified our nature, though not by turning it into himself, yet by making it his own inseparable habitation, we cannot now conceive how God should without man, either exercise divine power, or receive the glory of divine praise. For man is in both an associate of Deity.<sup>1</sup>

The group of passages<sup>2</sup> 1 Cor. 8<sup>6</sup>, εἰς κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα; Col. 1<sup>16, 17</sup>, ἐν αὐτῷ ἔκτισθη τὰ πάντα...τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἔκτισται...καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν; Heb. 1<sup>2</sup>, δι' οὗ καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς αἰῶνας<sup>3</sup>; John 1<sup>3</sup>, πάντα δι'

<sup>1</sup> What Hooker calls *the grace of unction* was dealt with in the companion essay.

<sup>2</sup> See Bishops Westcott and Lightfoot *ad loc.* on these quotations.

<sup>3</sup> *The cycles of universal life.*

αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν (no matter how the next clause is punctuated); John 1<sup>10</sup>, ὁ κόσμος δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο (not Eph. 3<sup>9</sup> in the correct text) attributes the agency in creation to the Second Person in the Trinity<sup>1</sup>. In Heb. 1<sup>2</sup> the relative refers to υἱός (but see App. R); in Col. 1<sup>16</sup> the reference is back to ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀγάπης (but see App. C); in 1 Cor. 8<sup>6</sup> the reference is to Ἰησοῦς Χριστός; in John 1<sup>3</sup> to ὁ λόγος; in John 1<sup>10</sup> directly to φῶς, or rather if αὐτοῦ, like the αὐτόν of the next clause, is masculine, to the Person who is τὸ φῶς. Thus the work in creation is attached to the Son under various names, though in 1 Cor. 8<sup>6</sup> it is plain that the work cannot be attached to Him in the aspect under which He is named, and some would say the same of υἱός. The various prepositions employed present various aspects of the Son's work and relation to creation. It will be observed that the usual preposition is διά, but ἐν is found, together with διά, in Col. 1<sup>16</sup>, and there εἰς is also employed; ἐξ belongs to God the Father. The verb κτίζειν looks to the orderly design of the Creator, the word γίνομαι is rather taken from the side of the created.

Some of these passages in other connections have already come before us, but, quoted from a representative group of New Testament writers, they clearly indicate the Apostolic belief as to the particular relation to creation of Him whom we know as the Son of God. Though the origination of all things is from God the Father alone, 1 Cor. 8<sup>6</sup>, εἰς θεὸς ὁ πατήρ, ἐξ οὗ τὰ

<sup>1</sup> Psalm 33<sup>6</sup> (יְהוָה בְּדָבָר) and Heb. 11<sup>3</sup> (ῥήματι θεοῦ) are not applicable here; they rather refer to the repeated אֱלֹהִים יְהוָה of the account of the creation in P.



πάντα, the Father and the Son alike are represented as the goal of all things. Of the Father it is said, 1 Cor. 8<sup>6</sup>, ἡμεῖς (after τὰ πάντα) εἰς αὐτόν; of the Son, Col. 1<sup>16</sup>, τὰ πάντα...εἰς αὐτὸν ἔκτισται: this however is of course subject to the ἵνα ἧ ὁ θεὸς πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν of 1 Cor. 15<sup>28</sup>, to be considered in the next section. τὰ πάντα as a whole must be brought back to the Word, the Son; and through Him to the Father. The Son, as in recreation and reconciliation, so in creation is He through whom the Father works; He is the μεσίτης, He δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο. It is thought that this use of the preposition διὰ may have been derived from Judaic philosophy; but with the Apostles it must have more than an instrumental force<sup>1</sup>; they give it rather a mediatorial meaning. When the Son acts, the Father acts with Him and in Him; cf. Heb. 2<sup>10</sup> above, where διὰ is apparently used of the Father Himself, and also John 5<sup>17</sup>. The Son, so far from being a mere instrument coming between God and the creation, is rather the Person who, by His union with God, makes the medium or channel through which God reaches to the creation: for God is in Him. The preposition ἐν is also used of the Son's work in creation, Col. 1<sup>16, 17</sup>, ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα...ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν, with which we may compare John 1<sup>4</sup>, ὃ γέγονεν ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν. The Eternal Son<sup>2</sup> is the centre, the point of cohesion of the universe: He has not made it and then let it go, but it still abides in Him and rests on Him; it cannot

<sup>1</sup> "The Eternal Son is 'the beginning of the creation of God' (Rev. 3<sup>14</sup>), not as being the first thing created, but as being the deep principle by which any creation becomes possible. 'By Him all things were made.' His everlasting birth is the first step towards creation." Dr. Mason 'The Faith of the Gospel,' p. 63.

<sup>2</sup> But see App. C.

go beyond Him; in Him is included all its life. We may summarise the whole in the words "All the laws and purposes which guide the creation and government of the Universe reside in Him, the Eternal Word, as their meeting-point. The Apostolic doctrine of the Logos teaches us to regard the Eternal Word as holding the same relation to the Universe which the Incarnate Christ holds to the Church. He is the source of its life, the centre of all its developments, the mainspring of all its motions.... All things must find their meeting-point, their reconciliation, at length in Him from whom they took their rise—in the Word as the mediatorial agent, and through the Word in the Father as the primary source.... The Eternal Word is the goal of the Universe, as He was the starting-point. It must end in unity: and the centre of this unity is Christ. This expression has no parallel, and could have none, in the Alexandrian phraseology and doctrine.<sup>1</sup>"

The next group of passages to be considered should be one in which the Son is in a similar manner shewn to be the medium, through whom God acts in His work of recreation and reconciliation. Such a group would contain Luke 19<sup>10</sup>, Acts 4<sup>12</sup>, 2 Cor. 5<sup>17-19</sup>, Rom. 5<sup>10</sup>. Col. 1<sup>20</sup>, Heb. 10<sup>4-22</sup>, John 3<sup>16</sup>, John 20<sup>31</sup>, but very many more passages as well; indeed this aspect of the Son's work covers the range of the Gospel message. Only those parts of our Lord's work which deal<sup>2</sup> with the consummation of mankind and not their redemption, could be properly excluded; and owing to the presence of sin in the world, the redemption of men and their consummation are now very closely connected. Even

<sup>1</sup> Lightfoot, 'Epistle to the Colossians,' pp. 150, 155.   <sup>2</sup> See App. F.

the passages which deal with the consummation of all things in Christ, now to a great extent belong to this section of His work: for Gen. 3<sup>17, 18</sup>, Rom. 8<sup>19-22</sup>, shew that the effects of the fall of man have reached to the world in which he lives. In such passages as Is. 35<sup>1, 2</sup>, 66<sup>32</sup>, Rev. 21<sup>1</sup>, in more or less pictorial language the aspect of nature is shewn in sympathy with man's position; and as things are, man's change of heart and his return to God comes before the goal of creation is to be reached, Acts 3<sup>19-21</sup> (cf. the *ἰδοὺ καινὰ ποιῶ πάντα* of Rev. 21<sup>5</sup> bound up with the fate of God's peoples). Thus in the hymn of Fortunatus the effect of Christ's death is extended to all creation:

Mite corpus perforatur,  
Sanguis, unda profluit;  
Terra, pontus, astra, mundus  
Quo lavantur flumine.

The fact that redemption and the remission of sins are accomplished by the Incarnation, Death, Resurrection, and Ascension of our Lord Jesus Christ, who was and is at once God and Man, so completely underlies the New Testament that there is no need to elaborate the matter here. If reconciliation and restoration were to be made possible for fallen man, it could only be by the love of God, and the Incarnation, accompanied by the Passion and Resurrection, is the expression of that love. We can ourselves see, at any rate 'in part,' the fitness of the plan, that the union between God and Man should be effected by One who combines the nature of both in His one Person, nor can we now devise any other way of bringing the Finite and Infinite, God and man together; and looking more particularly to the work of

the perfecting of humanity discussed in App. F, it is not difficult to see how it properly belongs to One who is at once the Son of God as well as the Son of Man. And into the sin-bearing aspect of the actual Incarnation we can also 'in part' enter. *How* exactly Christ's death avails with the Father it is probably beyond our minds to understand; but the fact of forgiveness we can accept with grateful faith, the fact that, as Christ has taken to Himself our human nature, the virtue of His life and death reaches all those, who, in St. Paul's language, are 'in Christ;' that by no fiction, by no artificial process, but by the simple channels of life, Christ's work avails for those who are united to Him; that, as the vine supports the branches, so the healing, quickening power of Christ's life flows in those who are members of His Body. On the one hand, it is because He is Man that all men can have part in Him and His work, but on the other hand we must not forget that He who effected this reconciliation was the Son of God, and that He did it as such, Rom. 5<sup>10</sup>, *κατηλλάγημεν τῷ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ*, Rom. 8<sup>32</sup>, *ὅς γε τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ οὐκ ἐφείσατο, ἀλλὰ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πάντων παρέδωκεν αὐτόν*, Gal. 2<sup>20</sup>, *ἐν πίστει ζῶ τῇ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντός με καὶ παραδόντος ἑαυτόν ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ*, 1 John 1<sup>7</sup>, *τὸ αἷμα Ἰησοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ καθαρίζει ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἁμαρτίας*. If He had not also been the Son of God, as well as Man, we should not through Him have been *θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως*, nor could such words as Heb. 7<sup>23-28</sup>, Heb. 10<sup>10-22</sup>, Matt. 28<sup>20</sup>, John 17<sup>20-25</sup>, have been fulfilled to us.

We need not here attempt to enumerate the passages where the work of reconciliation and perfecting is expressly assigned to the Son of God *eo nomine*:

for as the truth is presupposed in the whole New Testament, there is no occasion to restrict the reference to the places where He is so named in exact words, as indeed He is in some of the passages already mentioned in this section. Sometimes in reference to the Lord's Person and work, as we have seen, the human nature and the Divine nature are placed side by side in a comprehensive title, for example 1 Cor. 1<sup>9</sup>, τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Heb. 4<sup>14</sup>, Ἰησοῦν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, John 20<sup>31</sup>, Ἰησοῦς ἐστὶν ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ.

The passage 1 Cor. 15<sup>24-28</sup>, εἶτα τὸ τέλος, ὅταν παραδιδῶ τὴν βασιλείαν τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ.....δεῖ γὰρ αὐτὸν βασιλεύειν ἄχρι οὗ θῆ πάντας τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ.....ὅταν δὲ ὑποταγῇ αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα, τότε [καὶ] αὐτὸς ὁ υἱὸς ὑποταγήσεται τῷ ὑποτάξαντι αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα, ἵνα ἡ ὁ θεὸς πάντα ἐν πάσιν, is one of difficulty. This much, however, we may safely say, that it is plainly dealing not with the absolute, but with the economic relations of the Trinity: for it comes in an eschatological passage concerning death and the final victory over death, and is a part of St. Paul's great argument addressed to men for their comfort and edification on the resurrection of the dead. The question has been raised, in what capacity does Christ receive the kingdom enjoyed up to His final victory, and then Himself become subject to the Father. Does He receive it as God or Man? But in this connection we must remember<sup>1</sup> that "there is no necessity that all things spoken of Christ should agree unto Him either as God or else as Man; but some things as He is the consubstantial Word of God,

<sup>1</sup> Hooker, 'Ecclesiastical Polity,' VIII. iv, 6.

some things as He is that Word incarnate." To Him in the latter capacity belongs the right to this kingdom. It is necessarily true that this subjection cannot in any way affect His Divine immutable nature as the Son of God, even if it may relate to that subordination of Person of which we have already had occasion to speak.<sup>1</sup> Christ in this passage has been compared<sup>2</sup> to a general on a campaign, who has received his commission with full powers to subdue his king's enemies, and then, when the war has been brought to a successful issue, resigns his power and rejoins the ranks of ordinary citizens. His kingdom has been considered to consist in the Headship of the Church Militant, so that that office lapses when there is no longer any Church Militant to lead. It is, however, true that though, like such a general, the Incarnate Son of God may resign His command, yet He is no mere general, but the King's own Son, who on resigning the office still keeps the higher position of the King's Son and Heir, which is His by right, independently of any office to be discharged in the subjugation of the King's enemies. Viewed in this way, Christ's claim to the kingly position partly passes away as far as it was economic, and partly lasts for ever. Whatever the passage means, it certainly cannot imply any degradation of the Son of God, nor indeed any voluntary making way for the Father on the part of the Son; that is to say, probably it would be a mistake to speak as if the Son unnecessarily and out of abundance of humility went out of His way to subject Himself to the Father, if one may reverently use such

<sup>1</sup> See App. O.

VIII. iv, 6; Pearson 'Exposition

<sup>2</sup> Hooker, 'Ecclesiastical Polity,' of the Creed,' II. iv.

familiar words. Such a thought, however proper in dealings between man and God, has no place in the Blessed Trinity, and the very difficulty of expressing it in reverent language shews how foreign it is to the subject. And of course we must not speak, under any circumstances, as if any rivalry of any kind were possible between the Father and the Son; they are ever united in Being and united in love. St. John (Rev. 11<sup>15</sup>) speaks of the voices saying "The kingdom of the world is become the kingdom of our Lord, and of his Christ: and he shall reign for ever and ever." These words simply pass by any question whether it is the Father or the Son who is to reign for ever and ever; *καὶ βασιλεύσει* runs on without a pronoun expressed (cf. Rev. 20<sup>6</sup>). The words of St. Paul speak of an act in God's great scheme. The full meaning is beyond the horizon of our apprehension; "we must leave it where St. Paul leaves it," fixing our minds on the grand *ἵνα ἡ ὁ θεὸς πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν*, the great goal of all, with which we may compare the *εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πατρὸς*, which in Phil. 2<sup>11</sup> is set forth as the goal of the Exaltation of our Lord.

The last group of passages to be considered is found in the first Epistle of St. John, and comprises more than twenty examples of the use of *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ* or its equivalent; this exact phrase, we find, is used seven times, and fourteen times we have *ὁ υἱός* used in connection with either *ὁ πατήρ* or *ὁ θεός*, once with *ὁ ἀληθινός*, while once to *ὁ υἱός* is added *ὁ μονογενής*.

The first Epistle of St. John<sup>1</sup> is written in the fulness of the Christian life by the aged teacher who

<sup>1</sup> See Westcott, 'Epistles of St. John,' *passim*.

speaks with supreme authority. He does not write to give information, or to argue, or to introduce fresh facts or thoughts. Rather his object is to place the Person of the Lord before his readers and to shew that the contemplation of Him as He is, or rather as He has been known to His disciples, is the one necessity of the Christian life; that from this flows Christian truth and Christian practice, the answer to false thoughts and false ways; that Christian life with its truth and fellowship centre in Him; that eternal life is in Him. The first verses of the first chapter, and the last verses of the last, make this very plain. The result of this is that, as in St. John's Gospel, so in his Epistle, such words as Life, Believe, Confess, Witness, figure largely. Indeed we may group the passages about the Son round them.

In the end of the fifth chapter the theme is Life, and we are reminded again of the truths concerning the life-giving power of the Son which we have found in the fifth chapter of the Gospel. "And the witness is this, that God gave unto us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath the life; he that hath not the Son of God hath not the life. These things have I written unto you, that ye may know that ye have eternal life, even unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God.....And we know (*οἶδαμεν*) that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we know him that is true (*ἵνα γινώσκωμεν τὸν ἀληθινόν*), and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal life." Eternal life is in the Son, the Incarnate Son of God, a growing knowledge (*γινώσκωμεν*) of the Father as He has revealed Him; in fellowship through Him with the Father, a fellowship



in which we are united; not God, but God in Christ (the *ἦκει* is to be noted and the double title 'Jesus Christ' in 5<sup>20</sup>, cf. John 20<sup>31</sup>) is for us the source and aim of eternal life. The last verse recalls the other description of eternal life given in the Lord's high priestly prayer, John 17<sup>3</sup>; and the words *ὁ ἀληθινὸς θεὸς καὶ ζωὴ* recall the *θεῶ ζῶντι καὶ ἀληθινῶ* of 1 Thess. 1<sup>9</sup>. And again in 4<sup>9</sup> we have our life connected with the mission (*ἀπέσταλκεν*) of the only begotten Son into the world; and this passage makes it plain that it is through the Incarnate Son that we receive the life, though the life springs from the Son of God (cf. again John 5<sup>26, 31</sup>).

With the eternal life is bound up the idea of Fellowship in 5<sup>20</sup> just quoted, as similarly in 2<sup>24</sup>, "If that which ye heard from the beginning abide in you, ye also shall abide in the Son, and in the Father." "The Gospel is a quickening spirit, and the presence of the divine life carries with it of necessity the possession of divine fellowship." This fellowship in its character and extent is described in 1<sup>3</sup>. "That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you also, that ye also may have fellowship with us: yea, and our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ." For the association of the idea of union and unity with the knowledge of the Son of God in 5<sup>20</sup>, we may compare Eph. 4<sup>13</sup>, *μέχρι καταστήσωμεν οἱ πάντες εἰς τὴν ἐνότητα τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, εἰς ἄνδρα (sing.) τέλειον.*

Already the Confession of Jesus as the Son of God leads to this fellowship, 4<sup>15</sup>, "Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God abideth in him, and he in God," and 2<sup>23</sup>, "Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father: he that confesseth the Son

hath the Father also." The very spirit of the anti-christ is shewn in the denial of the Father and the Son, 2<sup>22</sup>.

And this confession is based on the Witness of God and the 'experimental' witness of the believer himself, 5<sup>9-11</sup>, "If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater: for the witness of God is this, that he hath borne witness concerning his Son. He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in him: he that believeth not God hath made him a liar; because he hath not believed in the witness that God hath borne concerning his Son. And the witness is this, that God gave unto us eternal life, and this life is in his Son."

And Faith in the Son of God based on such witness, and leading to such confession, of itself on the one hand conquers the world, so far as it is still hostile to God (5<sup>4</sup>), and on the other issues in the service of love (3<sup>23</sup>, 3<sup>17, 18</sup>). But as the world and all it contains has been spoilt and warped by sin, such Life, Fellowship, Confession, Witness, Faith, do not come natural to man; sin is a barrier that must be first removed, a mist that blurs the vision; and this has been done by the Son of God who "was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil" (3<sup>8</sup>). The Son was sent that He might be a "propitiation for our sins" (4<sup>10</sup>), that we may be able to approach to God with all that was between Him and us removed. The Son was sent on an abiding mission as the Saviour of the world (4<sup>14</sup>, *ὁ πατήρ ἀπέσταλκεν (perf.) τὸν υἱὸν σωτήρα τοῦ κόσμου*), and for those who walk in the light and already enjoy the Christian fellowship there is still the provision for cleansing them from all (or every)

sin, its guilt, its power. "The blood of Jesus his Son cleanseth us from all sin" (1<sup>7</sup>).

It is beyond the range of this essay to comment on the teaching of the first Epistle of St. John; and indeed it may seem that all these last pages rather deal with the work of the Son of God than discuss His Sonship in itself. It may be so, but so far as this Epistle is concerned, the title of Son is so persistently used in it, that it seemed impossible not to carry our questioning into its chapters; and the exhibition of the Person and work of the Son of God therein contained is not really beside our point, for "the object of our knowledge is not abstract but personal"; and again, must it be repeated that if we wish to know God, the best form in which to ask the question, Who is He? is to ask, What has He done? What has He revealed Himself as doing among men, as being to them and for them? Those will know most about the Son of God, who turn, not only their minds, but their hearts to Him, who do not merely have a mental conviction about God (cf. James 2<sup>19</sup>), but starting with a living faith in Jesus the Son of God, and recognising what He has done, what He does, and who He is for them, in the fulness of mind and heart and will hold fast their confession (Heb. 4<sup>14</sup>, *ἔχοντες οὖν ἀρχιερέα μέγαν διεληλυθότα τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, Ἰησοῦν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, κρατῶμεν τῆς ὁμολογίας*). Such indeed was His own command given from heaven to the Church at Thyatira, Rev. 2<sup>18, 25</sup>, *τάδε λέγει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ... ὃ ἔχετε κρατήσατε*. In which passage, with full authority He repeats (vv. 26 and 27) to him 'that overcometh' the promises long ago addressed in Psalm 2, as we have seen, to the Son of David, the Son of God, and

already fulfilled (see John 16<sup>33</sup>, ἐγὼ νενίκηκα τὸν κόσμον, and Matt. 28<sup>18</sup>, ἐδόθη μοι πᾶσα ἐξουσία ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς); and also as in the days of His unascended human life on earth, so in glory does He here once more repeat His own relation to the Father, ὡς κἀγὼ εἶληφα παρὰ τοῦ πατρός, in words primarily to be referred to the promises of Psalm 2 (see Psalm 2<sup>7-9</sup>, also Luke 22<sup>29</sup>), but capable of a wider extension.

Not to Thyatira only, but to us too, belongs this command, ὁ ἔχετε κρατήσατε ἄχρι οὗ ἂν ἴξω: for it is still our duty too, and our privilege, δουλεύειν θεῷ ζῶντι καὶ ἀληθινῷ, καὶ ἀναμένειν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν (I Thess. 1<sup>9,10</sup>).

## APPENDIX.

A.

*Harnack's view of early Christologies.*

In Harnack's 'History of Dogma,' pp. 189—199, will be found his summary of early Christologies. He maintains that in the earliest days the conceptions current as to the Being of Christ were practically two, the Adoptian Christology and the Pneumatic Christology. "Jesus was either regarded as the man whom God hath chosen, in whom the Deity or the Spirit of God dwelt, and who, after being tested, was adopted by God and invested with dominion; or Jesus was regarded as a heavenly spiritual being (the highest after God) who took flesh and again returned to Heaven after the completion of His work on earth." A reply to this contention will be found in Dr. Swete's 'Apostles' Creed,' pp. 26—29.

B.

*Interpretation of Psalm 2.*

The interpretation of the passage in Psalm 2 given in the text is based upon the view that the Psalm was evoked by some definite historic circumstances. We must not, however, pass over the view recently maintained that it is rather a future aspiration than a present fact that underlies it. It is taken by some as the expression of the

hopes of the theocracy, which looked forward to Israel being the acknowledged representative of God in the world. It is not clear, nor indeed does it matter, on such a view how far this hope was identified with a definite Messianic figure, though in the fulfilment it is One Figure who has realised and given substance to the conception and hope thus adumbrated. The Psalm on this view is still not to be regarded as Messianic in the old fashioned way; but, unconnected with any present victory or political situation, it offers a picture of Israel's future position which only, as a matter of fact, was or is to be realised by the true Messiah, who, however, at the time was not personally apprehended by the author of the Psalm. On this view the difficulty of the words "This day have I begotten thee" is certainly less.

### C.

#### *The preexistence of the Son.*

The fact of the preexistence of the Son, which underlies much that has been written in the text, requires some separate consideration. The question to which an answer is asked is "Is it stated by the writers of the New Testament that the Son of God was, before the Incarnation, already preexistent?" To this question no one within the limits of the Catholic Church could reply in the negative. But the case is altered when the question is put in the more precise form "Is it directly stated by the writers of the New Testament that the Son of God was, before the Incarnation, already preexistent as Son, or, so far as it is directly referred to in the New Testament, does the Sonship of the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity depend primarily upon His human birth?" It is plainly possible to maintain His Personal preexistence, and yet to say that it is to be attributed to Him under another name, in another capacity,

if the word may be forgiven. Thus this view has been recently advocated, that the title 'Son' is used in the first instance of the Incarnate Son, of the Son as Incarnate; that the Eternal preexistent Sonship is rather an inference backwards from this truth; and that the main direct support of the Eternal Sonship lies in the fact that, granting His pre-existence under *some* aspect, if in His historic life the Incarnate Lord spoke of God as His Father, and of Himself as God's Son, though these titles certainly referred primarily to a relationship established by the Incarnation, yet such a relationship could not have existed in this world unless it had had behind it an eternal relationship that determined it (see p. 15 and App. O). Logos, it is maintained, is the proper title of the Second Person in the Trinity as pre-existent, Son belongs to Him primarily as Incarnate; and some of the difficulties felt in connection with the Eternal Sonship arise from carrying too sharply into pre-existent relations the associations of a term that in Scripture is, though not restricted to the Incarnate Son, yet primarily used of Him as such, in a way that shows us that special care is needed if we are not to be misled and puzzled by our own language, when we transfer the term to the absolute relations of the Trinity. Those who hold this view would not themselves deny His preexistence as Son; but they maintain that the truth is not plainly enunciated in Holy Scripture, and that wherever the Sonship appears, the Sonship of the Incarnate is alluded to. As the doctrine of the Trinity in Unity is rather derived from than strictly set down in so many words in Holy Scripture, rather underlies it than is expressly taught; so those who adopt this view would hold that the preexistence of the Eternal Son is rather aninterp retation of Scripture (whether a necessary interpretation or not we do not now ask), than an explicit statement of Scripture, that it was rather realised by the Church with the writings of the Apostles before it, than part of the original Apostolic message.



This would not of course mean that the doctrine of the Eternal Sonship was merely a subsequent development, but that in this shape either it had not explicitly presented itself to the minds of the Apostles, or at any rate it was not so defined in their writings.

Before going any further it may be permitted, so far as any question of definition is concerned, to refer to App. Q. It is not to be expected in any case, that this or many similar truths should be found in the New Testament clear cut and with the rigidity of formal creeds. If our Lord was pre-existent as the Son of God, we should rather expect to find the fact to be mentioned simply or incidentally than formally elaborated.

But there is a further point to be first considered. It has been shown in the text that of God, as He is in Himself to Himself, we are told little in the Bible (see p. 53). The Bible is the record of the manner in which God has come into the life of men, and in it we read about the Being of the Son of God from a mediatorial and not from a metaphysical point of view; we only read of what He is in connection with what He has done for us; there is little in the Bible to gratify mere speculation. The preexistence of our Lord in any capacity, as the Logos or in any other aspect of His Being, is rarely stated plainly in so many words in the New Testament; and this is true even of St. John's Gospel. As said in the text (p. 4), we find such truths as the Divinity of our Lord underlying and implied in the whole tenor of the Lord's words and life and of the Apostles' teaching about Him, but not reiterated in formal statements. Such a passage as Phil. 2<sup>6-8</sup> is rather exceptional, and even there the clear enunciation of the Lord's preexistence only comes to the surface incidentally, to emphasize a practical precept of humility. The sharp lines of philosophical definition are for the most part sought in vain in the New Testament, and we must therefore not be surprised or

disappointed if we do not find many passages in which the preexistence of the Son as Son is clearly stated, especially considering how few there are for us to isolate and to quote in order to prove, apart from their context, the preexistence of the Lord at all.

And if it is generally true that references to such truths are for the most part made incidentally and that we learn of the Being of God only as He has taken part in the life of men, so that the little we know of God, as He is absolutely, we have learnt from the record of His relations with mankind (see pp. 52, 53), especially is it the case that in regard to the Son of God the Incarnation overshadows everything else, and whether we primarily think of that aspect of the Incarnation which deals with the redemption of men, or whether we think of the consummation of humanity achieved in and by Christ, all, as we see it, is the result of the Incarnation. The Word made flesh is the point in which all centres; the Son of God comes before us as Son of Man, and it is the record of His life on earth to which our faith and hope turn, His life as He was born, lived, died, ascended; that which was beyond time has in the Incarnation come within the limits of time; the Infinite God has Personally identified Himself with our nature, He has touched our finite life, and it is to that touch, that contact that we owe all. The opening verses of the first Epistle of St. John show very plainly that it is not as the Eternal Second Person of the Blessed Trinity is in Himself, but as He has come to men in the Incarnation that He is the theme of Apostolic preaching, the life of the Christian fellowship (1 John 1<sup>1, 2, 3</sup>). "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the Word of life; (for the life was manifested, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and show unto you that eternal life, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us;)

that which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, that ye also may have fellowship with us: and truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ."

It is only natural then that the Incarnate Sonship of our Lord should dominate, since in the consideration of *His* Person there is not only the initial difficulty of knowing God apart from the part which He has taken in human life, but also we have to bear in mind that He, unlike the Father and the Holy Spirit, is truly Man Himself, and actually as Man has come into our world, and as Man has done His work for us; there is therefore a further reason why, in the record of His life and work, His Being should be chiefly spoken of not absolutely as He ever is and has been, but in the terms of His human life.

It may suit our purpose best to investigate the question of the preexistence of the Son as Son, not with a view to offer an answer to those who deny the preexistence of the Second Person in the Blessed Trinity altogether, or to those who deny the preexistence of the Son, but rather by way of examining the view that though the Son was eternally begotten, yet in the New Testament it is the Sonship of the Incarnate Son which is primarily in view wherever our Lord is directly spoken of as Son of God.

First of all we may note that it would be quite possible for this to be the case, and yet to have the preexistence of the Eternal Son, as Son, clearly indicated in some other way: for the indication of that fact need not necessarily be bound up with the particular interpretation of these three words. And indeed these words do present a particular difficulty: for apart from any precise definition of them, which, as we have seen, we are not to expect in the New Testament, it will constantly be open to question in which of the two senses they are used; indeed it may be doubted whether they could in any given passage be so clearly used of the preexistent

Sonship as wholly to exclude any possible reference to the Son as Incarnate. Our Lord as Man was undoubtedly the Son of God. It is shown in the text in what sense the title may be and is applied even to men, but in a much fuller, indeed in a special sense, even as Man the Lord was Son of God; He had no earthly Father<sup>1</sup>, and even if we confine ourselves strictly to those aspects of His Being which clearly belong to His limited historic human life, it is plain that in them God was His Father. Hence in every passage in the New Testament, subsequent to the Incarnation, where Christ is spoken of or speaks of Himself as the Son of God, we *may* restrict the title to the Sonship of the Incarnate, unless we find a case where this meaning is definitely excluded, and so far as the present writer is aware no such passage is found. But we are bound to take a larger view of the matter than this. It would be against any fair interpretation of the language of the Bible on such subjects, being as it is of the character which we have above described, to say that where two meanings are ever possible, one which is not in so many words directly excluded must always be the right one. The fact that within the limits of this world our Lord is in an unique sense God's Son, is a fact that comes within the range of human life; it may be beyond ordinary experience, but if true it is to a great extent a matter of history. The eternal generation however can by no possibility be brought within the limits of finite life; we can date the revelation of the Incarnate Son, the Eternal Sonship is timeless. Consequently when in the interpretation of the title we may apply it to our Lord either as Incarnate or Preincarnate, we can more readily recognize and apply it in the one aspect than in the other. The eternal aspect of the Sonship thus stands at an interpretational disadvantage compared with the Sonship of

<sup>1</sup> See the bearing of this further explained in App. S. p. 165.

the Lord as Incarnate. This is certainly not less the case when, in speaking of the Sonship of the Incarnate Son, we do not confine ourselves to those features of it that only belonged to our Lord's life while He was actually on earth, but include also the glorification of the Incarnate Son, and His Exaltation: for His glory, without any interpretation of it added, is itself a term capable of two meanings; it may refer to the glory which was His own before the world was, John 17<sup>5</sup>, and it may refer to the glory which was given Him when He rose and ascended in triumph, Phil. 2<sup>8-11</sup>.

We may put the matter thus. Accepting the truth of the preexistent Eternal Sonship, when we come to look for definite and absolutely certain allusions to it in the New Testament they are hard to find. For when we look back beyond the Incarnation we find that we are told little of the absolute relations in the Godhead under any aspect or name. When we look at the historic life of the Lord on earth, naturally it is the Sonship of the Incarnate Son which first presents itself to our minds. When we look beyond the Ascension and hear of the Son in His glory, we find a difficulty in distinguishing between the position assigned on His Exaltation to the Incarnate Son and the resumption (as we speak) of the original glory of the Eternal Son of God. We must however observe that, because in interpreting a passage we experience this difficulty, it in no sense follows that there is any mixture or confusion in the things themselves. There is no doubt a correspondence between the Exaltation of the Incarnate Son, and the eternal glory of the Eternal Son, answering to the unity of the Sonship as revealed on earth and preexistent in heaven; but correspondence means neither coincidence nor confusion.

It would seem then that from the phrase Son of God in itself we are, owing to the conditions of the problem, likely to gain no certain light as to its meaning of such a character as could silence every doubt; the phrase taken in isolation

lends itself too readily to either interpretation for that to be possible. If however we can find in Holy Scripture independent statements or reasonable inferences which seem to establish the Sonship as preexistent, or special allusions to Christ's Sonship which seem less appropriate, though not wholly inapplicable to Him as Incarnate, then we may use that light in interpreting the phrase Son of God, which in its turn may add a precision of meaning. And if we can maintain from the New Testament the preexistence of the Eternal Sonship on independent grounds, then we may adduce such characteristics of the uses of the actual title as seem to involve some difficulty, if the words in themselves do not refer to eternal relations. Throughout we may remember the background of passages in which, though the reference to the Sonship of the Incarnate is obviously possible and natural, yet a reference to the Sonship as an eternal relation would still afford the fuller and so far better sense. It is difficult, and rather a subjective matter, to draw a very sharp line between these passages and those in which both references, simultaneously admitted side by side, would naturally meet the requirements of the case.

It will not be necessary to repeat here what has been said in the text, and what will be said in App. D, as to the metaphorical character of the Divine Sonship, as to what that means and does not mean. If the word Son is an earthly mould to express a heavenly reality, we may none the less remember that, making the necessary deduction of the necessarily inappropriate ideas which are inseparably connected with human sonship, we may find in the Eternal Sonship of our Lord, as the Catholic Church holds it, at least as much as there is implied in any human sonship.

What has been said of Christ being the image of God tends to establish the Sonship as Eternal. In the text the correspondence is shown between the use of *εἰκῶν* and cognate words on the one hand and *λόγος* and cognate phrases

on the other; but the words certainly are connected with two different trains of ideas, and though we may insist that we cannot argue from language necessarily inadequate and tentative, as if it precisely expressed the truth with which it deals, still it is interesting to note that these two lines of expression and thought do lead back to the two aspects of Christ's relation to God which are respectively expressed by *υἱός* and the actual word *λόγος*. *λόγος* and the phrases associated with it (*e.g.* *ἐξηγήσατο*, John 1<sup>16</sup>) are most firmly established if the word *λόγος* is the expression of an eternal relationship; and that this is the case no one would deny who is prepared to accept the preexistence of our Lord at all. Similarly the idea of resemblance and reproduction, clearly marked as eternal by the phrase *εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ*, Col. 1<sup>15</sup>, reaches its fullest scope in the word *υἱός* used with an eternal reference.

Then all the train of thought connected with the love of God (p. 58) leads up to Christ's Eternal Sonship. In the text it is pointed out that it is easier for us to apprehend the eternal relation of the First and Second Person of the Blessed Trinity from the point of view of love than from any other; this point of view clearly leads up to the thought of Father and Son, much more than to the conception of God and Word. Indeed from this consideration alone one might be prepared to accept the preexistence of the Son. If the Sonship were considered to date from the human Birth of the Lord, it would seem to follow that the Incarnation supplied a want to God the Father; and even if it is said that though not absolutely, yet primarily the Sonship is bound up with the Incarnation, even so it would place God's eternal faculty of love, or God's eternal Being as Love in a very subordinate place, one might say a far too subordinate place. It would mean that the very clearest idea of God, as He is absolutely, that is given to us must be regarded rather as an inference than as a primary revelation. To say that

we can drop the idea of Sonship and still say that God's love was satisfied in loving the Logos is really to leave the plain straightforward phraseology of the New Testament, and indeed to depreciate the power of any language to mould the expression of what we can understand of Divine truth. At this point the words of our Lord, John 17<sup>24</sup>, are suggestive, *πατήρ.....ἡγάπησάς με πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου*; in this connection these latter words are very telling, perhaps especially so taken in connection with the word *πατήρ* at the head of the sentence. And the words of verse 5, in the use of *πάτερ*, may be considered to tend in the same direction; *νῦν δόξασόν με σύ, πάτερ, παρὰ σεαυτῷ τῇ δόξῃ ἣ εἶχον πρὸ τοῦ τὸν κόσμον εἶναι παρὰ σοί*. Certainly the Lord does not speak as if the address *πάτερ* only belonged to His present position, or as if there were the least change in the Fatherly and Filial relations as essentially such, before and after the existence of the world. This vocative does not *prove* the point: for it *could* be used as being at the moment applicable to the position of the *νῦν δόξασον*, though strictly inapplicable to the position *πρὸ τοῦ τὸν κόσμον εἶναι*. But the first and simplest suggestion that occurs to the mind is that *ὁ πατήρ* and *ὁ υἱός* existed as such originally, and this first simple meaning one would maintain unless there is anything really to the contrary that can be advanced.

If then the Eternal Sonship, as a truth, in these respects seems to underlie the doctrine of the New Testament, and the word *υἱός* would be the most natural expression of the truth, it would seem unnatural universally to exclude the idea of the Eternal Sonship from the word in every case where it is not possible to demonstrate that it is not used of the Lord as Incarnate, especially when we remember that, as already remarked, since the Eternal Son is now also the Incarnate Son, passages of



such a character must by the nature of the case necessarily be very difficult, if not impossible to find.

It may not be possible to press the *ἐξαπέστειλεν* of Gal. 4<sup>4</sup> in connection with *τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ* so as to maintain that Christ was already Son when He was sent. We could for example say of a people 'that they sent their representative to conduct negotiations,' when obviously the man sent would not be a representative on departure but on arrival. With this verse we may compare John 8<sup>16</sup>, *ὁ πέμψας με [πατήρ]*, John 12<sup>40</sup>, where there is no doubt about the reading *πατήρ*, John 14<sup>24</sup>, 1 John 4<sup>14</sup>, *ὁ πατήρ ἀπέσταλκεν τὸν υἱόν*. But Rom. 8<sup>8</sup> *ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ υἱὸν πέμψας* is rather a stronger case; the emphasis that *ἑαυτοῦ* gives to *υἱόν*, suggests that *υἱόν* is used in the strongest sense possible and that the Son was already in existence as such before His human birth, that is, that His Sonship was original and eternal; and the *ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας* perhaps tells in the same direction. And indeed there is a difference in any case between the word 'Son' and a word like 'representative;' the latter suggests an office assumed, the former an inherent natural characteristic. With *τὸν ἑαυτοῦ υἱὸν πέμψας* we may coordinate verse 32, *ὅς γε* (the *γε* marking the strength of the meaning of the following words by basing an argument on them) *τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ οὐκ ἐφείσατο, ἀλλὰ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πάντων παρέδωκεν αὐτόν*, where it seems most natural to extend the first words to a period before the Incarnation, and to believe that He was already *υἱός* when in that period God decided not to spare Him. Similar to this is John 3<sup>16</sup>, *οὕτως γὰρ ἠγάπησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν κόσμον ὥστε τὸν υἱὸν τὸν μονογενῆ ἔδωκεν*. Both *οὐκ ἐφείσατο* and *ἔδωκεν* have more weight if they are not restricted to God's attitude to Jesus in His Incarnate days, but reach back to His preexistence.

The passage 2 Cor. 8<sup>9</sup>, δι' ὑμᾶς ἐπτώχευσεν πλούσιος ὢν, which does not however contain the equivocal word υἱός, may be quoted for the preexistence of our Lord, but leaves it open in what capacity He was preexistent; it does not touch the question as between λόγος and υἱός except in so far as it tells against any idea that the preexistence of our Lord is necessarily restricted to the connection with λόγος. Exactly the same may be said of Heb. 10<sup>5</sup>, εἰσερχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον λέγει; and John 6<sup>64</sup> and John 8<sup>58</sup> are of the same character. Similar to 2 Cor. 8<sup>9</sup>, but clearer and fuller is Phil. 2<sup>6,7</sup>, which is dealt with in the text; it also does not restrict His preexistence to the aspect of λόγος. While it does not directly touch His preexistence as Son, yet the word μορφή is used—ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων—and it has just been shown that such words denoting likeness or form or representation are more naturally associated with υἱός than λόγος; on the other hand it is not ἐν μορφῇ πατρός but ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ, the absolute word for God being used. Thus in these three words at once the Sonship and its eternal absolute character are at least glanced at, and the full title εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πατρός concludes the whole passage, the exact relation of the word πατρός being left open.

The passage Col. 1<sup>13-17</sup> is important. It is plain that the words of, at any rate, verses 16 and 17 apply to our Lord as preexistent; and it might be thought that as He is spoken of as υἱός in verse 13, this would settle the question, and that in this passage we clearly have characteristics of preexistence applied to the Son. It is however urged on the other hand that the words ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν, τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν very clearly refer to the earthly work of our Lord, and that this being the case these phrases mark the word υἱός as relating to the Incarnate Son. If this is so, the following characteristics of preexistence can only be

somewhat loosely attached to the word Son here: for they plainly do not refer to the Son in the aspect, on this shewing, here in view, that is as Incarnate. They must therefore be considered to be constructed in the sentence, as they stand, with a natural lack of precision common in all language, and be held strictly to apply to another unmentioned aspect or capacity of Him, who is at the same time the Incarnate Son; and it is said that the aspect in which they do apply to Him is the aspect of Logos (cf. App. R.). That the words do refer to the position of the Logos is true, but this view of the case admits of some reply. The phrase used in v. 13, which stands at the head of the whole passage, is *τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης*. It could not of course be said that the Incarnate Son was not the Son of God's love (cf. Matt. 3<sup>17</sup> and similar passages); but the use of this special phrase may rather refer to the eternal relation of love in the Blessed Trinity to which we have referred, and allude to the Eternal *μονογενῆς υἱός*, the eternal and necessary object for the satisfaction of the Father's love, the Eternal only Son of Him whose name is Love; this would give a satisfactory distinction between the common *ἀγαπητός* and *τῆς ἀγάπης*. If this is the case then, while it is true that He who is and acts as in verses 17 and 18, does so as Logos, it is also true that Logos is a *coordinate* aspect of the Preincarnate Son, so that it is natural to attach to the Eternal Son that which He does as Logos. The one unchanged Person of the Eternal Son of God now possesses both Divine and human nature and characteristics, and it is easier to speak of the human work of the Eternal Son than of the preincarnate work of the Incarnate Son; in either case the Person is unchanged, but in a passage like this, covering both preincarnate and incarnate attributes, it seems a more natural transition to speak of what the Eternal Son became (cf. Heb. 1<sup>1-4</sup>), than to attach

to the Incarnate Son the attributes which belonged to Him in quite another capacity before the Incarnation. Again, even if *υἱὸς τῆς ἀγάπης* is in the first instance to be restricted to the Incarnate Son, the preincarnate attributes of the following verses must belong to Him in some preincarnate aspect, and it seems linguistically easier in this connection to attach them to Him directly as Eternal Son than as Logos. The very laxity of the phraseology would suggest that the language employed must readily itself provide any references that are needed to make it run consecutively and be wholly intelligible, and a double meaning underlying *υἱός* exactly answers such requirements: for then, as the Eternal Son is the Logos, every clause may be attached to the word *υἱός* in the one sense or the other.

The important passage Heb. 1<sup>1-4</sup> is fully dealt with in the text and in App. R., but the occurrence of the actual word *υἱός* in connection with attributes of preexistence requires the inclusion of the passage in this place. It need not however be further discussed here, except to point out that though the allusion to the work of the Incarnate Son makes it obviously impossible to reject the view given in App. R. as untenable, on the other hand the view given in the text makes the construction of the sentence rather simpler, and the clauses to succeed one another a little more smoothly, while by beginning at the beginning, and tracing progressively the Being and work of the Son in preexistence, Incarnation, Exaltation, it certainly gives a richer sense to the passage. This does not *prove* that *υἱός* refers to the period of preexistence, nor probably could we, here or elsewhere, for the reasons given above, devise any use of *υἱός* that did so beyond all possibility of question, unless we travelled outside the simple forms of biblical expression. But if it can be reasonably shewn to be the natural and most forcible interpretation of the phrase, it would be going too far to rule out such a reference on the ground that it cannot be

conclusively demonstrated. Another passage to be observed in the Epistle to the Hebrews is 7<sup>s</sup>, where the author is dealing with the portrait of Melchizedek as he is introduced into the sacred narrative. He represents Melchizedek as *μήτε ἀρχὴν ἡμερῶν μήτε ζωῆς τέλος ἔχων*, and in this respect it is to the Son of God, using the exact phrase *τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ θεοῦ*, that he compares him.

In forming an opinion on any one passage, we may not ignore the other passages that on the whole tell in the same direction. The more numerous they are, the less becomes the improbability of such a reference in any given place, where the sense would be really helped by it, especially if there are any other indications which in an independent manner tend reasonably to establish the fact of the preexistent Sonship to which these references are held to point.

Another passage already referred to must be mentioned again in this connection, John 20<sup>17</sup>. Here, as already observed, a distinction is drawn between the Sonship of the Lord and the sonship of His brethren. Though this involves no real proof of a preexistent Sonship, such a Sonship does, as a matter of fact, more completely than any other, account for the distinction which is made between *πατέρα μου* and *πατέρα ὑμῶν* (cf. *τῷ πατρὶ σου* Matt. 6<sup>18</sup>). The terms are united under the one article, because the Father is the same Person; but the repetition of the word suggests that the character of the Fatherhood is different in the two cases. A similar thought underlies the miracle Matt. 17<sup>24-27</sup>, and the Lord's words *ἀντὶ ἐμοῦ καὶ σοῦ* (not *ἡμῶν*) correspond to the words *τὸν πατέρα μου καὶ πατέρα ὑμῶν*, His position in regard to His Father's (v. 26) temple being different to the position of St. Peter (*Χριστὸς ὡς υἱὸς ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον [θεοῦ]*). Here again an Eternal pre-existent Sonship would explain the situation, though the passage might be satisfied with less.

In John 14<sup>9</sup> we have *ὁ ἑώρακὼς ἐμὲ ἑώρακεν τὸν πατέρα* (not *τὸν θεόν*), and it seems almost impossible to read the whole passage John 14<sup>7-14</sup> and to suppose that the Lord is speaking of a Fatherhood which does not reach back behind the Incarnation, or that He is not speaking of an aspect of the eternal Being of God. The possibility of such a final revelation was due to the Incarnation, but not the relationship itself; the Lord claims to have completely brought the Father before men in a way they could understand. It is very hard to believe that St. Philip in asking about the Father was not speaking of God in language by which he referred to His eternal Being, and it is very hard to believe that our Lord in His answer and discourse was referring to a relationship only established at the Incarnation. The obvious interpretation of the passage is that the Eternal Son through His Incarnation had presented the Eternal Father before men in an intelligible form, a glimpse of a preexistent and essential relation in the Godhead thus coming within range of human sight. We could not suppose in this or other passages of the kind that the term Father reached its true significance apart from the eternity of the Son, as Son; and there is no warrant for taking the words to mean 'hath seen (God who has now first *become*) the Father,' though it is perfectly true that God was first really *shown to men* as the Father in Christ.

Similarly must it not be by virtue of some preexistent relation that Christ can say (John 10<sup>30</sup>) *ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατήρ ἕν ἐσμεν*, and is not the relation of Logos here either excluded, or only to be brought in by an awkward handling of the simple words of the sentence? Again, John 8<sup>38</sup>, *ἃ ἐγὼ ἑώρακα παρὰ τῷ πατρὶ λαλῶ*, seems clearly to speak of a presence with the Father before the Incarnation, and again the only way to avoid the obvious inference of such a passage is to say that it means 'what I have seen with (Him in some other aspect who is now) the Father.' It is fair however

in justification of such an explanation here or elsewhere, to point to the use noted below of *ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβάς* in connection with the Son of Man (cf. John 6<sup>69</sup>): for the preexistence involved in the words cannot refer to the Son of Man as such. We may also compare John 6<sup>46</sup>, *ὁ ὢν παρὰ [τοῦ] θεοῦ, οὗτος ἐώρακεν τὸν πατέρα*, where the *παρὰ [τοῦ] θεοῦ* seems to indicate the essential character of the Fatherhood which is immediately mentioned. To John 16<sup>28</sup> reference has been made in the text. *ἐξῆλθον ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς* certainly appears to refer the Filial relation to a preexistent state: for the phrase stands in some contrast to the next words *καὶ ἐλήλυθα εἰς τὸν κόσμον*, which mark a different item or a subsequent aspect of Christ's coming. Can any other interpretation but that of an eternal and essential relationship of Fatherhood and Sonship in the Blessed Trinity adequately satisfy these and all the other references to "the Father" and "my Father" in St. John's Gospel?

The passage John 1<sup>18</sup> is all important. If the text *ὁ μονογευῆς υἱός* is to be accepted as correct, it is possible here again to refer *υἱός* to the Incarnate Son; in that case *ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς*, if the words are to be restricted to such a use of *υἱός*, will refer to the result of His Ascension and Exaltation. They cannot however be said to be very natural words to have such a reference, and that idea could be much more simply and clearly expressed in some other way. The passage John 3<sup>13</sup> cannot be quoted in this connection to show that such a phrase could be used of Christ's Exaltation, because even if the words *ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ* are to be accepted as part of the text, which is more than doubtful, they can only refer to the uninterrupted abiding of our Lord in heaven in some capacity outside His historic life on earth: for they were spoken before the Ascension, and do not refer to the Exaltation. The earlier

words οὐδεὶς ἀναβέβηκεν εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν do not affect the question, and cannot alter the situation of the conversation with Nicodemus so as to make the point of view to be after the Ascension. Indeed these words do not contemplate the Lord's own Ascension at all; they merely indicate that to reach such heavenly truths as the Lord then had before His mind, any teacher must have ascended into heaven, with the single exception of the Son of Man, who, having His abiding home in heaven, brought these truths down to earth with Him; *He* did *not* need to ascend. The additional words only emphasize what the text without them implies. They do not refer to the Ascension of the Incarnate Son, but to the fact that He ever had been, and still then was, as Logos or the Son of God, in heaven. So far then as the authority of these words is admissible at all, they tell rather against than for referring the ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς to the Exaltation of the Incarnate Son. What we have in this passage (John 3<sup>19</sup>) is a clear indication of preexistence in the words ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβίς, but they are attached not to the Son of God, but to the Son of Man; the words speak to the preexistence in *some* capacity, and also emphasize the unity of the Lord's Person. If however the words ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς are not to be restricted to the Exalted Incarnate Son, but are by a looseness of expression to refer as well to another and suitable aspect of the Being of the Lord, then still such other aspect must be one proper to be connected with the phrase εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς, and this would be the Eternal Sonship; the Logos seems quite out of place in such a connection, and unsuited to the κόλπος τοῦ πατρὸς. It is very cumbrous, and really going out of the way, in order to avoid a reference to the Eternal Sonship, to say that the words mean 'The Incarnate Son, who on His Ascension was exalted to the bosom of the Father, in an analogous position to which place or state He—as



the Logos—had ever uninterruptedly been.' The whole language is that of Fatherly and Filial relations, and if *υἱός* refers to the Eternal Sonship and to the work on earth of the Eternal Son, all becomes smooth and clear.

But the evidence of the passage is very much stronger if the text *μονογενῆς θεός* is adopted. The evidence for the text has been summarised as follows<sup>1</sup>:

"The whole attestation (D is defective here) distinctly marks *ὁ μονογενῆς υἱός* as in the first instance Western; while the evidence of early Greek MSS. (B, N, C, L) for text is amply varied.

Both readings intrinsically are free from objection. Text, though startling at first, simply combines in a single phrase the two attributes of the Logos marked before (*θεός* v. 1, *μονογενῆς* v. 14); its sense is 'One who was both *θεός* and *μονογενῆς*.' The substitution of the familiar phrase *ὁ μονογενῆς υἱός* for the unique *μονογενῆς θεός* would be obvious, and *μονογενῆς* by its own primary meaning directly suggested *υἱός*. The converse substitution is inexplicable by any ordinary motive likely to affect transcribers."

"The occurrence of the word 'Father' in the context would suggest the use of the word 'Son,' while the word God would appear at first sight out of place in the relation described."

"There is no evidence that the reading had any controversial interest in ancient times. And the absence of the article from the more important documents is fatal to the idea that  $\overline{\theta\varsigma}$  was an accidental substitution for  $\overline{\Upsilon\varsigma}$ ."

"On the whole, the reading God only-begotten must be accepted, because (1) it is the best attested by ancient authority; (2) it is the more intrinsically probable from its uniqueness; (3) it makes the origin of the alternative reading more intelligible.

The conclusion of Dr. Hort in favour of *μονογενῆς θεός*, after a full examination of Prof. Abbot's arguments for *ὁ μονογενῆς υἱός*, is pronounced by Prof. Harnack in an elaborate review of his essay to have been established beyond contradiction."

If then we adopt the reading *μονογενῆς θεός* as "established beyond contradiction," we find in this place a clear

<sup>1</sup> See Westcott and Hort, 'Greek Testament,' vol. 2, App. p. 74, and Westcott, 'Gospel of St. John,' p. 33.

statement of the Sonship as preexistent, which there is no necessity to elaborate further.

The early verses of 1 John 1 tend in the same direction.<sup>1</sup> It is true that *περὶ τοῦ λόγου τῆς ζωῆς* is used in the first verse, but it would not probably be correct here to refer *ὁ λόγος* personally to the preexistent Word; it rather refers to the whole contents of God's revelation of life to men, centred in and consummated in Christ (cf. Heb. 1<sup>1-4</sup>); the whole phrase is against an *identification* with the Eternal Word. Nor is the word *ζωή* when first it occurs personally identified with Him who has described Himself as the Life (in the two senses or applications John 11<sup>25</sup>, 14<sup>6</sup>); but at the same time "Christ is the life which He *brings*, and which is realised by believers *in* Him. In Him 'the life' became visible." Thus both in verse 1 and verse 2 St. John is speaking of the union of the Finite and Infinite achieved in the Incarnation; and the clauses of verse 2 speak of the revelation of eternal life made in Christ. It is important to note the word *πατέρα* in the remarkable phrase *ἦτις ἦν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα*. It seems closely analogous to the words of John 1<sup>1</sup> used of the Logos *ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν*, just as the *ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος* is represented here in the form *ὃ ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς*. The most obvious inference from the passage, taken in connection with these parallels in the Gospel, and further emphasized with the word *αἰώνιον*, is that *πατήρ* and *υἱός* present a no less essential and eternal aspect of the First Two Persons in the Trinity than do *θεός* and *λόγος*. When then in verse 3 we have the full phrase *μετὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, we seem bound not to restrict the reference in *υἱός* to the Son as Incarnate, but the words very simply mark the Incarnation of the Eternal Son of God, corresponding to the *ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο* of John 1<sup>14</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> See Westcott, 'Epistles of St. John.'

In another sense verse 3 tells in this direction: for the exact parallel in the expression of the fellowship with the Father and the Son (*μετὰ...καὶ μετὰ*) at least suggests an identity of Divine nature and thus an eternal coordination of relationship between the Father and the Son, who has already been shown to be preexistent and not only Incarnate.

There are other passages in the New Testament, where as full or nearly as full a designation of our Lord is employed, *e.g.* 1 Cor. 1<sup>9</sup>, 2 Cor. 1<sup>19</sup>, 1 Thess. 1<sup>10</sup>, Heb. 4<sup>14</sup>; and if in such passages we suppose that the Eternal Sonship is referred to, and that the idea is of the Incarnation of the Eternal Son of God, we gain a fuller meaning.

To these passages must be added such verses as Acts 9<sup>20</sup> and Rom. 1<sup>4</sup>, where the Divinity of the Lord is the point of the preaching or the designation, and the conception of a preexistent Sonship affords the readiest aspect by which the Divinity may be shown. In App. L. it is shown that the title of Son of God is that by which the Divinity of the Lord is indicated in Apostolic teaching; and though it is true that the problem of the preexistent Sonship would not have presented itself to the Apostles with the precision with which we now can isolate that aspect of the Lord's Person, it cannot be doubted that a phrase which in itself contained a clear reference to His eternal preexistence, would even then have been a much more satisfactory indication of His Divinity, than one which centred all on the Incarnation. We may even go further and ask the question whether really the phrase *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*, apart from the conception of preexistence, would have been as satisfactory for the purpose of indicating the Lord's Divinity in the days of the Apostles as we now suppose; whether it would have been then an adequate designation of His Divinity. To say that the reference in the phrase, though it may primarily be to the Incarnate Son, yet is still an indication of Divinity, may involve some inaccuracy of thought in throwing back our

word Incarnate—with all its present associations of pre-existence, and a coming down from heaven—to the days of the Apostles. With us the word is a technical word, suggesting more than it says; it is not drawn from the Apostles' mode of expression. The words *ἐνανθρωπήσαντα* and *σάρκωθέντα* which are found in Creeds, do not belong to the vocabulary of the New Testament. But it is not so much a question of words as of the associations arising from a dogmatic literature; 'Incarnate' to us immediately suggests a preincarnate existence, and when we speak of the Son as Incarnate we mean much more than that He lived on earth. But have we anything to show that a Sonship *not merely manifested* in this life but considered as *primarily belonging* to this life, would have been an idea natural to the Apostles' minds in its suggestion of something more than a Sonship limited to this life, so as to connote Divinity? Have we any reason to suppose that, if some one had then stated that, if Jesus was the Son of God, the phrase *in its essential meaning* was in the first instance applicable to His life on earth, such language would in those days have meant much else than that Jesus was Son of God as Man, in some fuller sense than other men, but simply as the Nazarene? If, in the simple phraseology of those days, *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ* was to involve Divinity, must it not have been that the words in themselves did so by expressing as they stood a relation in the Godhead? If the words in those days were to reach beyond earth, must not it have been by the word *υἱός* itself doing so? We are not excluding from the word the reference to the Son as Incarnate, but including the eternal relation, remembering that the Apostles had not reached such a precision of definition as to distinguish as sharply as we do between the Son as Preincarnate and as Incarnate; we have already quoted the words of Dr. Swete, referring to rather a later date, that "the earliest orthodox

writers spoke of the preexistent Christ as Spirit, and connected His Sonship more especially with the human life by which it was manifested,...but ..there is no sufficient evidence...that during any part of the second century, the Sonship was limited by orthodox Christians to the manifestation of the Word in human flesh.”<sup>1</sup> The question indeed is whether in the plain unsystematised language of the New Testament the title “The Son of God” would have been “chosen by the early Church to express its sense of that which was transcendent in the Person of Christ,”<sup>2</sup> had not the words in themselves, in their first meaning, clearly risen above Christ’s earthly life. “It is as certain that when [St. Paul] speaks of the [Incarnate Christ] as *ὁ ἴδιος υἱός* (Rom. 8<sup>8a</sup>), *ὁ ἑαυτοῦ υἱός* (Rom. 8<sup>8b</sup>), he intends to cover the period of preexistence, as that St. John identifies the *μονογενής* with the preexistent Logos. There is no sufficient reason to think that the early Church, so far as it reflected upon these terms, understood them differently.”<sup>3</sup> The human life of Christ revealed His Sonship to the eyes of men, and of course it would be in connection with His human life and its results, that early believers would dwell upon it; the life which they now lived in the flesh they now lived in faith, the faith which is in the Son of God, who loved them and gave Himself up for them. They were not theologians or metaphysicians; but to express His Divinity a phrase could scarcely have been selected which did not *itself* suggest that the relation between Christ and God the Father was something greater than that manifestation of Sonship which reached the eyes of men, and it likewise seems very improbable that the Apostles should have used the phrase as

<sup>1</sup> ‘The Apostles’ Creed,’ p. 29. The significance of *μονογενής* attached to *λόγος* in the second quotation there given will be noted as introducing the idea of *υἱός*.

<sup>2</sup> Sanday and Headlam, ‘Epistle to the Romans,’ p. 8.

a Divine title, if all that was really Divine in it was some inference from it.

We may add that if the words 'Son of God' did not in Apostolic days imply and indeed express, in the language of that time, a preexistent Sonship, it is more difficult to account for the later belief in that truth and the use of the phrase<sup>1</sup>; it seems scarcely enough to say that such a truth was mainly inferred from other indications in the New Testament, and that such a use of the phrase was found not at variance with that in Holy Scripture. The Apostolic writers come too near the discussion of such a subject for a mere silence, or indeterminate hints on their part, to offer sufficient justification for the belief of the closely succeeding generations; and it seems hard to suppose that the same words, used by the Apostles and by those who came after, should develop so much in their meaning as almost to have a different content in the two cases. One cannot say of this question—as for example of such a question as that of the authorship of the Psalms—that it was simply passed by or non-existent in Apostolic days; the phrase was in use and the meaning of it was already important; and on such a subject in considering what Scripture says, we are at liberty, nay we are bound to consider what early believers thought that it said, and though not of course tied by their opinions, yet to give them their proper value.

Last of all we may venture to ask the question whether, if the title, as is agreed, belongs to the Lord in a unique sense, beyond the metaphorical and inexact uses of the Old Testament, beyond the limited senses in which it belongs to men, any other adequate meaning can be found for it, than that which makes our Lord by a unity of essence the Eternal Son of God. This is obviously a possible interpretation of the title, and can any other equally satisfactory be

<sup>1</sup> See App. T.

suggested? A difference of degree in possession of a right to the title as among men can be imagined; but can the unique claim to an unique Sonship be fairly satisfied by some special Sonship, even some unique Sonship manifested in this world? Can it under all the circumstances really involve less than that the title is in this one case, so far as human language reaches, used *properly*, and designates a Fatherly and Filial relation eternal as God is eternal, and existing in the very Being of the Blessed Trinity? Those however who hesitate as to the answer to be given to this interrogation will say that it begs the question, and that we have changed the steady guidance of historic and logical interpretation for the flight of faith.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> It may be thought rather to complicate one difficulty by another than to elucidate the question before us, to allude to the title 'Son of Man.' But if the view may be allowed that that phrase designates the completeness and universality of the Lord's human nature and life, then the phrase Son of God, understood as relating to the Lord's preexistence, would be a closely parallel and complementary title, the one describing Him as essentially Man, the other as essentially God; the one denoting His primary relation to other men, the other a primary relation to the One God; the union of the two titles in one Person meaning the union of Man with God in Him, 1 Tim. 2<sup>6</sup>. But the origin and meaning of the title 'Son of Man' are not clear, and we can scarcely base any argument on it, especially one of analogy. On the whole subject see 'Atonement and Personality,' p. 185.

#### D.

#### *Dr. Moberly on 'Metaphors.'*

Since these words were written the writer has had the advantage of seeing Dr. Moberly's justification of the word 'metaphor' in this connection ('Atonement and Personality', pp. 183—185). The following sentences may be quoted at length as illustrating the point of view taken in the text:

"A mistake arises as a result of a tacit (but false) assumption that a metaphorical truth is *ipso facto* "less true" than what we call a literal one. The fact is that almost every word of deep spiritual

import is a metaphor: that is to say, is expressed in terms of a likeness drawn immediately from material things.....It is a disastrous, though deeply ingrained error, to assume that the material experiences are absolutely, and the spiritual only relatively, and less really, true.....This instinct is nearly the precise reverse of truth. The material experience is as a sort of parable or hint which serves to suggest a term for describing the spiritual. But the term, as borrowed for spiritual use, means something not less, but far more, than ever it meant in the material sphere: the spiritual significance outruns the material, not only in width of content, but in profoundness of truth. Spiritual hunger may be rarer than material among men who are still largely animal: but spiritual hunger, where realized, is more overwhelming, more intense, more real, as hunger, than physical decay for lack of food."

It is exceedingly important in dealing with such metaphorical expressions not to carry into the Eternal ideas that only belong to the temporal mould in which the eternal truths are presented to us. Thus many of the difficulties associated in our minds with the Fatherhood and Sonship preexisting in the Blessed Trinity can be seen to arise from the inadequacy of the terms which have their origin in human relations. There may well be other difficulties that have, though we may not be aware that they have, their origin in the necessary lack of complete correspondence between the heavenly truth and the earthly expression of it.

And Dr. Moberly mentions

"The extreme difficulty to human thought of using the terms 'Father' and 'Son' at all, without projecting too materially, across the conception of the Eternal Being of God, the shadow of the associations of these human words; without (that is to say) carrying both the distinction which the words imply between the two, and the inferiority and posteriority of the one to the other, much further than they ought to be carried."

And he adds that

"The words, though not inapplicable or untrue, are yet applicable only through reserves which are not easy to human thought, but without which they inevitably tend to convey, to human thought, what is other, and more, than the truth."



## E.

*The word μονογενής.*

Though the doctrinal significance and the acceptance of the word *μονογενής* may involve some discussion, the straightforward sense of the word itself seems plain. It is used in two rather difficult passages of Hesiod. In the first (Op. 374) *μονογενής παῖς* means 'an only son' as opposed to the following *ἕτερον παῖδα* and *πλεόνεσσι*. Though the interpretation of the passage is not very easy, the meaning of the word is clearly brought out in it. Again it is used by Hesiod (Theog. 426, if the passage is genuine) or by an interpolator, concerning Hecate, where the sense of the line is very obscure; and again of her, 448, where the words are *μονογενής ἐκ μητρὸς ἐούσα*. The word is also used in the same sense in Herodotus. It occurs in the LXX, sometimes in the Apocrypha, and sometimes as a rendering of the Hebrew *יָחִיד*. This latter word is used in the sense of an only son, with or without *יָחִיד* added; in the feminine, besides being used of Jephthah's daughter (with *קָה* preceding it), it is used of life, as being the one and only life of a man. The plural *יָחִידִים* is rendered "the solitary" in A.V. and R.V. in Psalm 68<sup>6</sup>. Sometimes the LXX represent *יָחִיד* by *ἀγαπητός*, which appears to be similarly used elsewhere. The text in Demosthenes Meidias 567 is not free from doubt: *μόνος* (if this word there carries such a force) is added to *ἀγαπητός*, Hom. Od. II. 365. But the use in the New Testament of the word *μονογενής* can leave no doubt of the meaning. It is used three times by St. Luke, of the son of the widow of Nain (7<sup>19</sup>), of Jairus' daughter (8<sup>43</sup>), of the demoniac boy (9<sup>88</sup>). It is used of Isaac, Heb. 11<sup>17</sup>. There is no suggestion that it means *γεννηθεὶς παρὰ μόνου*. It simply means *the only one born*; there is no emphasis on the begetting; *the*

only one in his family. As applied to the Lord it speaks of Him as the only Son of God; no sonship of others is the same as His Sonship. *Unicus*, or sometimes *unigenitus*, is the Latin equivalent; in the Vulgate *unicus* is used in the three passages of St. Luke, *unigenitus* in Heb. 11<sup>17</sup>, and *unigenitus* in the five passages of St. John. As regards later use Dr. Swete points out that the word is not found in subapostolic writers, and was only gradually called back into the use of the Church, probably in opposition to the misuse of it by the Valentinians, who gave the name of *μονογενής* to the *Æon Νοῦς*. The reasons for preferring the text *μονογενής θεός* (not *ὁ μονογενής θεός*) to *μονογενής υἱός* are briefly set out by Dr. Westcott ('Gospel of St. John,' pp. 32, 33); but as he points out, p. 15, the variation "makes no difference in the sense of the passage; and, however strange the statement may appear, does not seriously affect the form in which it is conveyed to us. 'One who is God only begotten,' or 'God the only Son' (*μονογενής θεός*), One of whom it can be predicated that He is unique in His Being, and God, is none other than 'the only begotten Son' (*ὁ μονογενής υἱός*). The word Son—'the only begotten Son'—carries with it the idea of identity of essence. The article in the one case defines as completely as the predicate in the other. But the best attested reading (*μονογενής θεός*) has the advantage of combining the two great predicates of the word, which have been previously indicated (v. 1 *θεός*, v. 14 *μονογενής*)."

## F.

### *The Incarnation and the Fall.*

In his well known essay on the Gospel of Creation at the end of his edition of St. John's Epistles, Dr. Westcott has presented the reasons for believing that the Incarnation was

independent of the Fall<sup>1</sup>. Had man continued sinless we may believe Christ would have come into the world, and even as it is, in spite of the fact that the whole character of His life and death were conditioned by the Fall, there are aspects of our Lord's life, of His exaltation, of His work on earth and in us, that lead beyond the mere redemption of man, and deal with man as man and not with man as sinful. This subject appears to have been little discussed in the earlier ages of the Church; the practical requirements of the spread of the gospel of redemption kept out of sight this more theoretical question. But from the twelfth or thirteenth century the topic was treated, and Dr. Westcott gives an abstract of some views held upon it by the schoolmen. Among others these words of Thomas Aquinas should be noted: "Since the redemption of man from the slavery of sin is assigned in Holy Scriptures as the sole cause of the Incarnation, many say with good reason that if man had not sinned, the Son of God would not have been man... Others however say that since by the Incarnation of the Son of God there was accomplished not only the liberation from sin, but also the exaltation of human nature, and the consummation of the whole universe, for these reasons even if sin had not existed the Incarnation would have taken place." In these words are well expressed leading arguments in favour of the belief. On the other hand, there were those who could with the sequence exclaim "O felix culpa quae tantum ac talem meruit habere Redemptorem," where the view is given that the Fall was in itself a blessing, because to it is to be traced the coming of the Redeemer. Placed in this crude way it seems difficult to accept such an idea, and yet, if by saying that it was not God's purpose that His Son should in any case take our nature upon Him, and unite man with God, and God with man, independently of

<sup>1</sup> See also Martensen, 'Christian Dogmatics,' pp. 260—263.

man's sin, we make the Incarnation only and entirely a means of man's redemption, we really become involved in a difficulty of the kind.

It seems impossible to believe that sin was necessary for man's highest development, or that sin entered from the beginning into the Divine economy for man. To suppose that sin is of the very essence of man's development comes dangerously near supposing that man as created was essentially sinful or necessarily to be sinful, and *that* would mean that sin could not be wholly eradicated without man ceasing to be truly man. In this case redeemed mankind free from sin would be in characteristic qualities and very nature different from man as created. For, in ceasing to be sinful, man would cease to be properly man, as having lost a quality essentially inherent in mankind as created. We cannot for a moment believe that when man was created in God's image after His likeness, sin in any sense could have been necessary for his development.

The fact that there is no direct scriptural warrant for a theory that would make the Incarnation independent of the Fall, need not surprise us. The Bible is throughout a book that deals with man's needs, with what God has done and will do for man as he is, and as a theoretical question it was unlikely that this point should be raised. The attitude of the Bible is like that of our Lord Himself. We notice that in His replies to enquirers it was His way to turn them from speculation to duty. Thus a question "Who is my neighbour?" Luke 10<sup>39</sup>, is not directly answered but elicits a picture of duty and the command "Go, and do thou likewise." The Apostles' question, Acts 1<sup>6</sup>, "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" meets with an answer that diverts them from speculation and anticipation to the prospect of duty and their equipment for it. A similar principle characterises the words of the Bible as a whole. We need not then ignore this question in its proper place,

if we do not find it plainly set before us in Holy Scripture. It may be doubted whether in so many words Holy Scripture anywhere opens the subject, though the passage referred to in the text Col. 1<sup>18-20</sup> has been considered to do so, and to this we may add the expression of God's original purpose in Eph. 1<sup>3-5</sup> *καθὼς ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς ἐν αὐτῷ πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου.*

When however we turn from the actual words of the Bible to consider its suggestions and the inferences which it prompts, the case is different. Man was made in the image of God after His likeness, and the real progress of man was to come nearer and nearer to God: for it seems hard to suppose that man was incapable of development, and that he who was capable of so living as to go further from God, was incapable of so living as to come nearer to God. Such possibilities in either direction seem involved in man's free will. We must however guard our thoughts and language so as to avoid any impression that the possibility of development towards God involved an existing separation from Him. The acorn may be so far perfect, but it must grow before it becomes the oak, and our Lord in His human life learned obedience (*ἐμαθεν τὴν ὑπακοήν*), which does not mean that He did not know how to obey at all without learning it, but that experience was required before He could cover the total range of obedience. Exactly so it was for man as created in God's image to deepen and to advance his connection with God by discipline and training, and to come nearer and nearer to Him. But what would have been the end of this? To what point was this road that could lead nearer and nearer to God to bring sinless man? It seems natural to believe that it was to lead to God Himself, to a real union between God and man; and we can conceive no other way of union between the infinite God and finite man than in One who should Himself be both God and Man.

This applies both to the individual and to the race. The

individual in this supposed case, as under actual present circumstances, would have, so far as we can see, best realized the personal ideal of his being by such union with God ; and if the individual was to come nearer and nearer to God in any vital fellowship, could it have been otherwise than by partaking in One who could Himself unite man to God ? The powers of growth for the individual would thus still have been derived from the Divine Human Person. It is of course beyond the scope even of our fancy to consider when exactly or how the Son would have taken our nature upon Him and made such union possible for individual men ; even in our present world it is not easy, for example, to determine His exact relation to the saints of Old Testament times, far less can we imagine any details in such hypothetical circumstances as to how the '*In Christ*' life would have been effected. We are not considering manners and times, but only the idea of such connection between Him and the individual in a sinless world, and the apparent impossibility of man reaching to true fellowship with God apart from Him.

Such a line of thought leads all the more forcibly to such a conclusion if we think not so much of the individual man, but of the whole race. If we believe that the individual man could only have found his perfection in living union with One who is Himself God and Man, if the nature of the progress towards God of one created in God's image appears to involve some living point of union with God, it is much more so with the race. The human race in all circumstances, so far as we can see, could not have consisted of an aggregate of identical individuals all exactly of one stamp and pattern ; it must in any case have been composed of a number of individuals each representing in various combinations the total capacities of humanity. This is certainly the case now, and one can see no reason why the existing state of things should be the result of the Fall ;

indeed the greatest differentiation, that of sex, existed before the Fall. If then the sinless race as a whole was to be brought to God, it would have required some method by which this aggregate of individuals could be united, some point of union for the race as a race, and then some means of union between the race and God; then, as now, the race would have needed to be summed up in a Head, and then, as now, it would also have required a Mediator, One who could be the link between God and man, or better, One *in* whom rather than *by* whom God and man could be united. If these two offices were combined in one Person, (and it is difficult to see how otherwise there could be a vital union between God and man,) then humanity scattered in all its fragments would in this One Person have found its 'corporate personality' and at the same time in Him the means of its fellowship with God.

Thus in a sinless world the individual and the race alike would still have found in the Son of God the point of union with the eternal; and just because each individual would have been capable of union with Him, would He have been able to gather them all into one as the Head of the race, and to establish a living communion between the race and God. As things are, redemption must come first, and the barrier of sin that stands between man and God must be removed; but when that is done and man is once more in a position to advance as God's son, then the idea of that advance seems, so far as we can judge, to be the same that it would have been had man continued sinless. The surroundings of this advance may all be different, pain and sorrow and effort and all that follows from original and actual sin now characterise every individual man's progress and the progress of the race as a whole; but once the hindrance of sin is removed and man is accepted as God's son, one can see no reason why the goal and means of such progress should be different for sinful

man and for sinless man. If the love of God in its own way removed *the* great difference, namely sin, then it seems reasonable that man restored to his hopes and to his sonship should develop on the original lines. If that is the case, we may infer from what we have before us what would have been the case in the hypothetical position under consideration, and believe that the Incarnation did not depend upon the Fall.

We may further consider that if this was the case, if our Lord would in any case have taken our nature and in Himself have gathered together the scattered fragments of humanity and united them as the Head of humanity, then, if one may so speak with reverence, the possibility of His atoning work lay near at hand. He would on this supposition have been in any case the great Representative of humanity, and if, as originally intended, in this capacity He was to consummate the human race, now He could redeem it too, since already He was intending to unite humanity to Himself. For we do not regard the atonement as the substitution of a sinless victim, who was alien to the human race and unconnected with it, to bear the punishment due to the race, but we rather believe that He in whom humanity was summed up bore the sins of those whom He called His brethren, and bearing them removed the division which they had created between man and God. Thus if the Incarnation was independent of the Fall, the Incarnation as intended, if one may speak so, really prepared the way for the Atonement; and it is not the Atonement that led to the Incarnation, but the Incarnation that led to the Atonement.

Thus there is a real meaning in the duplication of the clause in the Creed "for us men and for our salvation." Had we remained sinless He would have come *for us men*; as it is He has also come *for our salvation*; this second object is an additional motive and does not supersede the first (cf. the double mission stated in the Collect for Palm Sunday).



Nor may we omit in this connection the possible interpretation of the mysterious making of man *in the image of God*, namely that man was made in the image of the humanity of our Lord which was to be; that just as Christ is the image of God, so also was He the image in which man was created. Thus God in Christ, the Father as imaged in the Son, and that image of the Son, translated, so to speak, into the form of human life and being by the foreordained humanity of the Son, would in this view have been the great exemplar of the human race. If there is any truth in such an idea, if the image of God in which man was created was really the Son of God destined in the fulness of time to be Incarnate, then also for fallen and unfallen men alike the "after God's likeness" of the Book of Genesis, the developing after God's likeness, if that is the meaning of the words, exactly falls in with the expression of St. Paul in Rom. 8<sup>19</sup>, the  $\alpha\alpha\eta\eta\alpha\delta\tau\tau$  of Gen. 1<sup>26</sup> anticipates the  $\pi\rho\acute{\omega}\rho\iota\sigma\epsilon\nu\ \sigma\upsilon\mu\mu\acute{o}\rho\phi\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \epsilon\iota\kappa\acute{o}\nu\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \nu\iota\acute{o}\upsilon\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau\acute{o}\ \epsilon\iota\upsilon\alpha\iota\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \pi\rho\omega\tau\acute{o}\tau\omicron\kappa\omicron\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\omicron\iota\varsigma$ .

There is yet a wider view of which we may not lose sight; we must not only consider man individually, and the human race collectively, but we must look beyond to the whole creation. The connection between man and creation is brought before us alike in the pages of the Bible and in the teaching of modern science. The dominion of man over creation is shewn in Gen. 1<sup>28</sup>, and so close is the connection between man and creation that, while man himself was made of the dust of the ground (Gen. 2<sup>7</sup>, 3<sup>19</sup>), in Gen. 3<sup>17, 18</sup> we read that the creation has shared in the fall of man; the same close union between man and the world in which he lives is put before us in Rom. 8<sup>19-23</sup>, where the fate of God's creation is bound up with the position of God's sons. "The earnest expectation of the creation ( $\tau\eta\varsigma\ \kappa\tau\acute{\iota}\sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ ) waiteth for the

revealing of the sons of God. For the creation was subjected to vanity, not of its own will, but by reason of him who subjected it, in hope that the creation itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God." Man as lord of creation is not then depicted as an alien lord, as a foreign governor introduced upon the scene, but rather as the crown of creation, the related representative of it, the head of the kingdom. Such a view of man's position is confirmed by the teaching of science which does not isolate man as an independent creation, but traces the closeness of his connection with less perfect forms, and tends to shew us how much has gone before him, and how much is summed up and perfected in him. Man then is the representative of creation to God, just as on the other hand as its ruler he is the representative of God to creation (Ps. 8<sup>6</sup>, 9). But in the same way that mankind is by its very growth divided up into many fragments, each realizing its own function, so also is creation differentiated and by the fulness of its life developed in countless directions; and though the more we learn about creation the more we apprehend in it an underlying unity, yet in its parts it appears to progress upon a plan of wider and wider differentiation. How then is this underlying unity to be realized? When we answer in man as the representative of creation, then as seen above we need to find a point of union for man himself, and, if one may so speak, such a unifying centre as is afforded by the Incarnation becomes necessary. But further if this unity of creation is God's will, it is difficult to conceive of it, except as no less returning to God than coming from God; and if man's position as lord and representative of creation, whereby he is at once creation's crown and God's vicegerent, seems, so far as we can apprehend the matter, alike in a sinless or sinful world, to point forward to something above itself, in

which creation can all be united with God, here again the Incarnation exactly fits the requirements of the case. The Incarnate Lord is not only the Head of humanity but the Head of creation; and whether He is the Head of creation as being the Head of humanity or in some other and wider sense, does not affect our argument. Now all this is independent of the Fall. Of course the existing relation between man and creation is entirely conditioned by the Fall (Gen. 3<sup>17, 18, 19</sup>, Heb. 2<sup>8</sup>); but man's original destiny and dominion were given him before the Fall, and the purpose of God (*εὐδοκία, πρόθεσις*, Eph. 1<sup>10, 11</sup>) *ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα* (neuter) *ἐν τῷ χριστῷ*, τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, so far as one can see, would have been equally applicable, equally the normal goal of creation, if man had not sinned.

Lastly, if we consider things as they are after the Fall and not as they might have been, and adapt our point of view to existing conditions, in the first place even so we observe how much of God's work for and in man deals with him as man and not primarily as sinner. As things are, the first thing is to deal with man as a sinner: for so long as sin is there to separate man from God, all God's good purposes for man are at a standstill; but once sin is removed then God's treatment of man proceeds to develop man's true character into which sin has intruded. Man by the removal of sin restored to God progresses along lines that, so far as we can see, belong to him as man, and would have belonged had there been no sin, original or other, in the world. Sinful man needs to be justified, *i.e.* put into a right relation with God, but justification in the narrower sense is not the completion of Christian life; man also needs to be sanctified, to go on from strength to strength. Now whatever obstacles to the progress of this sanctification sin still interposes, and however much this progress is now measured by the triumphing

over sin, yet, as said above, we cannot suppose that the idea of making such progress at all only belongs to man as a sinner, and that sinless man would have been stationary and unprogressive. If the body grows, so does the character, and the progress of both are placed side by side in the story of the development of the sinless Child (St. Luke 2<sup>52</sup>). We cannot but believe that the perfection, the likeness to God, or to the Son of God, after which we reach, which is our appointed goal, is set before us as men, sinful men it is true, but as men not as sinners.

Secondly, under the actual conditions of the Incarnation we observe how the Lord's life nevertheless reaches beyond the restoration of fallen man. We can see Him acting and hear Him speaking as the Man, the Perfect Man, the Divine Man, uniting in Himself all human capacities, and carrying all human endowments in consecration to God; not merely as making an offering for sin to God, but as serving God's good pleasure and living a perfect human life, and crowning every human power and uniting His "brethren" to His "Father." It is the whole figure as set before us in the Gospel and interpreted in the Epistles that shews us this rather than any isolated texts; but we may specially point to the parable of the vine and the branches, to the Lord's words "I am the way, the truth and the life," to the teaching in the Epistle of the Hebrews as to our Lord as the Representative of mankind, to the Lord's highpriestly prayer and to the Transfiguration. In such passages as these and in the Lord's life and work and Exaltation as a whole, beneath the conditions involved in His redeeming work, we may at least catch glimpses of His primal relation to man as man and not as sinner.

Thus the love of God triumphed over man's sin; the Fall could not alter the purpose of God's love. It is not a case of "O felix culpa", but rather

O Love of God, O sin of man,  
 In this dread act your strength is tried ;  
 And victory remains with Love,  
 For Love Himself is crucified.

In spite of the Fall God still sent His Son ; but what a different sending to that which it would have been ! “ Being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.”

## G.

*υιοθεσία.*

In Vol. I of Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible will be found under Adoption a full examination of the use of the word *υιοθεσία* by St. Paul, who alone of New Testament writers employs it, though it is not accurate to say that he coined it. St. Paul uses the word in five passages in three Epistles. The writer of the article, Dr. Candlish, takes the view that the origin of the term and some of its associations<sup>1</sup> may be traced to St. Paul's familiarity with the Roman law of adoption. The adoption of a child in Rome was very different to anything of the kind existing among ourselves, the adopted son in Roman law becoming as completely a member of the family of his adoption as if he had been born a member of it. He took the very name of the man who adopted him, and suppressed his own, though commonly keeping the name of his *gens* with the adjectival addition of *-anus*. Thus, to quote a well known instance, P. Cornelius Scipio Æmilianus Africanus was really the son of L. Æmilius Paulus, adopted by P. Cornelius Scipio Africanus. Whether the extreme authority of the Roman father, which the elaborate law of adoption protected from

<sup>1</sup> Possibly the witness of the Spirit, Romans 8<sup>16</sup>, may contain an allusion to the witnesses at certain Roman formalities.

invasion in this direction, was practically in common life as strong as it had been in earlier days, or whether such paternal rights had to any extent tended to become obsolete by the time of the Christian era, the idea of such a relation between father and son, and certainly the existence of such adoption, would be prominently enough before St. Paul's mind to colour and individualize his expressions and arguments. In the various contexts where St. Paul uses the term the application, though not the sense of it, varies.

In Rom. 8<sup>15</sup> this adoption at once liberates from the bondage of the slave and entitles the son to free access to his father.

Rom. 8<sup>29</sup> looks further still and awaits the perfected adoption with the redemption of the body, the consummated sonship in the regenerated creation which then as now will share in the fate of man.

Rom. 9<sup>4</sup> speaks of adoption first among the privileges of Israel. Here the sense is still the same, though the particular aspect of the sonship is of a more elementary kind. Israel was called as a nation to be God's son, as has been observed in the text; and though the *individual* application of this sonship was only brought before men by the teaching of God's Son to His brethren, Israel, which was eventually to be summed up in Christ, was in its sonship the forerunner of the Christian Church.

In Gal. 4<sup>5</sup> St. Paul is contrasting the full position of the adopted son both with (a) the slave and (b) the minor.

In Eph. 1<sup>5</sup> St. Paul speaks of this our adoption as God's sons through Christ as being God's eternal purpose for us. Chronologically therefore, if such a phrase may be used, this passage lies at the other extreme from Rom. 8<sup>29</sup>, this giving the original purpose, that looking forward to the final consummation of it.

A parallel suggests itself between St. Paul's use of the word 'adoption' (*υιοθεσία*) and the use of the word

'inheritance' (*κληρονομία*) in the Old and New Testament. Inheritance, as used in the Bible from the inheritance of Israel in the promised land onwards, suggests an incontrovertible right freely conferred and won by no merit of him who enjoys it. Similarly, adoption does not discharge an engagement or institute a provisional right but confers authoritatively a permanent position of privilege. And the association of the word with the majesty of the Roman law makes it speak the more surely and clearly.

## H.

### *The word ὑπόστασις.*

The word *ὑπόστασις* means that which underlies, and it is a word of wide application. It is that which is at the bottom or foundation (*e.g.* a literal foundation: a ground of action: the nature or substance of a thing), hence 'that by virtue of which a thing is what it is.' It can therefore be used in this passage of God's essence or nature; that which is the Being of God.

Later, from the time of Origen it came to be used in the sense of what we call Person; for when the Persons of the Trinity were to be distinguished, then *ὑπόστασις* could express that which underlay Each, that which made Him what He is as distinguished from the Others. In the first sense *οὐσία* is the equivalent of *ὑπόστασις*, in the second *πρόσωπον*.

The Latin *substantia* is used as the equivalent of *ὑπόστασις* in the first sense, but it is also used as the equivalent of *ὑπόστασις* in the second sense. *Essentia* also represents *ὑπόστασις* in the first sense. As however

*substantia* was generally used as equivalent to *essentia*, another word was required to express the second meaning of *ὑπόστασις* and *substantia*, and the word employed was *persona*. Originally in Latin therefore it was right to use the expression *tres substantias*; then *unam essentiam* (or *substantiam*) *tres personas* became the usual form. In Greek originally it would be right to speak alike of *μία οὐσία* or *μία ὑπόστασις*. But when *ὑπόστασις* gained its second meaning, the phrase was rather *μία οὐσία τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις*, and the word *πρόσωπον* was discarded.

It is interesting to note that while *ὁμοούσιος* was the watchword of the Creed of Nicaea, in the anathemas attached to the Creed *ὑπόστασις* was still used in the sense of *οὐσία*.

It is clear how fruitful a source of confusion and misunderstanding the change of meaning in the Greek *ὑπόστασις* and the Latin *substantia* might and, as a matter of fact, did become. Such a confusion may be compared with the widely divergent views held in connection with the word 'transubstantiation,' according as once again this word 'substance' is taken in the common, untechnical, material sense, or is on the other hand accepted in the scholastic sense of that 'inward essence or idea' underlying the 'accidents' which makes a thing what it is, while again it is these 'accidents' alone which are capable of being in any way at all apprehended by the senses.

One can easily see that the origin of the confusion was the extreme difficulty of finding any word either in Greek or Latin or indeed in any language for the second sense. The idea of the Trinity in Unity is a difficult one for our minds, the expression of it more difficult. Our Lord says *ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατήρ ἓν ἐσμεν*. He does not say *εἷς*; the *ἓν* then suggests the unity of substance, and we believe that



“they are not three Gods, but one God”; we may not ‘divide the substance.’ On the other hand we may not confound the Three, as if He had said εἷς. We believe that the Father is not the Son nor the Holy Ghost, and similarly we believe that the Son is not the Father nor the Holy Ghost, nor is the Holy Ghost the Father or the Son; we must avoid the Sabellian error which regards the Three as merely three economic aspects of the One God. But it is difficult merely to maintain this negative way of speaking; and when we say that the Father, Son and Holy Ghost are One in Being or Substance, but are Three also, we are almost compelled to ask in *what* are They Three; what it is that is contrasted to the One Being, in respect of which They may be spoken of as Three. The Greeks then answered ὑπόστασις, that which underlies Them, that by virtue of which Each is what He is as contrasted to the other Two; the Latin said *persona*, though as pointed out it could say *tres substantiae*, exactly following the Greek, and the Greek could say τρία πρόσωπα, in accordance with the Latin *tres personae*. In English we say Person; but it is of the nature of an adaptation of language, for we must divest our minds of the idea of limitation which with us is universally characteristic of a *person*. The Godhead cannot be limited and determined in this way. At the same time if we are to think or speak of God at all, we must be content to use our finite language, always being careful to remember its imperfections, and to avoid deductions that spring not from the subject itself, but from our apprehension and expression of it. The use of Greek and Latin terms here treated will be found briefly dealt with by St. Augustine (‘De Trinitate,’ Book V, ch. 9 & 10), and is discussed by Dr. Gibson (‘The Thirty-nine Articles,’ p. 103). It should be noted that in the phrase *hypostatic union* as applied to our Lord, the word has the sense of *Person*; the union being the union of the Divine and human natures *in one Person* in our Lord.

## I.

*The Baptism of the Lord.*<sup>1</sup>

When, so far as we know, the records of the earlier years of the Lord were so scanty and the Baptism, recorded in some way in each of the four Gospels, so clearly indicated the commencement of His work, perhaps it was only natural that it should be supposed by some that it was only at His Baptism that the Man Jesus received a Divine afflatus or inspiration. Such a view might be assisted by connecting the voice at the Baptism with Ps. 2<sup>7</sup>, in the way that we find in the Western text of St. Luke, and drawing a false inference, and it would make its way among any who may have been acquainted with the story of the Baptism and unfamiliar with or incredulous of the earlier events which are recorded by St. Matthew and St. Luke. This view is so far only a perversion of what is really true in that the Baptism *was* the Lord's Call, His anointing to preach the Gospel (Luke 4<sup>18, 21, 22</sup>), the commencement of His public work after the many years of preparation.

The Baptism of the Lord is in itself a difficult subject for us to grasp. The Baptist particularly distinguished his own baptism as a baptism to repentance as opposed to the coming baptism in the Holy Spirit. In what sense the Lord offered Himself to the rite thus closely connected with repentance is not very clear.

It may be that John's baptism, being something external like other ceremonial washings of the Jews, would be differently apprehended by the baptized, that their subjective attitude interpreted the rite for them, and that, according to John's preaching, the main idea to the baptized

<sup>1</sup> See Dr. Mason, 'The relation of Confirmation to Baptism,' and Dr. Sanday's article on 'Jesus Christ' in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible.

was that of starting fresh, of a new service of God, variously grasped by individuals. If this is so, though the new life or the new course in all other cases must have involved a break with the past and repentance must have been its first step, yet our Lord Himself was, as a matter of fact, similarly starting on a new phase of service of God and man, and it may be that it was in this manner He found it *πρέπον πληρῶσαι πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην*, to identify Himself with the same ceremony by which others, in anticipation of His coming of which the Baptist spoke, were emphasizing that they now wished to stand in a right relation to God and man, and as they apprehended it, to do their duty. If the acceptance of this rite did not in itself declare Him a sinner, the Baptist's words proclaiming Him as taking away the sin of the world prevented any misunderstanding; and thus from the beginning the Lord could identify Himself in the service of the One God with those whom He was not ashamed to call His brethren.

Perhaps on the other hand in this *baptism unto repentance* even in our Lord's case sin was more strictly kept in view, and in some mysterious sense the Baptism is to be more precisely connected with the bearing of the sin of the world, so that the Lord's submission to it in some manner pointed forward to the sin-bearing on the Cross, and was a part of the work of Him who was made sin "for us, who knew no sin." Such thoughts had already been suggested by the phrase "Behold the Lamb of God." The connection between the Lamb of God and the fulfilling all righteousness is well illustrated in Heb. 9<sup>5, 6, 7, 10</sup>. On this view the very opening of the Lord's work for sinful men, the first act in His public mission looked straight on to its consummation in His Passion.

In any case it is impossible to suppose that the whole occasion was merely formal and meant nothing for the Lord, or that its only value was the sign therein given to the

Baptist himself (John 1<sup>32-34</sup>). If we cannot consider that the mere baptism, the washing in the Jordan, conveyed anything to the Lord—for as just noted, it is not clear that it, being destitute of any gift of the Spirit, objectively conveyed anything to any of the baptized—yet it is plain from the whole narrative that the descent of the Spirit and the voice from heaven, this united action of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, marked an epoch in the life of our Lord. We are constrained to believe that on the occasion in some ineffable sense the Lord here received an endowment, an anointing for His public work. This is of course a totally different thing from saying that it was at His Baptism He was endowed with Divinity: for from the cradle at Bethlehem to the Cross at Calvary the Divine Son, living in the conditions of earth, never ceased to be in the full sense the Son of God. The Baptism by John led only to a mysterious gift of the Spirit in which the Incarnate Word should go forward to the work set before Him as “the Son the Saviour of the world” (1 John 4<sup>14</sup>).

## J.

*The text of St. Peter's confession.*

The text of this important confession is variously given in the three Gospels:

Matt. 16<sup>16</sup> *Σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος.*

Mark 8<sup>29</sup> *Σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός.*

Luke 9<sup>20</sup> *Τὸν χριστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ.*

If there is a common original, it is regarded as limited to the words in St. Mark. But the additions of St. Matthew are clearly of importance. The source of them cannot be determined; and it is maintained that they are due to a

later stage of Christian thought and expression, being in St. Matthew's record antedated and thrown back into an occasion where they really have no place. The very importance of the words cuts both ways. Because they are so clearly developed and emphatic, their absence would be a serious loss; but also for the same reason their presence is more exposed to suspicion. For those who consider that because they exist in the gospel as we have it, they must represent accurately what was said, no matter what may have been their oral or literary history, there will be little more to be said. Others will be compelled to deal with the question on both sides in a more subjective manner. It scarcely decides the point to say that so early an Epistle as the first to the Thessalonians shows a state of belief and expression very similar (1 Thess. 1<sup>9, 10</sup>): for the point of faith reached is not to be judged by mere years. The appositeness of this full confession at the close of the earlier stage of the Lord's ministry will be variously apprehended as an argument. The blessing pronounced by the Lord to St. Peter (which also only belongs to St. Matthew) further establishes the importance of the occasion, and marks the confession as a climax: for even as regards the word *χριστός*, at this stage of His ministry our Lord had neither been generally recognised as the Messiah, nor indeed had He yet openly proclaimed Himself. And we may trace an affinity between the confession *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζώντος* and the Lord's reply in which He attributes such insight not to St. Peter, but to the influence of *ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*. But these considerations may be held to tell in either direction for or against St. Matthew's text. "The whole phrase as it stands," says Dr. Sanday, "including the epithet 'living' of God, calls up such a host of Old Testament associations, and at one step sets the confession so conspicuously in its place amid the whole series of biblical revelations, that we may be loth to let it go."

## K.

*Old Testament phrases in the New Testament.*

It should be observed that in such cases the use to a greater or smaller extent of Old Testament words such as Psalm 117 or Isaiah 42<sup>1</sup>, recalled in the voice at the Baptism and at the Transfiguration, plainly cannot confine the meaning within the limits understood in Old Testament times. It is consonant with the progressive revelation of God in Christ, that to old words should be given a fuller meaning, and that the employment of them in the New Testament should not restrict the force of such a later use to the limits of their original meaning, but rather that the New Testament should build up further from the Old Testament foundation. The Old Testament element rather emphasizes the unity of God's revelation than puts a check upon its growing meaning. Thus it would be a mistake to suppose that the old Prophets, for example, could themselves have apprehended the fulness of the truth to which they looked forward. Our Lord Himself has both in the institution of His sacraments, and perhaps in the prayer which He taught, shown that to old things a new meaning can be given. We should be the slaves of the letter and not the hearers of the Spirit, if we supposed that every word of the Old Testament was stereotyped for ever in its first meaning, with no possibility of expansion. The words 'Son of God' in the New Testament may well have a richer meaning than it was possible for them to convey in former days.

## L.

*The 'Son of God' and the Divinity of Christ.*

It seems fair to consider that in the Epistles of the New

Testament, and indeed in the other records of the Apostles' attitude and belief, the title 'Son of God,' expresses what we should at the present time call the Divinity of Christ.

As has been remarked in the earlier pages of this essay, we cannot look for formulated dogmatic statements in the New Testament; it is only after conflict and contradiction that the sharper lines of definition are drawn; in Apostolic days the whole truth is there, but not yet marked out in all its parts in such a way that each aspect is set out and fenced in and fortified against aggression. Thus if the Apostles' belief in Jesus as the Son of God was at least as full and deep and real as our own, it does not follow that they would, or indeed could have expressed it in the terms that we employ, or have placed it in the light in which we should at the present time most naturally apprehend it ourselves. Different ages have different ways of putting the same inexhaustible truth, and it is the truth itself and not our own expression of it that we have to look for in an earlier age. Indeed we may say that it is a matter of the greatest importance that each age should express such truths in its own way. Otherwise there would be a real danger of subsequent ages accepting a stereotyped form from the past, with the substance gone and very likely with the very meaning of the words, in which the form has once been expressed, altered. When this last possibility has occurred, so far from possessing and expressing a truth as its very own, the subsequent age does not even accept the truth as the earlier age intended it. But the important point is that under varying conditions and the constantly altering stress from the outside put upon Christian doctrine, the particular expression of it should convey a real and living truth to those who employ it. The practical problems and the atmosphere of thought with which Christian doctrine is brought into relation are always changing, and if in Jesus the Son of God, the Word made

flesh, is the inexhaustible answer to every possible question of thought or conduct, the form of the answer will vary from time to time according to present needs and requirements. Thus on this principle there is no reason to be surprised or disappointed if in the New Testament the form of expression is not cast in such a mould as directly to meet questions which had not then been asked, and if it does not in so many words afford to us the particular statement of truth that could in our day silence every objection in the very language in which it is raised.

The phrase then 'Son of God' is one already well established in the New Testament, and carries the assertion of Divinity with it. At any rate there seems to be no adequate cause for really doubting this. Apart from the usage of the first Epistle of St. John, which is dealt with in the text, the phrase is found in its full form repeatedly, *e.g.* Rom. 1<sup>4</sup> (τοῦ ὀρισθέντος υἱοῦ θεοῦ); 2 Cor. 1<sup>10</sup>; Gal. 2<sup>20</sup>; Eph. 4<sup>18</sup>; Heb. 4<sup>14</sup>, 6<sup>6</sup>, 7<sup>3</sup>, 10<sup>29</sup>; Rev. 2<sup>18</sup>. And *His Son*, which amounts to the same thing, is as frequently found, 1 Thess. 1<sup>10</sup>; Rom. 1<sup>9</sup>, 5<sup>10</sup>, 8<sup>8</sup> (τὸν ἑαυτοῦ υἱόν), 8<sup>29</sup>, 8<sup>32</sup> (τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ); 1 Cor. 1<sup>9</sup>; Gal. 1<sup>16</sup>, 4<sup>4,6</sup>; Col. 1<sup>18</sup> (τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ). To these passages must be added those in which God is spoken of as 'Father' in close connection with our Lord, though the word 'Son' does not appear. This is frequent in the form of greeting in Epistles, 2 Cor. 1<sup>3</sup>; Eph. 1<sup>3</sup>; 1 Pet. 1<sup>3</sup>; 2 Cor. 11<sup>31</sup>. In a less close connection with our Lord the term 'Father' is applied to God *e.g.* 1 Thess. 1<sup>1</sup> and Col. 3<sup>17</sup>. In the same way 'Son,' though not definitely 'His Son,' is thus employed, Heb. 3<sup>6</sup>, 5<sup>6</sup>. In 2 Cor. 1<sup>18</sup> the phrase is ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ υἱὸς Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς ὁ ἐν ὑμῖν δι' ἡμῶν κηρυχθεὶς, where the Sonship of the Lord is represented as a part of the subject of Apostolic teaching; and this connects with the important passage Acts 9<sup>20</sup>, which tells of the first preaching of St. Paul in Damascus and marks the new



theme that his conversion had brought home to his mind, *ἐκήρυσσεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*. The phrase 'Jesus is Lord' is not equally germane to the points which we are investigating. But we may refer again to John 20<sup>31</sup>, and perhaps to Mark 1<sup>1</sup>. In this latter case the reading is uncertain but if the omission of *υἱοῦ θεοῦ* is to be preferred, yet the text that includes the words at least deserves consideration. It has been observed that if the words of St. Peter's confession, as given in St. Matthew, received the sanction of the Lord, the choice and use of the term of 'Son of God' in this high sense in the Apostolic writings is readily accounted for.

The Divinity of the Lord is of course presented in the other Christological passages, which are examined in the text, *e.g.* Phil. 2<sup>6-11</sup>; but for the moment we are only looking at the particular phrase 'Son' in the Apostolic writings. At the same time, when this question is before us, there is no need to refuse to recognize the background which these other passages form to it. The Apostolic teaching need not be kept as it were in separate and independent compartments.

## M.

### *St. Matthew 11* <sup>27</sup>.

As to the value and the admissibility of this passage Dr. Sanday says: "There is a distinct interval between the sense in which God can be claimed as Father by men, even the innermost circle of the disciples, and that in which He is Father to the Son. In this respect the passage Matt. 11<sup>27</sup> = Luke 10<sup>39</sup> is quite explicit (cf. also the graduated scale of being in Mark 13<sup>32</sup> = Matt. 24<sup>36</sup>). Although this passage stands out somewhat conspicuously in Synoptics, the context

in which it occurs is so original and so beyond the reach of invention, while it supplies so marvellously the key to that which distinguishes the history of Jesus from other histories, that doubt cannot reasonably be cast upon it. It is confirmed by the sense in which the title 'Son of God' is taken by the Jews—not merely by the populace but by the learned (Matt. 27<sup>41-48</sup>, cf. John 19<sup>7</sup>). And, on the other hand, it confirms sufficiently the substantial accuracy of like passages in the Fourth Gospel (*e.g.* 10<sup>30, 38</sup>)."

## N.

### *The use of the title in the Gospels.*

Some of the passages in the Gospels where Christ speaks of Himself and is spoken of as 'The Son of God,' are considered by critics not to represent the actual facts of the case, but to be a reflection of later usage. The language of the early Church is thought to colour these documents and to antedate the use. Such passages as those where Christ speaks of His Father 'which is in heaven' would be allowed to stand, being in conformity with ordinary Jewish use; but cardinal passages, such as St. Peter's confession, or Matt. 28<sup>19</sup>, would be open to this suspicion. Of the terms of St. Peter's confession something has been said in App. J. The passage in St. Matthew, βαπτίζοντες...εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, is of importance, containing as it does so clear an enunciation of the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity in Unity. The force of the single article and the one singular noun, τὸ ὄνομα, coupled with the separate names of the Three Persons of the Trinity, cannot be mistaken; nor must we omit the unique value of the preposition εἰς, not ἐν, which carries us so far into the meaning and the ground of Holy Baptism. But it

is just the importance of the passage, with its clear doctrinal and sacramental value, that exposes it to question. And the enquiry to which an answer is demanded is this: Was it possible for such language to be used at the date when these words are represented as being spoken? In this matter we must draw a distinction between the narrative of the Evangelists and the words they report; it is more natural that a historian should in his own framework employ the language that surrounds him at the time of his writing, than that he should throw it back also into the utterances which he records. It would be one thing to say that the narrative is open to the suspicion of reflecting a later stage of thought than existed at the times which it records, and another to say that the words which it records as spoken, have been brought into conformity with later usage. To the passages already quoted must be added Matt. 11<sup>27</sup> and Mark 13<sup>32</sup>, which, if they are not held to show the absolute use of the terms 'the Son' and 'the Father' in the Synoptists, make the area of error larger if the words have no proper place in these passages.<sup>1</sup> To these must also be added some passages of the Acts, namely 1<sup>4</sup>, 1<sup>7</sup>, 2<sup>33</sup>, where also 'the Father' is used absolutely (not 3<sup>13, 26</sup>: for there it is τὸν παῖδα, not τὸν υἱόν as A.V., but see above, p. 21): for one of the Synoptists is the author of them, and these verses further extend the support of documents in favour of the phrase. We have to note that the phrase 'Son of God' finds a place in the Epistles from the very first e.g. 1 Thess. 1<sup>10</sup>; and as shown in App. L. the direct or implied use of the title 'Son of God' in the Epistles is frequent. If we take it that 1 Thessalonians was not written later than the year 53, we are brought back rather near to the events recorded in the Gospels, because in the Epistle the title is not used as if there were something

<sup>1</sup> See the quotation in Appendix M.

novel or strange in it. At any rate in the passage quoted St. Paul takes no pains to elaborate the identification of τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ with Ἰησοῦν; the two stand side by side as if such an apposition was familiar. If then the title was so soon and so firmly established in the Epistles, it makes it easier to believe that it really was used as given in these phrases of St. Peter and of our Lord which the Synoptists quote; and "we should more easily understand the Apostolic use of the title, if there had been precedents for it on important occasions like the confession of St. Peter, when it is represented as receiving the sanction of Christ Himself." In this note we are dealing with the employment of the title and the date of its origin. The depth and extent of its meaning are discussed in App. C. and App. L.

## O.

*"The Father is greater than I."*

The passage, John 14<sup>28</sup>, ὁ πατὴρ μείζων μου ἐστίν<sup>1</sup>, has received at least two interpretations. Some have confined the reference of the statement to the Son in His Humanity, others have considered that it refers to Him as God. The context in which the words occur does not immediately decide the point. The Lord says to the disciples "If ye had been loving me, ye would have rejoiced, because I am going to the Father; because the Father is greater than I." Their minds were taken up with themselves; had they been wholly absorbed with their love for the Lord they would have entered into His feelings, and rejoiced that now He was to be exalted and to return to the Father with His work accomplished. This was the joy which they

<sup>1</sup> See Westcott, ad loc.

should have shared; and they ought to have understood better the mind of Him who for (this) "joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising shame, and hath sat down at the right hand of the throne of God." But there was more than this. On His return to the Father, the Lord's work would enter on a new stage, and would bear a richer fruit. This the Lord had from one point of view explained in the twelfth verse. "He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do; because I go unto the Father." Christ seated at the right hand of God, and present with the Church and in individual believers by the Holy Spirit, would be able to do more through the instrumentality of His disciples than He had done in the time of His life on earth. He Himself alone won the victory, through them He gathered and gathers its fruits. "Maiores fecit praedicatus a credentibus, quam locutus audientibus" (St. Augustine). When then the Lord adds "the Father is greater than I," He is speaking not merely of His return to the Father, of His Exaltation, but of the prospects of His work. This would be an additional source of joy to the disciples, but it is not stated as such; it is rather suggested as a consequence of Christ's return to the Father.

Now whether the words of the clause under consideration refer to the Lord as Man or as God, they are plainly spoken in reference to His present position; the Incarnate Son was now on His Exaltation to return (as we speak) to the Father and also to be more powerfully, if one may so say, associated with the Father, with no longer any limitations attached to Their communion or to Their fellowship in Their work for men, and the Father would now send the Holy Spirit in the name of the Son, to accomplish these greater works. The argument of the passage then merely requires that the Father should be greater than the Son was, *as the Son then spoke*; any further point as to the absolute greatness of the Father

is not necessary to the immediate reference; for the fact that the Father is greater than the Son was *when He was speaking*, is adequate for the argument, even if the absolute greatness of the Father would emphasize that truth more emphatically still. As our Lord speaks without any reservation in the clause, it seems best to take the view that He is, though applying the argument to His present situation, expressing the absolute relation of the Son to the Father.

On this view of course there is no comparison of nature between the Father and the Son; indeed among the Fathers the opinion can be found that the very possibility of instituting a comparison at all emphasizes the *identity* of nature: for things must be commensurate before they can be compared.

The comparison is one of Person, and the Father is greater than the Son because, though whatsoever things (the Father) doeth, these the Son also doeth in like manner (*ὁμοίως*), yet the Son can do nothing of Himself but what He seeth the Father do. His Being is derived from the Father, and though His Being is identical with the Father's, so that they are indivisibly One God, yet Christ has received His Being and the Father has given it to Him, and thus the Father is greater than He: for it is greater to give than to receive.

The passage was generally taken by the earlier Fathers to refer to Christ's essential Personality and as not to be restricted to His Humanity; but towards the close of the fourth century the latter view began to gain ground, and in the West, as time went on, became the generally accepted view.

Strictly speaking, as indeed the patristic writings show, these are not the only possible views as to the aspect, if one may use the word, in which Christ is less than the Father. Besides the two views already stated, namely, that the comparison is with Him (*a*) as Son of God, (*b*) as Man in the condition of His earthly life, there are also two other aspects, (*c*) as Man but in His Exaltation and glory, and (*d*) as the

Son of God but "in respect of the Incarnation." Probably, however, though we may draw these sharp lines, in reality these apparently divergent explanations are more closely connected. Once we grasp the subordination of the Son's Person, these various aspects are perhaps merely particular exhibitions or applications of the one fact, and these several interpretations of the passage are not mutually exclusive.

As a matter of fact the Incarnation itself, if reverently considered, suggests to us such a subordination. We know the Son was sent into the world, and we know that it is never said of the Father that He is sent, but He is the sender. The sent is in a position of subordination to the sender, and we may infer that whatever constituted the Father to be sender, and the Son to be sent, corresponds to some original relation in the Godhead, and that the subordination thus seen on earth first and eternally existed in the Deity itself.

Similarly the word 'sent' is used also of the Holy Spirit as sent both by the Father (John 14<sup>26</sup>, ὁ πέμψει ὁ πατήρ) and by the Son (John 15<sup>26</sup>, ὃν ἐγὼ πέμψω), and the Holy Spirit to whom the Godhead is imparted from the Father through the Son is thus Personally subordinated to the Father and to the Son. But He possesses the same unalterable Divine nature as They do: for these distinctions are of Person, not of essence: for the "Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost is all one, the Glory equal, the Majesty coeternal."

## P.

### *The contemporaneous meaning of the title.*

The use of the title 'The Son of God' as referring to our Lord, in the words of His contemporaries presents a certain difficulty.

On the one hand we must notice that the meaning of the phrase would vary according to the particular ideas of the individual who used it, and on the other there is no reason to suppose that the Lord's own use and the use of His contemporaries would be coextensive. 'The Son of God' would not have conveyed one clear definite idea to the Lord's contemporaries. It would have meant the Messiah, in whom "the sonship of Israel to God would be embodied and personally realised," but in exactly what sense the Messiah himself was the Son of God would be undetermined; individuals might well differ among themselves, and indeed the questions involved would probably not even be clearly apprehended at all, still less decided. As we look back and see the Person of Christ fulfilling all the earlier anticipations of the Messiah, and illuminating every conception previously formed of Him, it may be difficult for us to take a sufficiently detached view, and fairly to estimate the exact meaning of these anticipations, when they were only anticipations, indeterminate in character, with no complete clearly fixed presentation in them, and the key to the hopes and the questionings had not yet been given. In the light of the interpretation, that is in the light of the Incarnation, we can now see what the Jews were feeling after, but we have to bear in mind how much better we are able to do so than they could have been themselves.

There were many various streams of ideas, if we may so speak, that flowed toward and met in the conception of the Messiah; but the Jews themselves failed to effect the final combination. Had they remembered all the lines of thought that were already before them pointing to the Messiah, and spiritually tracing them out had they formed to their mind the conception of a Figure that united them all, they would have recognised the Christ when He came. Even in the study of the Prophets in their Messianic teach-



ing we have to be content with tracing here a little and there a little of the complete portraiture; and we lay special stress upon the value of a book from this very point of view, when for example, we find such notions as the King and the Sufferer beginning to be reconciled and combined in the Book of Zechariah. (Zech. 9<sup>9</sup>. "Thy King... just and saved.") In the minds of the Jews these various ideas under which they apprehended the Messiah were thus without a proper unity, and it would not be fair for us when we attempt to discover what they intended by such single titles as the Prophet (John 7<sup>40</sup>), the Son of David (Matt. 12<sup>23</sup>), the Son of God, to allow the whole Person of Christ as it presents itself to our own minds to throw back its light upon the meaning of various and separate aspects of it, as it was dimly imagined and, with an imperfect apprehension of its parts, conceived by the Jews. Some Figure, if subjectively and variously conceived, no doubt they foresaw, not merely an aggregate of attributes; but the full Person of the Lord was beyond the horizon of their vision.

On the other hand, there can be no reason to limit the Lord's application of the title to what the Jews meant; it would be more natural to suppose that He rather intended what they *ought* to have meant, so to speak, the full meaning which underlay their incomplete or even misguided apprehension. Even if, as apparently in the Book of Enoch, the preexistence of Messiah was recognized, the Jews cannot have had the same clear ideas that the Church now holds of the Eternally Begotten Son of God. It may be true that such truth as already lay within their reach in the Prophets of the Old Testament suggested, if it did not logically require, the Messiah to be in the full sense God's Son. God's full and final Representative could not really be less than God; when God was to visit His people, if another was really to bring Him near to them, He must Himself be One with God. But these are just the points to which the Jews had not

reached forward. When then the high priest asks, "Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?" there is no likelihood that, as he spoke for himself, he could have meant to ask whether Jesus was the Eternal Son of God as we now use the term. It is, of course, a separate question whether under God's providence the high priest's lips were of God's set purpose used to make a fuller declaration than the man himself was aware of (compare John 11<sup>50, 51, 52</sup>). But it would be a very different thing to say that our Lord meant no more than the high priest, that His reply was simply an acceptance of the limited title which the high priest offered.

It is important too from our own point of view to remember the distinction between the Messiah and the Son of God; this is clearly indicated in John 20<sup>31</sup>, where the phrases are used side by side. They are not co-extensive. Only by inference and implication can each be made wholly to cover the ground that belongs to the other. On the one hand the Person and work of the Son of God both eternally and in time, as we believe, is far wider than His immediate function as Messiah; had the Jews recognized in our Lord the Messiah there would still have been much more for them to learn about the Son of God. Thus after St. Peter's confession of Christ as the Messiah, the Apostles still had to be led on not merely to discard inaccurate thoughts about the Messiah (Luke 24<sup>26</sup>) but to apprehend His real Being (see further App. Q). No doubt the portrait of the Messiah as drawn bit by bit in the Old Testament does reach *towards* or even *to* the figure of the Son of God; but it could scarcely be said that the Old Testament contains it. On the other hand, the title of Messiah must by us be still safeguarded if we are to place in its historic place the work and life of our Lord. Looking back on the whole we might now be able to see how the life of Christ as He lived, and His death as He

died, *became* the Son of God, in His work as the Redeemer and Consummator of humanity; but without the record of His historic presence on earth, no one could have gathered from a view of Christ's Sonship as the Son of God all that was involved in His Messiahship, nor have independently deduced His actual life and work as the Son of Man, to which (as we speak) it was directly His Messiahship and not His Divine Sonship that led Him.

## Q.

*Lack of precision in earlier Christology.*

We are supposing nothing contrary to God's usual plan in educating the human mind, if we believe that the Apostles did not themselves come at once to the full expression of the Godhead of Christ, in its largest and most absolute bearing. In App. L. it has been shown how early the phrase 'Son of God' appears in the Epistles, and we may believe in the Gospels too; and we have further seen that there appears to be no reason to doubt that by the phrase was intended what we should now call the Divinity of Christ. But it does not follow that the contents of the phrase were from the beginning as clearly and fully apprehended as they now are. It would have been quite possible for the Apostles to recognise the Divine nature and Person of the Lord without immediately seeing or stating all that follows from it. As a speculative question it would not appeal to them; in the first instance they were preachers, preachers of "Jesus and the resurrection," and the Divine Fatherhood and the Divine Sonship would only come into their preaching as far as they tended to the accomplishment of their purpose of converting the heathen. Where in the Epistles we do find more elaborately doctrinal passages on these points, such passages are not complete teachings cast in a philosophical mould, but arise from the needs of the

moment. This is probably true even of the opening verses of the Epistle to the Hebrews; and certainly the Christological passages in the Epistles to the Colossians and Philippians were directed to meet errors of thought or conduct in those special Churches. It is not till we come to the prologue of St. John's Gospel, that we meet with the statement of the Lord's Divinity expressed in a detached or absolute manner. The general apprehension and the precise expression of a truth are not the same thing, and the latter does not necessarily keep pace with the former. To say that there is no such definite enunciation of the Lord's Divinity in the Synoptists as in St. John, does not mean that they doubted it, but that while it was the background of all they wrote or compiled, the occasion did not arise in the scope of their work to state the doctrine philosophically in so many words; and not only is such statement therefore absent, but very likely the Apostles themselves had not yet grasped the truth in what we should call a philosophical light, or rather it had not yet presented itself to their thought in this guise. Had they said anything contrary to the fulness of the Lord's Divinity, it would of course have been a very different thing. We may draw a parallel from common life; a man may behave himself towards his son as a father should, and the whole ground of his action may be his fatherhood, and yet in so many words the statement that his son is his son, need not and often is not made among those who are acquainted with them both. There are no doubt at the present day many who without in so many words expressing their belief in the Manhood or Godhead of Christ, yet think of Him in a way that really involves both. When the poor regard the Lord both as having lived the life described in the gospel story and also as being their own Friend at the present time, their thoughts involve theological truths which they may not in that shape have clearly apprehended.

We may then observe two things, first that there is nothing surprising if the Lord's Divinity is commonly assumed in the New Testament rather than stated in so many words, and secondly that such words as are used to imply or convey the truth are, if one may so say, rudimentary, complete that is as far as they go, and definite for present needs, but yet lacking philosophical precision. This however is reached in St. John. In his prologue is unfolded in its fulness that which is already implied in the earlier language but not directly stated.

We may conclude this note by quoting the words of two authorities on the question. The insight of Dr. Westcott's treatment of the subject in his Introduction to the Gospel of St. John will be remembered. In discussing the relation of the Apocalypse to the Gospel of St. John, he says :

" Under this aspect the Gospel is the spiritual interpretation of the Apocalypse. The materials of the Gospel were treasured up, pondered, illuminated as time went on. Meanwhile the active and manifold religious thought of Ephesus furnished the intellectual assistance which was needed to exhibit Christianity as the absolute and historical religion in contrast with Judaism and Heathenism. The final desolation of the centre of the old Theocracy was the decisive sign of the form which the new Faith must take. Then first, according to the divine law of order, the Spirit would guide the Apostle into all the truth. . . . The Christology of the books illustrates very remarkably the position which has been assigned to the Apocalypse as connecting the Synoptists and St. John. It is necessary then to indicate shortly the teaching of the Apocalypse on Christ's work and being.

The work of Christ is presented summarily as the victory through death of One who was truly man. . . . The exaltation of Christ followed on the completion of His earthly work, the " Lamb slain " was raised to glory. The " seven spirits of God " are His. In the heavenly sanctuary He is revealed as the divine High Priest " like a son of man ; " truly man, and yet more than man, " the living One. " He possesses divine knowledge and divine power. He receives divine honour and is joined with God, so that with God He is spoken of as one. . . . The full importance of these passages is brought out by the stern denunciations against every form of idolatry with which the book

abounds. Christ therefore is wholly separated from creatures. And further, the passages show that the imagery which is used in the Old Testament to describe the revelation of God is transferred by the writer to Christ.

One other point remains to be noticed. In the Synoptists there is no direct statement of the preexistence of Christ. The truth is recognised in the Apocalypse, but relatively rather than absolutely, Christ is spoken of as *the first and the last* (1<sup>17</sup>, 2<sup>8</sup>); *the beginning of the creation of God* (3<sup>14</sup>; comp. Prov. 8<sup>22</sup>, Col. 1<sup>15</sup>), and *the Word of God* (19<sup>10</sup>). In these phrases we find the earliest form of the "Logos doctrine" which is still kept within the lines of the Old Testament ideas. But the later unfolding of the truth is included in this earliest confession. If an Apostle was enabled to see in the Master whom he had followed the Being to whom all creation pays homage in the spiritual world, there is no difficulty in apprehending how he could rise, without doing violence to the laws of human thought, to the enunciation of the fact on which the Fourth Gospel is a commentary, *the Word became flesh and dwelt among us, and we beheld His glory.*

In a word, the study of the Synoptists, of the Apocalypse and of the Gospel of St. John in succession enables us to see under what human conditions the full majesty of Christ was perceived and declared, not all at once, but step by step, and by the help of the old prophetic teaching."

And to quote from a recent work, the progressive character of the apprehension and expression of the dignity of Christ as shown in the New Testament, is clearly drawn by Dr. Agar Beet (*Hastings' Dictionary*, vol. I. pp. 387, 388).

"In this harmonious account, by various writers, of the dignity of Christ we notice marks of development. In the Synoptic Gospels we find it in its most rudimentary form; in the Epistles of St. Paul it is more fully developed; in the Fourth Gospel the development is complete. Even within the writings of St. Paul, and again within the Fourth Gospel we notice development. In 1 Cor. 8<sup>6</sup>, we read of 'one Lord, through whom are all things'; and in Col. 1<sup>16, 17</sup>, written in the mature thought of St. Paul's first imprisonment, we read that the Son existed before all creatures, and that through His agency even the successive ranks of angels were created,—a thought much in advance of anything in his earlier Epistles. Very much in advance of Christ's teaching about Himself before His death, are the exclamation of Thomas, and the assertion of the evangelist that "the Word was God."

It is worthy of note that this development proceeds always on the same lines, that whatever we read about Christ in the Epistles of St. Paul, and indeed in the Fourth Gospel, is either a necessary inference from the teaching of Christ about Himself in the First Gospel, or is needful in order to give to that teaching unity and intelligibility. Between the accounts of the dignity of Christ given by the different writers of the New Testament there is no contradiction. They differ only in their degree of definiteness and completeness. Indeed there is much greater difference between Matt. 19<sup>17</sup> and 28<sup>19</sup>, and between John 1<sup>1</sup> and 14<sup>28</sup>, than between the teaching of the First Gospel, taken as a whole, and that of the Fourth.

Possibly, the more fully developed teaching of the Epistles of St. Paul and of the Fourth Gospel about the Son of God may, in its literary form, have been influenced by gentile modes of thought and expression. Certainly, St. Paul's modes of thought and expression were moulded by his gentile surroundings. But the complete harmony of all New Testament writers about the Son of God, and the infinite gulf which separates their teaching from all other earlier or contemporary teaching, leave no room for substantial contributions from sources external to Israel....The definite and complex and yet harmonious conception of God, which underlies the teaching about Christ of the various writers of the New Testament, is altogether different from every conception of God set forth in the entire literature of the world, except so far as later literature has been moulded by Christian teaching. It is a matter of simple historical fact that the New Testament embodies a complete revolution in man's thought about God."

## R.

### *Another view of Heb. 1 1-4.*

As against the view here taken it is proper to state another view of the passage presented if not advocated by Dr. Sanday. "Because the relative clauses refer to the Son, it does not quite necessarily follow that they refer to Him as Son. It may be urged that the main contrast in the passage is between the previous revelations through the prophets and the final revelation through the Son, *i.e.* the

Incarnate Son, and that this contrast dominates the whole passage, many parts of which do indeed point to the Son as Incarnate ("whom he appointed heir of all things," "when he made purification of sins," "sat down at the right hand"). The other clauses, which imply preexistence, would then be referred to the Son not strictly as such, but by a slight and quite natural laxity of language to Him who [afterwards, in view of His Incarnation] came to be specially called 'Son.' This second way of taking the passage is not really stretched beyond what is common enough in language, though the first would be more accurate."

## S.

### *The Virgin Birth of the Lord.*

Perhaps it is necessary to say if only a few words on the subject of the Virgin Birth of the Lord, which apart from the record of St. Matthew and St. Luke, seems to be antecedently probable, one might almost say necessarily involved, in an adequate view of the Incarnation.

One born of two sinful parents, in the way that every one else is born, would by ordinary heredity derive from them the nature of a mere man, as that nature now is; and though man was created without sin, so that sin is not necessary to his humanity, yet as a matter of fact the nature of all men is now sinful. That our Lord was sinless needs no proof; that His own sinlessness was a necessary condition to His work for others, seems equally plain. The Virgin Birth under the power of the Holy Spirit (one speaks with all reverence) appears to be exactly what was needed to make the Lord's Humanity sinless as well as real.

It is hard to see how one conceived in the ordinary



way could offer a true point of union between God and man. From the very beginning of the Incarnation, He who was to unite God and man must have had the nature of both, and these two united in One Person. If the Lord had been generated as a mere man, and had only subsequently by some divine power become the Son of God, two Persons, one human and the other Divine, would have coexisted in Him; but there would have been no true union of two natures in One Person, and God and man would have been as far apart as ever.

On the other hand if the Godhead is regarded as merely some divine afflatus without Personality at all, the position remains the same; there is no vital point of union between God and man.

Or again, if we suppose that the Lord was begotten and conceived in the usual way, and that from the beginning the Godhead rested in Him, concurrently and simultaneously, so to speak, with the inception of His human nature, we do not even so get a satisfactory theory. It is true we may thus think of the Divine power as removing the sinfulness of ordinary human nature, as curing 'the ineradicable taint of sin,' to use Byron's phrase. But such a connection, however remedial on the human side, is not therefore any the more vital on the Divine side, and tends towards representing the Divine power in Him, on this hypothesis in *all other* respects an ordinary man among men, as at least similar to that which rested in Apostles and Prophets. It looks rather a question of degree than of kind; there is nothing from the beginning of the human nature that either shows, or as we may speak, constitutes the Incarnate Lord's relation to the Father as unique and belonging to another order. If this relation is unique, it comes sufficiently with the range of human life — to which of course on the one side the Incarnation belongs — for us to expect to be enabled to recognize some sign of the fact from the human side in some

special and unique characteristics of the case being revealed to us. Such is the Virgin Birth, leaving one aspect of the human side of the Incarnation not inclosed within human relationships but, as it were, open towards the Godhead. By the Virgin Birth it is shewn that the *natural* relationships of the Lord are not exhausted by those which belong to His human life.

We must no doubt be careful not to use such language as would in its strict application make God the Father actually a *human* Father to the Lord. Nothing in Holy Scripture is separately said of the part taken by God the Father in the Lord's human birth; only we have τὸ γεννώμενον ἅγιον κληθήσεται, υἱὸς θεοῦ (Luke 1<sup>36</sup>), and the action of the Holy Spirit is described in the words τὸ ἐν αὐτῇ γεννηθὲν ἐκ πνεύματος ἐστὶν ἁγίου (Matt. 1<sup>20</sup>), and more particularly πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σέ (Luke 1<sup>36</sup>, compare Ignatius, Eph. 1<sup>8</sup>, ὁ γὰρ θεὸς ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς ἐκνοφορήθη ὑπὸ Μαρίας κατ' οἰκονομίαν ἐκ σπέρματος μὲν Δαυεὶδ πνεύματος δὲ ἁγίου). But the truth of the unique Divine Sonship of the Incarnate, although in the *manifest* of its achievement necessarily beyond the range of our thought, the truth that the Son of God by a living union united human nature to His Divine nature in His One Person, comes nearer within the grasp of our mind, if we think that in the Son of Man the Divine Fatherhood replaced any human Fatherhood, and that according to the analogy of human sonship, in His case too, there was no other who could in any sense share the name of Father with His One Father. In this connection we may notice Luke 2<sup>49-50</sup>, καὶ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτοὺς, Τί ὅτι ἐζητεῖτέ με; οὐκ ᾔδειτε ὅτι ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μου δεῖ εἶναί με; καὶ αὐτοὶ οὐ συνῆκαν τὸ ῥῆμα ὃ ἐλάλησεν αὐτοῖς; and the significant contrast with τοῦ πατρὸς μου in Matt. 12<sup>40, 60</sup>, εἶπεν Ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ μου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί μου. ὅστις γὰρ

ἀν ποιήσῃ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς, αὐτός μου ἀδελφός καὶ ἀδελφή καὶ μήτηρ ἐστίν.

There is another point to be borne in mind. We are not led to believe that the Lord's relation to humanity is exhausted in saying that He was (and is) a man. 'Ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο means that, but much more; the Lord took to Himself the whole of human nature, which, as we see it, is widely differentiated and, so to speak, dispersed in various individuals according to their sex, age, country, temperament and so on. But the Lord took the whole in its completeness, and thus He is for all men in His Humanity the centre of union to which all alike are potentially united; and thus through the union of the two natures in His One Person He is the one link between men and God, εἰς...μεσίτης θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων (1 Tim. 2<sup>5</sup>). This consideration underlies St. Paul's characteristic teaching in connection with the phrase ἐν χριστῷ and the second Adam; it underlies the parable of the vine, and finds expression in Gal. 3<sup>28</sup>, πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἰς (not ἓν) ἐστὲ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. This aspect of the question however has been somewhat fully dealt with in the present writer's essay 'De Filio Hominiis,' to which reference may be permitted. If the Lord had been born as any other man, his human nature would, so we must suppose, have been individual and not universal; He would in His human nature simply have become one more man among many others, but He would not have occupied an inherently unique position in regard to the race. Had the Lord had a human father, His human nature would have been limited by that of His father and His mother and circumscribed on both sides, and thus would have been confined within the limits of His descent. The Virgin Birth prevents such a restriction as ordinary heredity would have imposed, while at the same time it makes the human

nature real and is opposed to any docetic error, and shews 'Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθότα.

The manner in which the hypostatic union was effected is, as we have said, quite beyond our apprehension, and if the doctrine of the Virgin Birth was no more than a theory on that point it would be merely a matter of opinion. There may be some who regard the doctrine in this light, and while believing in the Incarnation find themselves unable to accept this as the particular manner of it, supporting their disinclination by such readings of the text of Matt. 1<sup>18</sup> as represent Joseph as the father of Jesus, or by difficulties arising or supposed to arise, with reference to the meaning of ἡ παρθένος (Heb. *ἡ ἁγία*) in Isaiah 7<sup>14</sup> as quoted, and on one view misapplied, by St. Matthew. To such persons we may, if in a new sense, apply the language of Ignatius, *ἔλαθεν... ἡ παρθενία Μαρίας καὶ ὁ τοκετὸς αὐτῆς*. But they are in a very different position to those who do not accept the Incarnation of our Lord at all; they may be wrong in their views as to the early chapters of St. Matthew and St. Luke, and they may have failed to appreciate the true position and underlying importance of the doctrine. But we may still accept them as fellow believers in Christ as God made Man. Such a friendly attitude however towards them will not change the personal view of those who on the one hand are prepared to accept the statements of St. Matthew and St. Luke, as we find them in the better attested texts, and on the other hand could not give their adhesion to any statement of the case which regarded the Virgin Birth as *merely* affecting the *mode* of the Incarnation, and as having no special relation that we can follow to the intention of it. For this is, to say the least, an incomplete view. No doubt the Virgin Birth may be said primarily to concern the manner of the Incarnation, yet the considerations just urged seem to show that the denial of the Virgin

Birth really touches the efficacy of the Incarnation. Though we might not have been able to predict the Virgin Birth, or, before experience, have regarded it as the divine manner of an Incarnation, yet none the less, as we look back, we can in the light of God's revelation humbly recognize and welcome its necessary fitness.

## T.

### *The view of the early Church.*

In this dissertation the actual words of Scripture have been closely adhered to. It has been no part of the essay to discuss the attitude of the early Church after the close of the Canon. But in interpreting what Holy Scripture said and says, we may aid our own attempts to recognise its meaning, by considering the views and attitude of believers of early days; and it is only proper to carry the matter one step further by at least a reference to this question as dealt with in the concluding portion of the article in Hasting's Dictionary, vol. 4, p. 578, and in 'The Apostles' Creed,' by Dr. Swete, pp. 26—29.

In this case, as in dealing with the words of the New Testament, it is difficult to get away from the inherent difficulty belonging to the word *υἱός*, which may refer to the Son as Incarnate, and may refer to the preexistent Sonship, and thirdly may include both references. Thus Ignatius (Smyrn. i. 1) uses the words *πεπληροφορημένους εἰς τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν ἀληθῶς ὄντα ἐκ γένους Δαυεὶδ κατὰ σάρκα, υἱὸν Θεοῦ κατὰ θέλημα καὶ δύναμιν, γεγεννημένον ἀληθῶς | ἐκ | παρθένου*. Here, as in the New Testament, we may find it hard absolutely to contradict those who maintain that 'the Son of God' refers to the Incarnate Sonship, though it is more natural

to take the first two clauses as complementary, than to take *υἰόν* as either coextensive with or including the fact expressed by *ἐκ γένους Δαυεΐδ*; the *γεγεννημένον*, especially with *ἀληθῶς*, seems not to explain *υἰόν* but rather to be in contrast to it. Another passage of Ignatius telling for the preexistent Sonship is Magn. vi. 1, *Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ ὃς πρὸ αἰώνων παρὰ πατρὶ ἦν καὶ ἐν τέλει ἐφάνη*. Here it will be observed that the Fatherly—and presumably the Filial—relation is before the worlds (*πρὸ αἰώνων*). Dr. Lightfoot in discussing the relation of *ἀγέννητος* to *ἀγένητος* (Ignatius Ep. to Eph. p. 92) writes "Whenever...in Ignatius we have *ἀγέννητος*," which refers to generation, "where we should expect *ἀγένητος*," which refers to creation, "we must ascribe the fact to the indistinctness of the writer's theological conceptions, not to any obliteration of the meaning of the terms themselves. To this early Father for instance the eternal *γέννησις* of the Son was not a distinct theological idea, though substantially he held the same views as the Nicene Fathers respecting the Person of Christ."

The words of Aristides tell in this direction, *οὗτος δὲ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου ὁμολογεῖται...ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ καταβάς*. (See John 3<sup>28</sup>, and above p. 115). In Barnabas we have the plural of Gen. 1<sup>26</sup> "Let us make" taken as spoken to the Son. In Hermas the Son, by that title, is spoken of as prior to creation *ὁ μὲν υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ πάσης τῆς κτίσεως αὐτοῦ προγενέστερός ἐστιν*. Thus it is in Hermas that Harnack finds the first fusion of the two Christologies referred to in App. A. In Justin the pre-existence of the Son as such is clearly spoken of, and He is unreservedly identified with the Logos. He writes *μονογενῆς ἦν τῷ πατρὶ τῶν ὄλων, ἰδίως ἐξ αὐτοῦ λόγος καὶ δύναμις γεγεννημένος*, and *ὁ δὲ υἱὸς ἐκείνου, ὁ μόνος λεγόμενος κυρίως υἱός, ὁ λόγος πρὸ τῶν ποιημάτων καὶ συνῶν καὶ γεννώμενος*. The only way to evade the force

of such passages as this, is to say that when the word *υἱός* is used, it means Him who subsequently came to be known as *υἱός* through the human birth and was not yet *υἱός* at the time to which the phrase refers. But this seems out of the question; indeed it comes near to refusing to allow any language to convey the idea of preexistent Sonship.

It should be pointed out that the question as to the belief in the preexistence of the Son in the minds of those who in earliest days used the Apostles' Creed, is not quite the same question as the first meaning of the words *unicum Filium eius* in the Creed itself. So far as concerns the actual words of the Creed, it may be possible to suppose that the assertion contained in *unicum Filium* refers to the historic birth when it is taken in connection with the clause *Qui natus est de Spiritu sancto ex Maria virgine* (ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου); this is maintained by those who consider that the first interest in this paragraph of the Creed is in historical facts. But even so it may yet be truly said that there "is still no antithesis to the Christology of preexistence. The question is not really raised; and yet, as we might perhaps put it, the conception of Sonship is left open on that side. The Creed is in its origin Western and not oriental. And for Western thought more especially, the denial of a purely natural birth may be taken to imply preexistence." It is however rather a large concession to suppose that in the second paragraph of the Creed the historical complexion of the clauses which refer to the Lord's life and death on earth and His exaltation, necessarily colours the first clause, which may be regarded as more introductory and defining in its character. We have already seen that the belief in the preexistence of the Son is clearly found in Hermas and in Justin, and therefore, even supposing for the moment that we were indisposed to accept such a

belief as belonging to the earliest age, we should still have to allow that it was probably contemporary with, if not earlier than, the formation of the Apostles' Creed. The difficulties that have been shown (App. C.) to attach to the pursuit of the question as to the meaning of *υῖός* in the New Testament as applied to the Lord will be remembered; and there need not be repeated here what is said there both as to the Incarnation of the Lord being the central thought of our religion, and as to the necessary difficulty of absolutely excluding any possible reference to the Sonship of the Son as Incarnate in passages where the word *υῖός* occurs.

The attitude of Marcellus of Ancyra<sup>1</sup> must not be entirely passed over; though different views are maintained as to his sincerity and as to the ideas he held, or was supposed to hold, on this subject. He has been regarded as a trimmer on the one hand, while others have spoken of the "earnest zeal and high character of the man who for years stood side by side with Athanasius." As to his views, it is plain that he limited the title Son to the Incarnate Son; what he really meant by doing so is less clear. It may have been his way of denying the pre-existence of the Son altogether under any name or form of existence; when he claimed that the title Logos was the correct designation of the Preincarnate, it may have been for the reason that to the Logos he allowed no personality at all, and therefore considered it the proper phrase to use, just because it carried no meaning of pre-existence. So he both refused the title Son and allowed the title Logos to the Preincarnate for the same reason, which was that he wished to deny His preexistence;

<sup>1</sup> For various appreciations of Marcellus see Hasting's Dictionary, Vol. 4, p. 578, Gwatkin, 'Studies of Arianism,' pp. 75—83, Moberly, 'Atonement and Personality,' pp. 208—215.



for to call Him Son before the human birth would have allowed Him already to be personally existing, while to call Him Logos did not, as it was, on this view, an impersonal title. Accordingly Marcellus has been thus criticised<sup>1</sup>:

"The danger from Marcellus was not imaginary. As far as doctrine went, there was not much to choose between him and Arius..... Instead of destroying Arianism by the roots, he returned to something very like the obsolete error of Sabellianism. In his doctrine the Son of God is a mere phenomenon of time; and even the Logos is as external to the divine essence as the Arian Son..... Resting on the doctrine of the Logos like the apologists and Irenæus, Marcellus abandoned the eternal Sonship—the one solid conquest of the last generation, and brought back the whole question into the old indefiniteness from which a century of toil had hardly rescued it."

Others have understood Marcellus more favourably and have considered that what he meant to do was not to deny the preexistence of the Son altogether, but only a preexistence as Son. The Second Person in the Blessed Trinity was preexistent, but as Logos (implying a distinct personal existence) not as Son; the name Son, and the fact of Sonship belonging to the Incarnate and not to the Preincarnate. His aim was to answer the Arians who from the idea of Sonship argued the inferiority of the Son, and maintained that He could not have been existent from all eternity. Marcellus meets their contention by removing the whole ground of the argument with a denial that in the Bible the term Son was applied at all to the Lord otherwise than as Incarnate, the apparent exceptions being capable of satisfactory explanation. On this side we may quote the concluding words of the article already referred to<sup>1</sup>:

"The assertion of Marcellus in regard to the biblical usage was really very much in the right direction, though—as is so often the case with the ancients, when they have got hold of a right principle in criticism or exegesis—it is rather too sweeping and unqualified.

<sup>1</sup> See the references given on the preceding page.

---

As compared with Marcellus and the modern revivers of his opinion, our own conclusion from the evidence passed in review would be, that while it is undoubtedly true that the biblical writers and the other early Christian writers before Justin start from the Incarnation and are thinking primarily of this, their thought does not necessarily end with it. It seems to point backwards into the dim past behind it. Certainly there is no sharp line of demarcation restricting the meaning of the title to the incarnate state and no other. The writers are so far from guarding themselves against any reference beyond the Incarnation that they seem rather naturally to suggest it. The Son is so called primarily as incarnate. But that which is the essence of the Incarnation must needs be also larger than the Incarnation. It must needs have its roots in the eternity of Godhead."