

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

ON THE GOD-MAN.

II. THE INCARNATION AND HUMAN NATURE.

CORRESPONDING to the humanity in God is the divine in man. As the Son of God reaches forward His hand to man, so man rises to meet Him in religion, which may be defined as subordination to God springing, in its highest form, from the filial spirit; and, therefore, resemblance to the Son of God. If the Son is eternally subordinate to the Father, and, because He is the Son, capable of becoming and willing to become man, human nature also is capable of sonship, that is, divine origination and subordination, and can be elevated into a fit shrine of Deity. How are the ideal humanity in God and the actual humanity related? We have hitherto considered the subject in relation to the Trinity. We have seen the humanity of God manifesting itself in the Son as He is the eternal Archetype of man. When we come down to the Son's actual appearance on earth, the same great conception of the Son of God as the Archetype of man meets us from the first, and dominates the character of the theology of the Incarnation in the three most original of the first expounders of Christianity, the Evangelist John, the Apostle Paul, and the unknown writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews. We shall consider them in order.

(i.) Among the writers of the New Testament John is famous for the prominence of the name Logos in his Gospel;¹ and the conception, though not the word, occu-

¹ The Jchannean authorship of the Fourth Gospel is admitted by Beyschlag and by Principal Drummond in his able and candid *Hibbert Lectures*, "Via, Veritas, Vita," p. 308.

pies as great a place in the epistles of Paul and the Epistle to the Hebrews. The root idea of the Trinity is that God is love; and the obscurity that involves the conception in the Old Testament arises from the absence, in some measure, of a revelation of the ethical character of the Most High. But an easier and nearer description prepares for the conception of God's love. The attribute of wisdom is personified. "Doth not wisdom cry, and understanding put forth her voice?"¹ Under the influence of the Alexandrian philosophy the conception of wisdom becomes more speculative in the Apocryphal books, as in Baruch;² and in the Wisdom of Solomon³ it is represented as an emanation (*ἀπόρροια*) of God, and the effulgence (*ἀπαύγασμα*) of His everlasting light. Wisdom loves men,⁴ and appears in connection with the Logos.⁵ In the Book of Enoch⁶ Messiah is described as having the spirit of wisdom. Turning to ethnic speculations, the "Reason" (*λόγος*) of Heraclitus, and the "Ideas" of Plato and the Stoics, notwithstanding inconsistent elements, such as the Stoic materialism, join the Hebrew stream in the Alexandrian Philo. He speaks of the Logos as superhuman and divine, on the one hand, and, on the other, as "the heavenly Man," "the Archetype of man." He speaks also of man as the most God-like thing in the Kosmos, an impression of a beautiful image, stamped with the pattern of the archetypal rational idea. But the two elements lie apart, without fusion. The Logos is never represented as incarnate. And the arguments of Mr. F. C. Conybeare⁷ in favour of the view that Philo regarded the Logos as a real Person, and not a mere personification of the highest of the divine powers, are too uncertain, to say the least, to warrant us in

¹ Prov. viii. 1. The chapter is throughout instructive.

² Bar. iii. 28.

³ Wisd. vii. 25.

⁴ *ib.* vii. 21.

⁵ *ib.* xvi. 13.

⁶ En. xlii. 1; xlix. 3.

⁷ *The Jewish Quarterly Review* for July, 1895.

inferring that the Logos-ship was attributed afterwards to Jesus of Nazareth because of the quasi-human elements in Philo's conception of the Logos. The writer is nearer the truth when he says "that the notion of an incarnation would doubtless have shocked Philo." The incarnation, as well as the cross, would have been a stumbling-block to Jews. Yet all these sources contribute their share to the form which the New Testament idea assumed, and make it intelligible to all classes and nations, though it is probable that the Apostle John knew nothing about either Greek philosophy or Philo. At least, the conception of the Logos in his Gospel as making the *ἐνανθρώπησις* possible, and the identification of the Logos with Jesus, seems to be perfectly original¹ and independent, and to have been suggested by our Lord's moral greatness. When revealed, the conception of the incarnate Logos becomes at once complete,—the greatest truth of the New Testament, the foundation of all truths, the meeting point of anthropocentric and theocentric theology. The prologue of John's Gospel combines in a marvellous way the highest Christological conception of the Logos with the minutest historical account of the doings and sayings of Jesus. Harnack has said that this prologue "is a mystery, not the solution of one."² The Epistle to the Hebrews also starts with the pre-existent Logos, an idea not directly made use of in the rest of the treatise. The prologue of John is really the prologue of the entire New Testament, and its central idea is that the Logos *was* God and *became* flesh.

(ii.) It is more especially in the Apostle Paul's system

¹ The originality of John is maintained by Bishop Westcott, who observes "that the assumption of humanity by the Word, who is God, was a truth undreamt of till it was realized" (*Gospel of Life*, p. 252); by Illingworth (*Bampton Lectures*, p. 66); and Drummond (*Via, Veritas, Vita*, p. 307). But, if John teaches only a humanitarian Christ, I can see nothing new, in the thought "that the utterance of the Eternal Reason speaks directly to the soul."

² *History of Dogma*, vol. i. p. 97, E.T.

that we find this idea yielding the richest harvest. We must, therefore, give an account of it at somewhat greater length. We may briefly characterize his theology as centring in the conception of the "Second Adam." But it connects itself with three features that stand out prominent in the life of Jesus Christ: (1) The first is His perfect sinlessness: "For He hath made Him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him."¹ In Paul's theology of redemption, taken in connection with his doctrine of universal and natural sinfulness, the sinlessness of Jesus was a necessary condition of the merits of His death. (2) The second is the tradition of His virgin-birth: "But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under the law."² This we believe to be a veiled, but very significant, allusion to the miraculous birth of Jesus, and a declaration that a life previously free from the law was ushered into the world, and redeemed us that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons; and, because we are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father; wherefore we are no more servants, but sons. Redemption procures, in Paul's theology, real sonship through adoption. (3) The third is the name by which Jesus nearly always speaks of Himself, Son of Man, or, as the Apostle designates Him, "the second Adam": "The last Adam was made a quickening Spirit."³ Christ is the second beginning of humanity. Redemption delivers men, not merely from personal sin, but also from the guilt of the race.

Let us consider these sources from which we think the theology of the Apostle Paul is historically derived.

(1) *The Sinlessness of Jesus.*

"The Religion of Jesus" has been proposed by Mar-

¹ 2 Cor. v. 21.

² Gal. iv. 4.

³ 1 Cor. xv. 46.

tineau, following a suggestion of Lessing, as a better name than Christianity. The usual designation comprises a wider field, the relations of Christ to other men, and the universally diffused system of religion arising from those relations. But even they originate in what Jesus was personally; and in that respect we may call Christianity a religion that rests essentially on the unique and perfect piety of Jesus, and consists in a veritable "*imitatio Christi*." The New Testament describes Jesus as a Holy Man, and as the only Sinless Man that ever lived and died on earth. This was the impression made upon all that saw Him. It was the universal tradition among His followers. So powerful was this belief that, whatever other causes may have given birth to the Christian Church, we may be sure that they would all have been insufficient, if this element had been wanting. Even the prophet contrasts the guilt of Israel with the absolute sinlessness of Messiah.¹ The New Testament is full of it, is saturated with it. The words spoken to Mary by the angel, "that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God," express not merely the consecration of the firstborn to the service of the Lord,² but such sinlessness as had not yet been found or expected among the children of men. The anticipations of His mother are in the subsequent history realized in His own consciousness. In His early years He has free and happy fellowship with God; His agony begins very near His death. The opposite would be the case of a good man who is conscious of sin, and, as a matter of fact, we often see men ending their life in great peace, whose youth was marked with conflict and anguish. That He was sinless became the unbroken conviction of all His contemporaries, whether friends or enemies, so that He dares to face the world with the challenge, "Who of you convinceth me of

¹ Isa. xlvi. 1-8, compared with liii. 9.

² Luke i. 35; ii. 23.

sin?"¹ One of the latest of the New Testament writers brings Christ's personal sinlessness to the front to prove His fitness to be the High Priest: "For such an high priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens."² Sinlessness in Him is not merely a neutral quality, or innocence, as it was in the first Adam. The New Testament speaks of His being tempted; and temptation means nothing if it does not comprise striving against sin. Hence we are exhorted, in the same wonderful epistle, to "look unto Jesus, the author and finisher of faith":³ the great exemplar, because the victor, in the fight. The words, "For we have not an high priest who cannot be touched by the feeling of our infirmities, but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin,"⁴ must mean that, though He was tempted to sin, the conflict left Him immaculate. The meaning is, not that though He was tried in various ways, He was not tried by being tempted to sin. That temptation to sin is possible to a sinless man we know, from the fact of the fall. How the God-Man could be tempted we may not be able to discover. But there can be no doubt that Jesus Christ during His life on earth was being perfected or made holy by discipline. The Epistle to the Hebrews states this clearly: "He learned obedience by the things which He suffered," and His sufferings included "prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto Him that was able to save Him from death."⁵ The process of perfecting commenced at the beginning of His life, when "the child grew and waxed strong in spirit . . . and increased in wisdom and stature and in favour with God and man."⁶ It was brought to a close in his obedience unto death.

The temptations of Jesus Christ arose from His claim

¹ John viii. 46.

² Heb. vii. 26.

³ Heb. xii. 3.

⁴ Heb. iv. 15.

⁵ Heb. v. 7.

⁶ Luke i. 80; ii. 52.

to be Messiah. They were addressed to sinless needs and desires of the Man. Taking the order in Matthew, the first temptation, "If Thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread," assails His faith in God and suggests doubt. The second is a temptation to presumption and is designed to incite to fanaticism, the opposite tendency in human nature. The third temptation points out an easy way to success in Messiah's work. When Satan failed to tempt Him to scepticism and fanaticism, and failed also to stir in His breast the ordinary motives of men, neither sceptical nor fanatical, but worldly wise, he leaves Him "for a time." When next "the prince of this world comes" to Jesus, "He hath nothing in Him."¹ After repeated failures he tried at last to discourage Him with forebodings of utter defeat with regard to the great object of His life. But Jesus knew from the beginning what all good men come to understand at last, that true victory is apparent defeat, or, as He Himself expressed it, "that, except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit."² All these temptations found "nothing in Him"—no sin on which to fasten in the spirit of Messiah, and after spending their force they leave Him stainless, as man, and, therefore more than man.

Again, the sinlessness of Christ is not a mere instinct, but has its root in His personal free act. That is the reason why He required the help of the Spirit of God as other men do. Holsten³ and Irving⁴ maintained, on the contrary, from Romans viii. 3, that the Son of God took upon Him *sinful* flesh. But, as Meyer⁵ points out, they

¹ John xiv. 30.

² John xii. 24.

³ *Zum Evangelium*, etc., p. 436.

⁴ *Collected Writings*, vol. v., p. 146, criticised by Bruce, *Humiliation*, etc., p. 270. But "redemption by sample" may be held without supposing Christ's flesh to have been sinful. See Du Bose, chap. xiii.

⁵ *In loc.*

fail to observe that the Apostle lays emphasis on the word "likeness."

Again, the fact that Jesus never confessed sin implies, in His case, that He never did sin.¹ In every other good man the saintlier he becomes the more pitiless is his self-condemnation, and the more severe he is on certain kinds of sin, such as hypocrisy. But Jesus, if He were a sinner, was guilty of the very worst forms of sin, which He rebuked with burning anger in the Pharisees of His day. Yet He never accuses Himself. He calls Himself a green branch, in contrast to the dry,² and the Apostle Paul says that, when Christ "was manifested in the flesh, He was justified in the spirit," *i.e.*, in His innermost consciousness.³ His life was so blameless that the Apostle Peter was not afraid of openly declaring that He "did no sin, neither was guile found in His mouth."⁴ Baptism was not to Him the sacrament of repentance; nor is it so represented anywhere in the Gospels. It was a sacramental recognition of Him as Messiah.⁵ He never speaks about redeeming Himself, but declares Himself to be the paschal lamb, "whose blood of the new covenant is shed for many unto the remission of sins."⁶

These considerations are conclusive as to the sinlessness of Jesus.

(2) *The birth of Jesus from a Virgin.*

The virgin-birth has, it must be confessed, the appearance of a myth, not only to those who cannot admit the possibility of miracles,⁷ but also to one who finds no

¹ For a most successful presentation of this argument cf. Mozley, *Lectures and other Theological Papers*, p. 116, and Godet, *Lectures in Defence of the Christian Faith*, p. 236: "The holier a man is the clearer is his perception of moral evil."

² Luke xxiii. 30.

³ 1 Tim. iii. 9.

⁴ 1 Pet. ii. 22.

⁵ John i. 33; iii. 36. Cf. Tert., *De Baptismo*, xii., "Ipse Dominus nullius penitentiae debitor tinctus est: peccatoribus non fuit necesse?"

⁶ Matt. xxvi. 28.

⁷ Cf. Dr. Stopford Brooke's, *God and Christ*, p. 182. On the other side, in

difficulty in accepting them. For, supposing it to be a myth, we easily account for its having arisen as the fulfilment of the prophecy in Isaiah vii. 14. The evangelist Matthew plainly declares that "all this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Behold a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call His name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is God with us."¹ The Evangelist has adopted the translation of the Septuagint, *παρθένος*.² Harnack³ refers the belief to post-apostolic times, and Dr. Bruce⁴ admits that it is a later addition prefixed to the evangelic story of the public ministry and the final sufferings of Jesus. Godet, on the other hand, thinks "a narrative so perfect could only have emanated from the holy sphere within which the mystery was accomplished." "A later origin," he says, "would inevitably have betrayed itself by some foreign element."⁵ Certainly we can at once understand why it was kept "a family secret" and one of the three mysteries which, as Ignatius⁶ tells us, "were wrought in the silence of God." (A sure evidence, by the way, that the Fourth Gospel, which does not mention it, was not written in the second century, when, as Ignatius says, the mystery of the virgin-birth

defence, cf. an article by Prof. Ince, in the *EXPOSITOR* for June, 1895. A correspondence on the question appeared recently in the *Academy*.

¹ Matt. i. 22, 23.

² Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion have *παρβίς* (as the three are found in Origen's Hexapla). The Hebrew is 'almah. Jerome, Vitringa, Pusey, Alexander, accept the rendering "virgin." Delitzsch and Kay adopt the same rendering, but from the context, not from the derivation or usage. Driver, Cheyne, Kirkpatrick, concur in saying that 'almah is not the usual term for "virgin." Cf. also Schultz (*Theology of the Old Testament*), and Briggs (*Messianic Prophecy*). Sir E. Strachey's *Jewish History and Politics* may still be read with advantage, p. 109.

³ Cited by Swete, *ut infra*.

⁴ *Apologetics*, p. 409.

⁵ *On Luke* i. 28.

⁶ *Ad Eph.* 19. The three mysteries were ἡ παρθένη Μαρίας, ὁ τοκεὶς αὐτῆς, and ὁ θάνατος τοῦ Κυρίου.

of Jesus "was proclaimed to all.") We believe the virgin-birth to have been a fact, however strange it appears at first, and however difficult it may be to harmonize the genealogies and to explain the relation of the "brethren" of Jesus, and however easy it would be to account for the origin of the myth.¹ Mark, who is now supposed to have been the earliest of the evangelists, may not have heard of it, and the author of the Fourth Gospel, whom the critics believe in these days with increasingly general consent to have been the Apostle John, and to whom our Lord on the Cross committed the care of His mother, would naturally, in speaking of the Divine origin of Christ, omit the manner of His human birth. Matthew, probably, gives the account which he received from Joseph, whose genealogy he traces. Luke, we may surmise, received "the secret" from the Virgin herself; and it is very unlikely that he would have kept it from the Apostle Paul. The words "made of a woman"² we have already taken to be a covert allusion to the same mystery. They mean that He who was made in a miraculous manner of a woman only, so that He was not subject to original sin, as all other descendants of the first Adam, according to the Pauline anthropology, were, was yet made under the law.

This is really its dogmatic significance. The fathers, in order to obviate the supposition of our Lord's natural depravity, speaks of the purification of the Virgin before His birth. So Gregory Nazianzen,³ Leo,⁴ and John Damascene,⁵ who says "that the holy thing born of Mary was

¹ The student who desires to trace the tradition as far back as possible will find very cogent arguments in its favour in Prof. Swete's book on *The Apostles' Creed* (pp. 42-55).

² Gal. iv. 4.

³ Or. 38, *κυθεις μὲν ἐκ τῆς Παρθένου καὶ ψυχὴν καὶ σαρκὰ προκαθαρθείσης τῷ πνεύματι.*

⁴ *Serm. XXII. iii.*, "Hæc inde purgationem traxit unde concepit."

⁵ *De Fide Orthodoxa, III. 2.* οὐ σπερματικῶς, ἀλλὰ δημιουργικῶς.

formed from the first by creation, and was hypostatized by the Logos of God." In more recent times Schleiermacher¹ admits the sinlessness of Jesus, and consequently recognises the supernatural character of the birth, yet does not believe it to have been wrought "out of nature, but according to nature," and several expositors have acknowledged that even on that supposition the dogmatic import of the miraculous birth would be still intact. For, they argue, transmission of original sin would have been prevented in the manner supposed by Schleiermacher. But the objection to Schleiermacher's hypothesis is what Damascene mentions, that the humanity of Christ was not, as a fact, humanly produced, which suggests that it was requisite that God should *create* it immediately. This objection is stated by Julius Müller.² In fact the Logos fashioned His own humanity, but from materials given by the faith and piety of the Virgin. It is not at all impossible that her faith is the high watermark of piety attained among the covenant people. The words of Mary are certainly most beautiful in their simplicity: "Behold the handmaid of the Lord; be it unto me according to thy word." Again: "The Lord has regarded the low estate of his handmaiden: for, behold, from henceforth all generations shall call me"—not a reproach, but—"blessed."³

¹ *Christl. Glaub.*, vol. ii. § 118 (Ed. 1828).

² *On Sin*, vol. ii., p. 379, E.T., "It was necessary that the Son of God, when He became incarnate, should not be born by ordinary generation. In order that his life might be human, He must be conceived and developed and born of a woman; but that it might be from its commencement sinless, a divine creative act must supplant that human act on which the commencement of any new life ordinarily depends. The Gospel narrative of the virgin-birth of Jesus exactly fulfils this dogmatic postulate." Müller refers also to Neander's *Leben Jesu*, pp. 16, 17. Schleiermacher's supposition of "an ordinary generation with a creative energy of God" leaves the miracle just where he found it. The question is one for criticism of the sources, which are silent as to the birth of a sinless man in the way of nature.

³ Luke i. 38.

(3) The Son of Man.

In course of time all who could have known, either by direct revelation or at second hand, from those who had received angelic visions, that Jesus was born of a virgin, died one after another, Elizabeth, Zechariah, Joseph, John the Baptist, all except the virgin mother herself. The tradition would probably have passed away from memory, if its place had not been filled by a mysterious name, which Jesus applied as the ordinary designation of Himself, and which, with one exception, that of the dying Stephen,¹ Jesus alone used. The title "Son of Man" occurs in the Gospels about seventy-six times. It was already used of Messiah in the Rabbinical "Book of Enoch," mainly in that portion that passed under the name of "The Similitudes." According to the latest editor, Charles, the definite title "Son of Man" is found in the "Book of Enoch" for the first time in Jewish literature, and its use there is, historically, the source of the New Testament designation, contributing to it some of its most characteristic contents.² Charles thinks that the use of the title by our Lord must have been an enigma, not only to the people generally, but also to His immediate disciples, so much so that they shrank from using it.³ He explains it as being a combination of the Enoch conception of a supernatural being with the Isaiah conception of the servant of Jehovah. At the same time it is difficult not to ascribe to this title, as used by Jesus, the meaning which it has in the Book of Daniel,⁴ where the prophet had a vision of a human prince descending from heaven, and succeeding to kingdoms symbolized by four beasts. If we combine these sources of the conception, Jesus is the Son of man as the head of the human race, the typical and ideal Man. This meaning seems to have been first suggested by Schleiermacher. But it was adopted by "Neander, Tholuck,

¹ Acts vii. 56.² p. 51.³ p. 317.⁴ vii. 13.

Olshausen, Reuss, Beyschlag, Liddon, Westcott, Stanton.”¹ Grimm says that “Jesus designates Himself thus as the head of the human race, the one who both furnished the pattern of the perfect man and acted on behalf of all mankind.”² It means that He was head of humanity, and at the same time a sufferer for humanity. “The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many.”³ It is right that the head of the race should act and suffer for the race. By so doing He became the High Priest, who, “being taken from among men, is appointed for men in things pertaining to God, that He may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins.”⁴ Thus, instead of disparaging Jesus, the title exalts Him to the same greatness as the parallel name—Son of God. Again, the Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath, which was made for man:⁵ that is, man is lord of the Sabbath in his representative. And, as He is Lord of the Sabbath, the Son of Man is not subject to ascetic rules, as was the case with John the Baptist. “The Son of Man eateth and drinketh,”⁶ simply because His piety is nurtured through prayer and obedience to God, and He has no need to put Himself under artificial regulations for the growth of His personal religion. Again, “the Son of Man hath,” what God alone properly has, “power to forgive sins.”⁷ He is appointed by God as His own representative, because He is the representative of the sinner. We are told also that this power of forgiving sins is parallel with His authority to judge men. The Father “gave Him authority to execute judgment,” not because He is Son of God merely, but “because He is the Son of Man.”⁸ To the same purport it is said that “whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of Man, it shall be forgiven him; but who-

¹ Cf. Charles, *Book of Enoch*, p. 313.

³ Mark x. 45.

⁶ Matt. xi. 19.

⁴ Heb. v. 1.

⁷ Mark ii. 10.

² Cf. *Lex.*, s. v.

⁵ Mark ii. 27, 28.

⁸ John v. 27.

soever shall speak against the Holy Spirit, it shall not be forgiven him";¹ and that he "who hath trodden under foot the Son of God . . . hath done despite unto the Spirit of Grace";² leaving it to be inferred that the sin against the Son of Man is a failure to come up to His standard as the ideal man, and does not contain the element of scorn that makes the sin against the Son of God, that is the *spirit* of Jesus, such that there remaineth no more sacrifice for sin. The sin of the Apostle who had persecuted Jesus was like the sin of those who crucified Him, and for whom He Himself prayed that they might be forgiven. As the representative Man He is greater than Solomon or Jonah; yet heathens in Nineveh repented at the preaching of the latter, and a heathen queen came to see the glory of the former, while the greater One was put to death. Once more, when Jesus asked, "Whom do men say that I the Son of Man am?"³ Simon Peter answered that He was the Son of God; and Christ signally honours him as the recipient of a special revelation. The answer must have meant that the promised Messiah was the ideal Man, and that the ideal Man again was not to be found on earth, except in Him who was the personal Son of God. It is not until shortly before the close of His earthly life that Jesus, who always calls Himself Son of Man, acknowledges to Caiaphas that He was Son of the Highest. Yet, even at that moment, he adds that, though He was Son of God in the deep self-consciousness of His person, it is as Son of Man, the representative of men, that He wills to be known at the Judgment Day, as He has always said that "authority to execute judgment" has been given Him "because He is the Son of Man."⁴

¹ Matt. xii. 32.

² Heb. x. 29. I do not understand the word "spirit" here as a personal name. Or it may be used of the risen Christ, as in Rom. i. 4; 2 Cor. iii. 17.

³ Matt. xvi. 13.

⁴ John v. 27.

How does all this bear on the theology of Paul? The name "Son of Man" now disappears. Its place is occupied by another title, "Second Adam." The reason for the change lies in the universalism of Paul's doctrine, as it is an advance on the national, Judaic reference to the Messianic idea, to which the conception of "Son of Man" had narrowed itself, probably on the lips of Jewish Christians.¹

Among the most important passages in the whole range of Scripture to prove the necessity of the incarnation of God for the redemption of man are Romans v. 20, 21, and 1 Corinthians xv. 45-47. For our present purpose the important thing is that the head of the redemptive economy must be a man; God-Man, it is true, yet a real, actual man; and that this actual man is the person who was from eternity the ideal Man in the Godhead. It is in the light of this truth that we must regard Paul as the first teacher to suggest what science calls the Law of Heredity, and to apply it to theology. At first it cannot but be a source of serious difficulty to all who believe in the moral goodness of God's government of the world, that one man should be naturally subject to certain forms of disease because his ancestors have indulged in vice, or that one man may actually be a criminal in consequence of the crimes of his forefathers. Yet everybody at the present day admits the solidarity and oneness of the race. Theologians, since the time of Cocceius (d. 1669), have called the Law of Heredity a Covenant.² The advantage of the latter designation is simply that it implies the moral government of God in reference to the influence of one man's act on the character and destiny of many. The Apostle does not use either term, but simply the correlatives, "as—so." But he has one all-important element in his account, which is that

¹ Cf. the suggestive remarks of Martineau, *The Seat of Authority in Religion*, p. 340.

² Cf. his *Summa Doctrinae de Foedere et Testamento Dei*. Opera, tom. vii.

one man was constituted the centre or head of the race in its moral, no less than its physical, affinities. That one man, he tells us, is the progenitor of all men. It is a Christian conception. "To the mind of antiquity," as Lotze¹ says, "the numerous races of men destined merely for the passing joy of life, and not for the accomplishment of tasks of eternal significance, may have sprung each from the soil of its native place, without original connexion. . . . It was Christian civilization that first developed with decisive clearness the thought that all nations made part of one whole, and that evolved from the concept of the human race the concept of *humanity*. . . . The name *humanity* expresses just this, that individuals . . . are preordained parts of a whole . . . that there is a vast, coherent, providential governance of the universe, which, between the extreme terms of creation and judgment, allows no part of what happens to escape the unity of its purpose. While Christianity developed this conviction, it at the same time connected it with the Hebrew account of man's origin." It is true that scientific investigation cannot be said to have as yet arrived at any certain conclusion as to either the one or the plural origin of mankind. Ethnographical, and especially philological, investigations tend to the former conclusion. But the Pauline theory need not wait for any such decision of science in favour of the original unity of the race. It is sufficient if all mankind form a real commonwealth because they have identical thoughts and aspirations, whether they started on the common road from one historical origin or not. "Adam" may be a name for man, even if it has no reference to an individual man who was placed in Eden. Even supposing the Apostle to be mistaken in adopting as history the Hebrew account of man's origin, this will by no means invalidate the

¹ Lotze, *Microcosmus*, vol. ii., bk. vii., chap. iv. (E.T.).

argument of the Epistle to the Romans. In fact, the myth may be, we do not say it always is, the most natural form in which a great theological theory can be embedded. Men are educated to truth, as Plato¹ tells us, through illusions, that is, through imagination. This ought not to present a difficulty to any one who admits that our Lord "taught in parables." The question, whether an account is historical or mythical is matter for critical investigation, in reference to every particular case, as it arises. While, therefore, it would be unjust to press the story of Paradise into an argument, it can well take its place as the matrix of a true theology. Even so orthodox a theologian as Dr. Charles Hodge² says that it is futile to base the doctrine of original sin on any speculations as to the origin of the soul. He is right. Whether every soul is a direct creation of God, or is derived from the parents, according to the Traducian theory, the question of natural depravity remains untouched. If so, the unity of men's origin in reference to their bodily constitution is equally immaterial to the problem of the moral identity of the race.

The fact of imputation is indubitable, however difficult it may be to explain its justice. We know of no hypothesis that makes a fair attempt to answer the question, other than the doctrine that God governs and must govern the race through its representative, or, in St. Paul's words, "that through one man sin entered into the world and death through sin; and so death passed unto all men, for that all sinned,"³ that is, in the one man who was the representative and whose actual sin was reckoned or imputed to those whose representative he was and who did not sin actually in their own persons. Again, "through the one man's disobedience the many were made sinners,"⁴

¹ *Rep.*, iii. 393, αὐτοὶ δ' ἂν τῷ ἀσθητοτέρῳ καὶ ἀηδεστέρῳ ποιητῇ χρέμεθα καὶ μυθολογῶν ὠφελείας ἕνεκα κ.τ.λ.

² *Syst. Theol.*, vol. ii., chap. iii.

³ *Rom.* v. 12.

⁴ *Rom.* v. 19. The term used by the Apostle is *κατεστάθησαν*, not *ἐγένοντο*.

as the result, not of their actual disobedience, but of his. Whatever else Cocceius' important hypothesis of Covenant in St. Paul's writings means, it must involve that the first Adam is primarily the representative of the race. If he sins, we sin in him. As it has been forcibly put, "The fall of man affected a whole world as an entire kingdom falls with its king."

But together with Christianity came the consciousness in man of higher needs than had been satisfied through the first, earthy Adam, a yearning for gifts and blessings of a more spiritual kind; not merely the restoration of what had been lost, but the attainment of new endowments and potentialities, which could only be brought about through a new Covenant to be centred in a Second Adam, the Man from heaven. These blessings consisted in redemption, communion with God, the consciousness of having other gifts than what man could obtain as a member of a privileged nationality, willingness to sacrifice the present life in order to gain the higher life thereby. These Christian aspirations made him humble and brought him to desire *personal* communion with the head of the Covenant. Hitherto the connection of one's life with the Adam was a theory more than an experience: a necessary presupposition of theology that did not enter into men's thoughts and had very little influence on their life. For they felt conscious of a power to accomplish the ordinary purposes for which they lived on earth, and, when they failed, they blamed themselves, and not Adam; or rather pitied themselves; for no man repents of original sin. But now their aims soared higher than earth, and, conscious of inability to master the problems of the spiritual life, they felt their need of a Second Adam, to supply all grace, to hear all prayers, to bless with every blessing, and to become their personal

It was the forensic act of God not the merely natural result. Cf. James iv. 4.

friend and Saviour. Hence the economy of Grace must be *centred* in one man. Whether the origin of the human race is one or plural, the origin of the new spiritual race—in other words, the Christian Church—cannot but be derived from one source, even from Christ Jesus alone. For this reason the Apostle's theory of the Second Adam is in one respect different from his theory of man's fall. The latter depended upon the act of a far-off progenitor, which one may or may not have heard of; whereas the way of salvation is simply one's act of faith directed to the person of the God-Man. Hence the necessity for the revelation of Christ as He who can attract the sinner to Himself by the beauty of his human character, as well as redeem him as the second Adam. The incarnation is demanded not only by human guilt but also by Christian humility and faith.

We have said that God's government assumes the form of Covenants. We further add that the one Covenant exists for the sake of the other. Science has no gracious account to give of the Law of Heredity, and nature is "red in tooth and claw." It is only the higher gift of faith in the revelation of a better Covenant that helps a man to be dumb and open not his mouth, but always to believe in a beneficent Creator. When, however, the further revelation of God's designs enters in, it is found that the two revelations are, after all, one and the same system of government. God has really but one plan. Creation, providence, redemption, salvation, are all revealed in Christ.

We may be inclined to think by this time that St. Paul's theology springs from his Christology: in fact, that the centre around which all his ideas turn is, not anthropology and soteriology, or redemption of fallen man through atonement, but deeper than all this, the revelation of God through the incarnation of his Son. While the present writer would firmly maintain the doctrine of the redemptive death on the Cross, the truth of the self-revelation of God

in the face of Jesus Christ is prior in order and idea, not only to redemption, but even to sin itself. "The emanation of his own infinite fulness was aimed at by God as the last end of creation." In this declaration of Jonathan Edwards¹ we all concur. Redemption is a means, and a gracious, glorious means, springing out of God's infinite love and planned by His manifold wisdom, for the attainment of this, the chief end of creation. We cannot suppose that the realization of God's chief end depended on the contingency of man's fall. God's "disposition to communicate Himself" would, undoubtedly, have led Him to reveal Himself to His sinless creatures, and that through His Son, "the image of the invisible God and the firstborn of all creation."

It would, therefore, seem that, before we can attain to a clear conception of Paul's theology, we must place at its deepest foundation the doctrine that the Son of God must become man, even if sin had not been permitted to enter into the world.

In 1 Corinthians xv. 45-47, the Apostle speaks of the Second Adam as "the Man from heaven." Meyer, Weiss, Pfeiderer, and other expositors, explain the words to mean that Christ acquires a glorified body in heaven after His resurrection and comes in that body at the *parousia* or second coming. But the words *ἐκ γῆς*, used of the first Adam, must express his original state. It is therefore probable that *ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ* will mean the second Adam's original state; and so also Athanasius² explains *ἐξ οὐρανοῦ* as tantamount to *ἐπουράνιος*, and both these terms as signifying that the Logos descended from heaven. Further, the Second Adam is not said to acquire a new body in heaven, but to change the body of His humiliation into a glorified condition.³ Again, the words "from heaven"

¹ *God's Chief End in Creation*, ch. i., sect. ii. *ad fin.*

² *Or. I. c. Arian.*, § 44.

³ *Phil.* iii. 21.

cannot refer to the incarnation; for Paul says¹ that Christ, as to his human nature, was "born of a woman." The idea of the passage is the principle of change, exemplified in the resurrection. The body that dies is physical; at the resurrection it will become a spiritual body. The change, however, is effected, not by evolution, but by the action from without of a personal, spiritual force; for the Second Adam is "a quickening spirit." And as He is the "last Adam" when He effects this change, He is so because He was the first Man. He is the Omega because he was the Alpha. The inference is that the Apostle speaks of Christ as to His heavenly origin. But, as we saw before, he cannot mean that His body was actually from heaven. He must mean, therefore, that He is the ideal Man, eternally in God, as Archetype of humanity. Again, the Apostle says "that God will sum up all things in Christ, the things in the heavens, and the things upon the earth."² The word *ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι* implies "that a dislocation in the original constitution of the world has taken place by sin."³ The God-Man has been constituted the centre of God's created universe, and, as Meyer, Ellicott, Von Soden, and many other expositors explain the verse, the *ἀνα-* is an allusion to a state of previous unity. When were all things previously united under one *κεφάλαιον*, if not ideally in the original divine-humanity of the Son of God?⁴

But this does not of necessity involve that the Eternal Logos would become incarnate. The revelation of God might still be mediated without the incarnation. This, we presume, is Calvin's view,⁵ that "even if man had remained free from all sin he was of too humble a condition to penetrate to God without a Mediator"; and he holds that "in

¹ Gal. iv. 4.

² Eph. i. 10.

³ Weiss, *Bibl. Theol. of the N. T.*, vol. ii. § 103 (E. T.).

⁴ For a good *résumé* of interpretations of the verse in the Fathers, cf. Petavius, *De Incarn.*, II. viii.

⁵ *Inst.*, II. xii. 1.

the first ordering of creation, while the state of nature was entire, Christ was appointed head of angels and of men."

We must admit that the subject of an incarnation apart from sin is not clearly revealed in Scripture. It may appear to many that we are intruding beyond what is written. The Biblical expressions that refer to it cannot, unfairly, be explained by what has been said concerning an original and ideal humanity of the divine Son. What we should strongly deprecate is the opinion held by a certain school of idealists, that evil is the universally necessary condition of the development of good. For this would imply that Jesus Himself "bears the sins and sorrows of men," not only by sympathy or "in some other theological meaning," but "as an immediate and personal experience."

It has been held by Dorner¹ that Irenæus thought that Christ would have become incarnate apart from sin. The passage seems to us to refer to what we have called the archetypal Logos as He was in God. Augustine² gave his verdict against the theory of incarnation apart from sin. The question after this fell into abeyance till it was resuscitated by the schoolmen. A considerable number of them decided in favour of the doctrine. It was discussed by Thomas Aquinas.³ He finally goes against it, though he admits it was possible, and maintains that the incarnation was the consummation of the universe.

The name of John Wessel deserves special mention. He died in 1489.⁴ Calvin⁵ condemns the opinion in allusion

¹ *Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, div. i., vol. i., p. 317 foll. (E.T.). The passage he refers to is Iren. V. xvi. § 2, *ἐτι γὰρ ἀόρατος ἦν ὁ Λόγος, οὗ κατ' εἰκόνα ὁ ἀσθραπος ἐγενόμην*, "For the Logos was yet invisible, after whose image man had been made." Cf. Petavius, *De Incarn.*, II. xvii.

² Vol. X., *Serm.* viii., and *Serm.* ix., "Quare venit in mundum peccatores salvos facere? Alia causa non fuit quare veniret in mundum."

³ Oosterzee (*The Person and Work of the Redeemer*, p. 78, E.T.) is mistaken in reckoning Aquinas in favour. Cf. *Summa*, P. III., Q. i., Art. iii., "Si homo non peccasset, Deus incarnatus non fuisset." But cf. also P. III., Q. ii., Art. viii.

⁴ See Ullmann, *Reformers before the Reformation*, vol. ii., p. 445 sqq.

⁵ *Inst.* ii., chap. xii., § 4-7.

to Osiander, and, to say the least, with too great asperity. Martensen¹ decides in favour of the doctrine and raises into notice some of the arguments which Aquinas put aside, such as that it was befitting for God to communicate Himself to His creatures in the perfect union of God with man. He argues that the most glorious thing in the world, the Incarnation, cannot be conceived as attained through the medium of sin. This argument will influence different men in different ways. Richard of St. Victor,² following Augustine, speaks of sin as *felix culpa*, because it has been followed by God's incarnation, and certainly it must be confessed that it manifests the surpassing greatness of God's love. Martensen argues also that the Logos incarnate is the centre of the universe. But this, on which Wessel also lays stress, may be met by the statement that the Logos is already before His incarnation centre of the whole creation. Dorner again accepts the theory; and the argument that prevails with the present writer is what he mentions, that Christ will be the God-Man for ever, when the work of redeeming His people from sin and all its consequences shall have been completed. His exalted humanity cannot be supposed to continue in existence for no purpose. He must be God-Man to all eternity, not to redeem His people, but to reveal God. But, if His human nature reveals God when His redemptive work is finished, does not this imply that He would have assumed our nature actually, if there had been no redemption needed, as He had been from eternity ideally and archetypically man? "If the God-Man," asks Dorner,³ "is part of the absolute religion, even after sin has been vanquished, must He not be willed eternally

¹ *Dogmatics*, § 131.

² Herzog, *R.E. für Prot. Theol.*, iii. 380.

³ *Syst. of Christian Doctrine*, vol. ii., p. 218 (E.T.); *Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, div. ii., vol. ii., p. 80 (E.T.). Dorner cites Luther as saying, "That it was an honour, not a dishonour, to the Son of God to be man."

and absolutely, and not merely on account of sin?" But we may mention the name of a pre-eminent critic and dogmatic theologian, who is more likely to command our respect for any theory which he may advocate than perhaps any writer of this age. We refer to Bishop Westcott, who has the following remarks in an essay on "The Gospel of Creation," inserted in his Exposition of the First Epistle of John: "The thought that the Incarnation was part of the Divine purpose in Creation opens unto us, as I believe, wider views of the wisdom of God than we commonly embrace, which must react upon life. It presents to us the highest manifestation of Divine love as answering to the idea of man, and not as dependent upon that which lay outside the Father's will. It reveals to us how the Divine purpose is fulfilled in unexpected and unimaginable ways in spite of man's selfishness and sin," etc.¹ The alternative is to suppose that man attains perfection through the operation of the Holy Spirit. But, apart from other difficulties, we repeat the question, why should the Son of God retain for ever His human nature?

(iii.) Another New Testament doctrine is that Christ is the representative or ideal Man. It derives its theological value from the wider and deeper doctrine of the Second Adam of which we have already spoken. It appears in the Epistle to the Hebrews, in which, however, there is no hint of Paul's doctrine of the two heads of the race, and, for this reason, we do not find in that Epistle the doctrine of a covenant of works, much less the thought that the Mosaic Dispensation is that covenant. The Epistle to the Hebrews represents the old economy as a rudimentary form of the covenant of Grace. But there is a clear statement of the conception that Jesus was the ideal Man in Hebrews ii. 5-9. In the very bosom of Judaism a prophet speaks in a Psalm of the infinitely great and holy

¹ *Epistles of John*, p. 238.

God coming near to man,—the transcendent God becoming the immanent God. To a Greek the notion might be commonplace. For his gods were but idealized men. The words “man” and “son of man” must refer, in the first instance, to human weakness and littleness, not to the excellence and superiority of his nature. But, in the second instance, man has been crowned king and made “little short” of angels.¹ The writer of the Epistle declares that the prophet’s words are verified only in the Man Jesus. Some expositors consider the eighth Psalm to be Messianic, and to refer directly to Christ, as St. Paul seems to have applied it in 1 Corinthians xv. 27. But it is inconceivable that the prophet should have wondered at God’s condescension in casting an eye of pity and visiting with kindness the Man Christ Jesus. Our Lord Himself, in the days of His flesh, never gives expression to any feeling of wondering thankfulness that God vouchsafes to notice him. In fact, the use He made of the same Psalm is just the opposite. He sees² in the children, who strawed His way with palm branches, the fulfilment of the prophecy, that God would perfect praise out of the mouth of babes. He thus, in some sense, identifies Himself with Jehovah, who has put all things in subjection to man. There cannot be much doubt that the Psalm is not Messianic. It is a hymn of praise to God, whose thoughts are so utterly different from our thoughts. God makes this weakling (*e’nosh*) to have dominion, as His vicegerent, over all the works of His hands. The Fathers give the same interpretation. Calvin and Bengel agree that the Psalm describes the exaltation of humanity. So far as observation and experience go, the prophecy has not yet been fulfilled. Man is not king of the universe. He is

“Great lord of all things, yet a prey to all.”

The writer of the Epistle argues that the prophet speaks

¹ Cf. Jennings and Lowe, *On the Psalms*, Ps. viii.

² Matt. xxii. 15.

of Christ, and of Christ, not as Messiah, but as the Representative or ideal Man. "We see not yet all things subjected" to man. The incarnation is already in God's mind; but it is hid—the very idea which we meet with so often in Paul's epistles, and which he calls "the mystery." The subjection of the universe to man is attained by the Man Jesus, whom the author has already described as "the Son, the effulgence of God's glory and the very image of His substance." He may be referring specially to the subjection of man to natural laws, whereas the Ideal Man has complete command over nature. Miracles were natural to Him, and He never appears to exert power in doing them. It would be more correct to say that He exerted power over Himself in refraining. Even from this point of sight, the passage successfully meets the modern objection to the doctrine of the Incarnation, that the entrance into the sphere of nature of a perfectly new element is inconceivable. Christ is not outside nature in its idea, but only in its sinful actuality.¹ Or the author may have required for his subsequent reasoning the statement that in Christ man has abolished death, not, indeed, as a physical fact, but in its ethical import. Satan, who had the power of death, must be destroyed. The deliverance of man must involve Christ's own perfecting through participation in blood and flesh, temptations and the suffering of death. The development of the universe to its final goal is subservient to the ultimate and sovereign purpose of Christ. Exclude the Representative Man from nature, the Son of God from creation, and the universe has no ethical end and teleological purpose.

Such, we understand, is the Scriptural argument for the incarnation derived from the conception of Christ as the Ideal Man. So far as the present writer has been able to

¹ Cf. Canon Gore, *Dampton Lectures for 1891, Lect. ii.*

trace it, the doctrine that God's idea of man is realized in Christ is first explicitly taught by Theodore of Mopsuestia.¹ It forms the foundation of his Christology. This will appear the more remarkable when we bear in mind the frequent declaration of the early apologists that God made all things for the sake of man. They probably borrowed this thought from the Stoics, not from Scripture, and they use it, as the Stoics did, to prove Divine providence. At least, they do not infer from it the necessity for the Incarnation, as the Epistle to the Hebrews does.²

But, while Scripture uses the conception of Christ as the ideal Man, either, as in the Epistle to the Hebrews, in connection with His priestly claims and atoning death, or, as in Paul's theology, in connection with the governmental relation and as the Second Adam, it has been recently employed, independently of these connexions, to describe Jesus as claiming divine sonship for Himself, not in a unique sense, but as the representative of all men.³ On this theory we venture to make the following remarks:—

(1) Christ is not, on this doctrine, the archetypal, but only the representative, Man. He is only what every man may become. But this is not a satisfactory account of the matter as it is stated in Scripture. For example, Christ is said to be "the only begotten from the Father,"⁴ and "the only-begotten Son," or, according to the best attested reading,⁵ "God only-begotten." In what sense can any other man be called only-begotten Son or only-begotten God? In what sense can any other man claim equality

¹ Cf. Dorner, *Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, div. ii., vol. i., p. 43 sqq.

² Cf. *Ep. ad. Diogn.*, x. 2, ὁ γὰρ θεὸς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἡγάπησεν, δι' οὓς ἐποίησεν τὸν κόσμον, οὓς ὑπέταξε πάντα τὰ ἐν τῇ γῆ κ.τ.λ.

³ Cf. Caird, *Evolution of Religion*, vol. ii., p. 139.

⁴ John i. 14, ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός.

⁵ *Ib.*, i. 18, μονογενῆς θεός. This is the reading accepted by Tregelles, Westcott and Hort, after the two best manuscripts B and N, and it is inserted in the margin of the Revised Version as being the reading of "many very ancient authorities." Tischendorf prefers *υἱός*, after A.

with God? ¹ We are told by an eloquent author "that we, indeed, cannot, like Christ, renounce heaven for earth." ² But the Apostle represents Christ as doing so, and therefore He cannot be a *mere* example, nor *merely* the firstborn among many brethren.

(2) This theory objects to everything in Christianity and in the New Testament that appears catastrophic or apocalyptic. But has it explained the appearance of such a man as Jesus? Has He evolved Himself out of Judaism? Or is He not to be regarded as Himself, though promised and predicted, the really most unexpected phenomenon of the ages? Is His moral perfection explained on natural principles? Strauss even admits it is not. It is equally incapable of accounting for the assumption of the New Testament that sin is an evil which will never develop into good, but will ever tend to greater evil until removed by the sacrifice of the Cross, which is therefore not merely the perfecting of Christ Himself personally, but the redemption of believers. St. Paul preaches the doctrine of imputed and imparted righteousness as the effect of faith. We are not surprised, therefore, that the upholders of this theory regard St. Paul's doctrine as marring the truth by "conceiving the dawn of the new life as a sudden conversion, produced by a foreign influence which descends upon man from above," ³ whereas the fact is that Paul's own life and experience are the effect of a sudden conversion, as Weizsäcker fully admits. ⁴

(3) The advocates of the theory acknowledge that in the Apostle Paul's teaching there begins a kind of separation of Christ from humanity and a kind of identification of Him with God. "In this way," we are told, the Apostle "seemed

¹ Phil. ii. 6, *τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ.*

² Caird, *Evolution of Religion*, vol. ii. p. 218.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 213.

⁴ *The Apostolic Age*, p. 79 sqq., E.T. [Theol. Trans. Library], "Great religious changes are to a very large extent the work of a moment."

to deny that union between the human and divine which was the essential lesson of the gospel of Jesus."¹ But the Incarnation of God in one man will not destroy the idea of the self-realization by means of self-sacrifice, which is the religious perfecting of every man that can accomplish it, any more than it does away with the indwelling of the Spirit. The Apostle Paul regards the Incarnation as an ethical truth and the greatest possible example of self-sacrifice simply because of the infinite distance between the form of a servant and the form of God. The same writer proceeds: "We are under a debt to the narrow Jewish Church which is greater even than our debt to St. Paul, because it did not pass away till it gathered together the records of the early life of Jesus."² The writer seems to think that the Synoptical Gospels did not contain universalistic elements, as if St. Mark were not the interpreter of Peter, and as if St. Luke had not discovered Pauline ideas in the life and teaching of Jesus, and as if it were not the fact that the Ebionite churches passed away just because they failed to realize the fundamental religious conception of Jesus, "Die to Live." In the Gospels probably the only things we owe to the Judæo-Christian Church are the *λογία κυρίου*, ascribed by Papias to Matthew.³ That in our Gospel of St. Matthew a "full-blown universalism" exists is not to be denied.⁴ The Book of Revelation is Judæo-Christian in origin, and yet it rose above Ebionitism, and taught the same theology as the Apostles John and Paul.

Martineau, again, who, however, is by no means to be identified with the advocates of the theory just mentioned, argues that the humanitarian view of Jesus gives Him greater influence as an example than the supposition that

¹ Caird, *Evolution of Religion*, p. 214.

² *Ibid.*, p. 216.

³ Cf. Müller, *History of the Christian Church*, p. 84.

⁴ Matt. xxviii, 16-20. Cf. Bruce, *Apologetics*, p. 463.

He was the God-Man. We admit the power of this conception, and the only explanation of its not being used to enforce the example of our Lord seems to be simply that it is not true. The Apostle James speaks of the prophets as examples of suffering and patience, and reminds us that Elias was a man of like passions with ourselves, that is, that he was "mere man" (*ἀνθρώπος ψιλός*), evidently to strengthen the force of his example.¹ But the Epistle to the Hebrews does not say that Jesus was a mere man when He resisted unto blood, striving against sin.² On the other hand, the writer does not in this passage say that He was the Son of God, the effulgence of His glory, and the very image of His substance. Surely the reason for his silence must be that He desires to give his readers to understand that He who had been in the form of God had now emptied Himself of all that which would have lifted Him above temptation. It was necessary for Him, no less than other men, to endure suffering. So the force of Christ's example comes back in another way, not by denying his real Deity, but by the implication that He who had been from eternity the effulgence of God's glory had through incarnation divested Himself of the form of God. The author was under the influence of St. Paul's ideas. But this is not all. Men had lost the very conception of what a perfect moral character is. In learning geometry the student requires at least the correct idea of a perfect circle. In the same way Christianity professes to hold Jesus before the world as a perfect example of goodness. He is not only a brave Man struggling against terrible odds, and that with marvellous courage, but He is an actual, concrete embodiment of all that God considers morally beautiful and good. This necessary element, the conception of what we may call "a perfect cube without a flaw," is and must be wanting in all humanitarian views of Christ's Person.

¹ James v. 10-17.

² Heb. xii. 2-4.

We maintain, therefore, that Jesus Christ is the Logos of God and, at the same time, that, because He has emptied Himself of the form of God and assumed instead of it the form of a servant, the divine perfection and greatness, which have now become His own ideal, are to be won by Him as the reward of human efforts and suffering. This is the addition made by the Epistle to the Hebrews to the theology of the incarnation.

T. C. EDWARDS.

THE BLESSED VIRGIN IN THE TALMUD.

My apology for drawing attention to a subject that is so offensive to Christian feeling as the dicta of the Jews with regard to our Lord and His Mother, must be found in scientific necessity and a desire for historical enlightenment. I have not the least wish to provoke a feeling of resentment against the ancient people of God on account of their hostility to the Christian faith and its Founder. Whatever we may think of the first forms of that hostility, its continuance and intensification are largely due to the injustice which they have suffered at the hands of priests and princes, and which they are in many places still suffering. The wonder is, not that the Jews should have hated the Christians, but that they should not have hated them more. And certainly we have not the smallest thought of hindering the coming reconciliation, of which there are so many signs in our own time, by dwelling upon distasteful or offensive language of earlier days.

But we must not neglect any branch of study which may throw light upon the genesis of modern beliefs; and it seems probable that renewed study of the Talmud may bring us unexpected scientific results. So large a mountain ought to produce more than the proverbial mouse. We