

ARTICLE II.

THE SON OF MAN.

BY REV. WILLIAM S. TYLER, PROFESSOR IN AMHERST COLLEGE.

THERE is something very remarkable about this name. Doubtless there is in it, also, some deep significance. It is the chosen, and, if we may so say, the favorite name of the Redeemer of mankind—the name by which he loves to designate himself, and by which he does call himself more frequently than any other. And yet, with the exception of a single instance, this name is never applied to him by any one but himself. The name occurs twenty-two times in the Gospel of Matthew, and, *besides the parallel passages* in the other Gospels, five times in Mark, twelve times in Luke, and eleven times in John—about eighty times in all, counting all the repetitions and parallel passages;¹ and in every instance of its use in the Gospels, it occurs in discourses or remarks made by our Lord himself, and is applied exclusively to himself.

It is also found once in the Acts (vii. 56), and there—a solitary exception to the otherwise unvarying usage of the New Testament—the expression is put into the mouth of the Martyr Stephen, who, “being full of the Holy Ghost, looked up steadfastly into heaven, and saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God”; and (apparently because he saw him in *human form*, and manifestly full of human sympathy, *standing* as if he had risen up to sustain the first Christian martyr and to receive his spirit when he should resign it to his keeping), he said: “Behold I see the heavens opened, and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God.”

This name does not appear in any of the Epistles. The

¹ We take this number (80) on the authority of Cruden. Bloomfield states the number at 61; but that is certainly too small. We have not taken the trouble to verify the accuracy of Cruden.

evangelists ordinarily call him by the simple name of Jesus, which, as explained by the angel at whose bidding the name was given to him at his birth, expresses his most characteristic work, as "The Saviour of his people from their sins" (Matt. i. 21). The writers of the epistles usually call him the Lord, the Lord Jesus, or the Lord Jesus Christ, thus denoting him (as the evangelists also begin to call him after his resurrection) as their risen Lord, the anointed King of the spiritual Israel, and the divinely appointed Ruler as well as Saviour of men. He calls himself "*the Son of Man*" and "*the Son of God*," or simply "THE SON," thus signifying his peculiarly intimate and endearing relations to man on the one hand, and to God on the other. It is also a significant fact that, while neither name is absolutely peculiar to either of the Gospels, the Saviour calls himself "the Son of Man" more frequently in the first three Gospels, where his outward life is particularly narrated and his human nature and relations are emphasized, and "the Son of God" or "the Son" more frequently in the fourth Gospel, which reveals especially his inward being and asserts his divine nature in the face of unbelieving "Jews."

This name is, therefore, entirely peculiar to the language of our Lord; appropriated by himself, and applied, as a distinctive name, to himself alone. There is, however, in the language of the Old Testament a manifest, and doubtless intentional, preparation for our Saviour's peculiar application and appropriation of the name to himself. By an idiom somewhat peculiar to the language of the Hebrews and the Hellenists, or Greek-speaking Jews, though there are not wanting some analogous usages in our own and other languages, the phrase "son of" is very often used to express likeness to, or participation with, some person or thing, or the possession of some character or quality, as in the expressions, *sons of Belial*, *son of perdition*, *son of the devil*,¹ *son of hell*,¹ *sons of thunder*, *son of peace*, *sons of light*,¹ *son*

¹ Child in our English version, son in the Greek: *υἱὸς διαβόλου* (Acts xiii. 10); *υἱὸς γένους* (Mat. xxiii. 15); *υἱὸς φωτός* (John. xii. 36).

of consolation, etc., meaning persons partaking of the nature, character, image, etc., of the devil, Belial, and hell on the one hand, or of light, peace, and consolation on the other. After the analogy of this idiom, *son of man* is another name for *child of humanity*, or, as we often say, *child of mortality*; that is, a human being, possessed of the attributes and characteristics of humanity. Accordingly it is very often used as a synonyme with man in the synonymous parallelisms of the Psalms and Prophets. Thus, in the book of Numbers, "God is not a *man* that he should lie, nor the *son of man* that he should repent"; in the book of Job: "How much less *man* that is a worm, and *the son of man* that is a worm"; and in the book of Psalms: "What is *man* that thou art mindful of him, or the *son of man* that thou visitest him." In these and many similar passages, *son of man* is obviously another name for one who is possessed of the attributes of humanity—any child of Adam who, like his father, is subject to human frailties and infirmities. And the name directs attention particularly to these characteristic attributes; it emphasizes them as the natural characteristics which distinguish the race, and to which every child of the race is born—is, as it were, a *son* and *heir*. By way of reminding him that, though now commissioned to speak in the name of God, he is still a frail, imperfect, dying man, like those to whom he is sent, the prophet Ezekiel, when God speaks to him, is constantly addressed by the title, son of man.¹ Still in all these passages no one person is singled out as exclusively, or even pre-eminently, *the son of man*. On the contrary, it is the very design of the phrase, either to comprise under one comprehensive and expressive name every child of Adam, or, if applied to an individual, as in the case of the prophet Ezekiel, not to distinguish him from other men, but rather to reduce him to just the same level with other mortals.

The nearest approach to our Lord's appropriation of this title to himself is in the prophecy of Daniel (vii. 13): "I saw in the night visions, and behold, one like the Son of

¹ Repeated some eighty-nine times.

Man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him; and there was given him dominion," etc. This is manifestly a prophecy of Christ; yet it may be doubted whether by the expression "like the Son of Man" anything more is meant than that the Messiah, God's anointed King, was to come in the form and likeness of a *man*, though he came in the clouds of heaven, and came to receive a universal and everlasting kingdom. And in the Revelation (i. 13), when it is said that he who was seen in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks was "like unto the Son of Man," probably it is not intended to say that he looked like Jesus Christ, for this would be only saying that he looked like himself; but that he, Jesus Christ, still appeared in human form, though now clothed with superhuman power and glory.¹

After all the analogies that we can discover, then, in the language of the Old Testament and in the Hebrew idiom, we cannot fail to observe the marked peculiarity of our Saviour's appropriation of this title to himself. He does not call himself *a* son of man, still less *a* son of *a* man. He does not call himself in general terms son of man; but "*the* Son of Man." He is not some indefinite son of some indefinite man. He is not some common son of our common humanity. He is not any ordinary common-place son of man. But he is emphatically, nay, as the exclusive language of Scripture shows, he is exclusively, "*the* Son of Man." He is in some peculiar sense *the* Son of *mankind*, the child of humanity, the son of the race; in the emphatic and unequivocal language of the original Greek, he is ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, in which designation the first article distinguishes him from all other *sons*, while the second, as every Greek scholar knows, generalizes *man*, and makes the word comprehensive of the race.²

¹ There is the same contrast between the exalted glory and the human form of Jesus as he is seen by the Martyr Stephen; and the explanation of that peculiar passage in the Acts, given on a former page, is confirmed by the analogy of the passages here cited.

² Just as in English, we say *the* ox, *the* horse, when we mean to denote the

Ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, *The Son of Man*. Let us analyze this peculiar expression; and, considering it at once in its own appropriate significance and in the light of scriptural usage, let us endeavor to ascertain its true meaning:

1. In the first place, it implies that Jesus was a *man*, a real and proper man, possessed of all the attributes and characteristics of our common humanity. This, as we have seen, is the primary import of the phrase "son of man," when interpreted according to the analogy of the Hebrew language. "Son of man," in the peculiar idiom of the Hebrews and the Greek-speaking Jews, is synonymous with man. It differs from man chiefly in that it *emphasizes* the idea of a human *origin* and human *characteristics*. It denotes emphatically one who is a man by birth and a man by nature; one who is *born* a man, and therefore possesses the characteristics of the race. There is no way in which the Redeemer could convey the idea of his real and proper humanity more clearly and forcibly to the minds of his immediate hearers, who were Jews, than by habitually calling himself "the Son of Man."

Moreover, aside from any peculiarities in the Hebrew idiom, this is the natural and appropriate signification of the word. A *son* partakes of the *nature* of his father. Christ was a man in origin and a man in nature; and, as if for the very purpose of emphasizing that fact and impressing it on the minds of men,—lest this fact should be forgotten in connection with his claim to be also something more than human, and under the overshadowing influence of his superhuman wisdom and power,—he takes pains to call himself "the Son of Man." He was the Redeemer of *men*, and he would have those whom he came to redeem understand, first of all, that their Redeemer was a *man*—a loving and sympathizing brother.¹ The atonement was to be made for

species; though by an idiom peculiar to the English, we generalize the word "man" by omitting the article.

¹ Dr. Robinson says in his *Lexicon* under ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου: "It would seem to refer not so much to his human nature, as to the fact of his being the

man, and it must be made by man. "By man came death; by man came also the resurrection of the dead."¹

In these days, when the humanity of Christ is seldom or never questioned, and the only question is in regard to his divinity, it is difficult for us to appreciate the necessity which existed in the primitive church of guarding so strenuously the proper humanity of the Redeemer. *Then*, be it remembered, his proper humanity was as strenuously denied by some (e.g. the Docetae) as his proper deity was by others (e.g. the Ebionites); indeed, at that time, his disciples seem to have found their chief difficulty in admitting and conceiving of his real humanity rather than his full divinity.² Hence the prominence given to his outward, human life in three of the Gospels. Hence the earnestness with which the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews insists that "*it behooved him in all things to be made like unto his brethren.*" And hence, in part at least, we think, the frequency with which our Lord calls himself by that name which his disciples and Jewish hearers could not but understand as an emphatic assertion of his real humanity.

Christ was a man in his earthly origin, because he was born of a woman, and so born into the race. He was a man in nature, because he possessed a human body with all the limbs, features, appetites, and powers of a human body, and gave as good evidence as any other man that he possessed a human soul with all the faculties and susceptibilities of a human soul. The sacred writers, in the Gospels, in the Acts, and in the Epistles, before and after his resurrection and ascension, speak of him as a man, "the Man Christ

Messiah who is described as coming from heaven in a human form;" and he refers to some passages in proof that the words were understood as synonymous with "the Messiah," "the Christ," and even with "the Son of God." It was not, however, these words, but always something asserted of himself in the connection, that was understood to be a claim to be the Messiah and the Son of God; cf. John xii. 23-34; Luke xxii. 69, 70, etc. And it would be strange, indeed, if these words could have lost so entirely the meaning they so manifestly and uniformly had in the Old Testament.

¹ Cf. Heb. ii. 2.

² See Ellicott's *Life of Christ*.

Jesus" (1 Tim. ii. 5; compare John viii. 40; Acts ii. 22, etc). He was born, brought up, and educated like other men of his class. He was known through the community as "the carpenter's son," and seems to have followed, to some extent, the occupation of his father (Mark vi. 3). His mother and sisters and brothers were well known; and he grew up among them—very unlike them, it is true—in wisdom and piety; but yet so like them, in his birth and education, in his general appearance and manner of life, that, notwithstanding they marvelled at his extraordinary wisdom and supernatural power, his neighbors and early acquaintances were slow to believe that he was anything more than human—anything radically different from the rest of his family and other men around him. He ate and drank and slept like other men. He hungered and thirsted, sorrowed and rejoiced, was weary and refreshed, was pleased and displeased, like other men. Like other men, he loved his friends and wept over their graves; though unlike most men, he loved also all mankind, and wept over the sins and miseries of his bitterest enemies. Like other men he was angry; though it was only at sin: He "looked round about with anger" on the hypocrites who would fain have interposed their sanctimonious keeping of the Sabbath in the way of his healing many, "being grieved at the hardness of their hearts" (Mark iii. 5). It is never said in the scriptures that he hated anything; certainly he never hated any human being; yet we are told that he was "much displeased" with his disciples when they would have kept back those mothers who brought young children to him for his blessing; and he was doubtless very indignant at the hypocrisy and iniquity of the Scribes and Pharisees on whom he denounced such heavy woes. We have no record in the Gospels of his having laughed; but this is no proof that he never did laugh. There was a tradition in the early church that he never smiled; but this we cannot believe. We are sure he smiled benignantly on every kind word and good deed. We know that he was free from selfishness and sin. We

know too that all *men* are sinners; that every other man who has ever lived was more or less selfish. But selfishness is an excrescence on humanity, and not a part of man's nature as he was originally created. Sin is a disease which has sprung up and spread through the race, and belonged not to man in his normal and healthy state.

On the whole, "never man spake like this man;" never man lived like him; never man died like him. At the same time, he spake and lived and died *as* a man; sustaining all the essential relations of man; subject to all the infirmities, temptations, and trials of men, and those in the largest measure and the greatest variety of forms; exercising all the attributes of proper humanity, and those in their most emphatic manifestations; and we have no more conclusive evidence that Peter or Paul or John was a real and proper man than that Jesus of Nazareth was such a man.

2. He was not merely *a* man, but *the* Man, in the same emphatic sense in which he was "*the* Son of Man,"—the only MAN in the fullest and highest sense, as he was in the fullest and highest sense the only SON OF MAN, that has ever lived in our world. He was *ὁ ἄνθρωπος*, as the Greeks say, or, as we say, *Man*—man generic, man universal, man typical and ideal; the living type and realized ideal of humanity. He was not one man or one type of man only, but he combined in himself all that belongs to the idea of humanity; he was, if we may so speak, the whole human race, or the idea and essence of it, embodied in one person.¹ As God is, in the fullest and highest sense, the only Father of the human family, so Christ is, in the fullest and highest

¹ This idea, or one similar to it, is suggested by those passages of the Old Testament in which the phrase "the Son of Man" occurs. For example, "What is man that thou art mindful of him, or the son of man that thou visitest him." In this passage "the son of man" is not any individual man, but mankind in general; man as God made him and placed him in the world; man made a little lower than the angels, and placed in this lower world as God's image and the vicegerent of his government over inferior creatures; man in the rank and condition characteristic of humanity; or, as we might say, man according to the essential type and idea of his being.

sense, the only Son of the race; and as our fatherhood is only an imperfect type of the fatherhood of God, so our manhood is only a broken image and shattered fragment of the manhood of Christ. No other man ever was absolutely whole, complete, with no part wanting and no element in excess or defect. Most men are not only small patterns, but mere fragments of humanity. You must put a great many of them together to make a real man. To make up our *ideal* of man, we must unite all that is highest and best in the biography and history of mankind, written and unwritten, and refine it of all that is impure and unreal and abnormal, leaving only the pure gold. Such an ideal is realized in the humanity of Christ.

Christ had no individual idiosyncrasies. You cannot say he was more like Peter or Paul or James or John. You must have put together Peter and Paul and James and John, or all that was normal and good in them, and all that was right and good in all other men that have ever lived, to make up the human nature of Christ. There have been a few men in the history of the world who seem to understand all other men, to be able to reproduce men of all ages and nations, because they comprehend all men in their universal and comprehensive genius. To call Jesus of Nazareth by any of those epithets by which we distinguish Homer or Shakspeare, as the many-sided, the myriad-minded, and the like, were only to degrade our conceptions of him. And yet this class of men may serve as types and images of him whom we have styled the universal and ideal man. Only he was the *all-sided*, the *all-minded*, the *all-hearted*, the *all-comprehending* type of humanity — the antitype of all that is beautiful and good in the past history and character of man and the prototype of all that man is capable of becoming, all that a pure heart can wish or a holy imagination can conceive in the future progress of the race.¹

¹ So naturalists tell us, man is the type and embodiment of all the inferior animals; and herein the religion of Christ shows itself to be analogous to the constitution and course of nature, or the substance of which nature is only the type and shadow.

Christ had none of the prejudices of the class to which he belonged or the section in which he was born and brought up. He was a poor man only in condition. He was just as much at home and at ease with the rich, provided only they were good. He was a Nazarene and a Galilean only in origin. He had none of the rusticity of an obscure village; none of the narrowness of a despised province. Country and city were alike to him. He taught with equal freedom and authority in a fisherman's boat on the Sea of Galilee, and in the temple at Jerusalem. He had no national peculiarities. He was born a Jew and brought up among Jews; but not a trace of Jewish prejudice, bigotry, or narrowness can be discovered in all his words and actions. His birth and education were in the East; but there is nothing peculiarly oriental in his ideas or instructions. He spoke the language of Judea; but he spoke to the hearts of *men* in all nations and ages. He was emphatically the Son of *Man*; not of one man nor another; not of one nation rather than another; not of one age to the exclusion of other ages,—but of man universal. We do not even conceive of the human nature and character of Christ as limited and narrowed by the distinction of sex. As the traditional face of Christ, which we see so often in paintings, combines the strength and dignity of one sex with the beauty and loveliness of the other, so his nature unites the susceptibilities, virtues, and graces of both. As in the Christian church, so in Christ himself, though in a different sense, there is neither Jew nor Greek, barbarian nor Scythian, bond or free, male or female; but all combined in one comprehensive, harmonious and perfect whole.

From this all-comprehending humanity, or complete and perfect manhood of Christ, it follows that he must be the model, the representative, and the friend of the human race. But these specific ideas, though involved in the general idea which we have just been considering, are so distinguishable from it and are so important in themselves, that we shall give each of them a separate examination. We remark, therefore, in the third place :

3. He was the model man. The universal man comprehends all of which man is capable. The ideal man exemplifies all that man should be. He must therefore be the model man. Many elements might be considered as entering into this comprehensive idea; such, for instance, as the balance of his mind, the normal operation of his mental faculties; perhaps also the fitting grace of his manners, and the sweet beauty, yet commanding dignity, of his person.¹ But the point which we now wish to single out and emphasize, is, that the Son of Man was the morally perfect, the sinless man. The scriptures distinguish him as the Holy One and the Just (Acts iii. 14). "In him is no sin" (1 John iii. 5). It is only the "*pura naturalia*," as the schoolmen say, only the original unfallen nature of man, that appears in him. How or why we cannot stay to ask. We are now concerned only with the fact. "The Son of Man" is son and heir to a perfect humanity—a humanity without sin. The all-embracing, all-comprehending man is, at the same time, the all-pure and the all-holy.

Christ, as man, exhibited the human virtues without imperfection or alloy; and man, when he becomes a Christian, is not expected or desired to de-humanize himself, but only to restore and perfect that portion of humanity which he has in him. And this can be accomplished only by being and doing just what Christ would be and do in like circumstances. We are not commanded to practise any superhuman virtues. Man has actually been and done all that we are commanded to be and do, and that, too, in circumstances essentially like our own. With a nature essentially like ours, and under temptations in all important respects like ours, he "knew no sin" (2 Cor. v. 21); "he did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth" (1 Pet. ii. 22). He was every human virtue embodied in a human form and

¹ Of which we see the evidence, perhaps, in the instantaneous obedience of the fishermen of Galilee to his call, and the falling backward on the ground of his enemies when he presented himself before them, saying, "I am he" (John xviii. 6).

exhibited in our fallen, sinful world. The patience of Job, the faith of Abraham, the prayer of Jacob, the obedience of David, the courage of Elijah, the fortitude of Daniel, the seraphic joy of Isaiah and the sympathetic tenderness of Jeremiah, the zeal of Peter and the love of John, the believing works of James and the working faith and heroism of Paul — all the active, aggressive, energetic, and heroic virtues of man; all the meek, gentle, loving, and suffering graces of woman; and all the humble, truthful, affectionate, and obedient spirit of the little child — all, and more than all, these virtues met in him, without any of the excesses into which they are prone to run, without any of the defects which attend them in other men, each so complete in itself, and all so tempered and combined, as to form a perfect whole. And yet, so far from dazzling and confounding us with the idea that this is superhuman excellence, which it is vain and almost impious for ordinary mortals to attempt to imitate, we feel all the while, that it is human virtue, the very excellence which we were made to aspire after, and, in kind, to reach; nay, more, that he exemplified all the virtues before our eyes for the very *purpose* of proving their practicability, and teaching and encouraging us, in his presence and in reliance on his aid, to practise them.

“The Son of Man” was a perfect pattern of what man should be in his relations to his fellow man, loving his neighbor as himself, doing unto others all things whatsoever he would that they should do unto him, and even going beyond the strict requirements of the golden rule in voluntary self-denial and self-sacrifice for the good of men. At the same time, he was a model man in his relations to God. The will of God was his will: “Not my will but thine be done,” was his language under the most trying and afflictive circumstances. He did always those things which pleased his Father in heaven. The glory of God was, in his daily consciousness and his habitual choice, the end of his being. He lived in habitual communion with God; and even his personal union with the Father was the most per-

fect image of the true life of man, which is life in Christ and life in God. Man attains to the dignity and perfection of his nature only when, like Christ, he is not only the son of man, but the son of God also. Godliness is true manliness, and perfect manliness is godliness. Godliness, and manliness in their perfection cannot be separated. They are seen together, seen in their perfection, and seen to be one, in the life and character of Christ.

4. He was the representative man. We do not say *a* representative man, but *the* representative man. He did not, like other representative men, represent an age or a nation, a class or a clan, but the whole human race. The son and heir is the proper representative of the family. Christ is "the Son of *Man*," and so the representative of the whole family of man.

That he is a *fit* representative is sufficiently evident from what we have already said of his person and character. He is a complete man and a perfect man. He is man personified. He is all human capabilities and all human virtues in one person. And he acted, as well he might, for the race. This is the point to which we here direct particular attention. He *acted* for the race. He was officially, as well as personally, its representative. He was born into the race that he might embody it, as it were, in his own person, live for it, reconcile it to God, redeem it, regenerate it, breathe his own life into it, and so raise it from the death into which it had fallen by sin. He lived, not for himself, but for mankind, forgetting himself, sacrificing himself for the good of others and for the redemption of the world. He suffered for the race, not for any sins of his own, but solely for the sins of others; sorrowing for *their* sins, sympathizing with their miseries, bearing their sicknesses and their iniquities continually on his head. He died for the race; for, not being a sinner, he did not deserve to die; he did not die as the penalty of any sin of his own, or in consequence of any necessity which lay upon himself, but as a voluntary sacrifice and atonement for the guilt of

mankind. His resurrection was the proof and pledge of the resurrection of all men; nay more, *his* resurrection was the *cause* and vital power of theirs. He is "the resurrection and the life." "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive."

In Christ, human history begins a new epoch, the human race, a new life. He is the second Adam, in whom humanity is again embodied, represented, and, as it were, created anew; from whom the stream of human existence starts afresh, as from a fountain, and that not like the first Adam, a fountain of sin and misery, of corruption and death, but a fountain of holiness and happiness, of regeneration and life. "For as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." He is "the new *man*," by putting on whom the Christian is renewed in the image of his Maker, and man, even on earth, will at length be restored to the likeness of God. By the union of Christ with the race, new vitality is imparted to society, government, civilization, literature, religion—the whole history of mankind. By the life of Christ in and for the race, the whole race will rise again to an immortal existence beyond the grave. By union to Christ, the individual Christian, in a still higher sense, begins a new life; he is born again; he is created anew; he lives a new life, as a new creature in a new world. For "if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things have passed away; behold all things have become new." Choosing Christ as his advocate and intercessor, the sinner obtains forgiveness for all his sins, and cleaving to him as his representative, following him as his exemplar, making him the ideal of his life, he becomes a new man, a *true* man, "a man in Christ." By faith in Christ and consequent vital union with him, every individual of the race may attain to spiritual and eternal life; a life with and like Christ, and so a

life with and like God. Christ overcame the world and the devil, not for himself only, but for the race of whom he was the representative; and he that overcometh, like him and through his grace, shall sit down with him in his throne, even as he also overcame and sat down with his Father in his throne. For as he "died for our sins and rose for our justification," so "he ever *liveth* at the right hand of God to make intercession *for us*," "head over all things *to the church*" — head over all things, in a subordinate sense for mankind; for "the head of every man is Christ, and the head of Christ is God." Man can attain to his full and proper manhood only in and through the humanity of Christ. "Man" is crowned with glory and honor, and exalted to full dominion over nature and the inferior creatures, only by the exaltation of "the Son of Man" to the throne of the universe.¹

5. He was the friend of man. He was not only a philanthropist; he was *the* philanthropist, — *the* man of love to all mankind, the pattern and embodiment of philanthropy, the philanthropic man, in the same emphatic and peculiar sense in which he was the Son of Man. The word "philanthropy" has had another meaning since he came into the world to teach and to exemplify it.² The mission of Socrates, on which he expatiates with so much satisfaction in his defence before his judges, was confined to Athens. The mission of Christ embraced the world. His religion, for the first time in the world's history, was a religion for all mankind, and a religion of love to all. Alone, of all that have gone before him, and all that have come after him, he was the friend of *man as man*, without distinction of time or place, condition

¹ See that remarkable prophecy or anticipation in the eighth Psalm as interpreted in the Epistle to the Hebrews (ii. 6-9), and both further illustrated on a subsequent page.

² It is most instructive to observe how this word has been widened and elevated by Christianity from the low and narrow sense in which it is used in the heathen classics, where it is generally used in the sense of friendliness, kindness, fairness, and even to express that which is pleasing and plausible. See exordium of Demos. Philippic II.

or character. He felt a peculiar complacency, of course, in his disciples, and found some of them more congenial than others, because they were more entirely in unison with his character and cause; but he sympathized with all men, and pitied them more in proportion as they were more tried and afflicted — in proportion as they needed his compassion and were conscious of their necessities. He was emphatically the friend and the companion of sinners, and justified himself on that truly philanthropic ground: "The whole need not a physician, but they that are sick: I came not to call the righteous, but sinners, to repentance." He did not limit his charities to the bodily wants of men, like some very charitable persons now-a-days, nor, like others, labor only for the good of their souls. He healed all manner of sicknesses; he also forgave all manner of sins. He bore both the sicknesses and the sins of men always on his heart, till, at length, he expiated the one and dried up the fountain of the other by his atoning death on the cross. His life was one continual conflict with evil and the evil one; and every conflict, every triumph, was not for himself, not for his kindred or his disciples, not for his country or his age merely, but for mankind throughout all ages; and not for time only, but through eternity. In the expressive language of the Apostle Peter in his first sermon to the Gentiles — language wonderfully descriptive of the most comprehensive and enlightened philanthropy, — "*he went about doing good and healing all that were oppressed of the devil; for God was with him.*" While he was always ready to alleviate the sorrows and sufferings of men, he always struck at *sin* as the root of them,¹ and *satan* as their author, the great adversary and murderer of man from the beginning.² And if all who have labored for the good of others had been as impartial and comprehensive, as wise and profound as he; if all philanthropists had been Christian philanthropists, and all

¹ E.g., instead of saying to the sick of the palsy, Thy disease is cured, he says, Thy sins are forgiven (Mark ii. 5).

² Cf. John viii. 44: *ἐκεῖνος ἀνδραποικτὸς ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς.*

Christians had been charitable and philanthropic Christians, a large part of human wants and woes would long ere this have been dried up at the fountain. The religion of the cross was the remedy for, "all the ills that flesh is heir to"; and no sooner was the atonement made for the sins of the world than he commissioned his disciples to "go into all the world and preach the gospel [publish the good news] to every creature," at the same time promising to be with them as an omnipresent spirit of love and power, "always, even to the end of the world." Yes, his was *philanthropy* that deserved the name — wide as the world, universal as the race, diversified as its wants and woes, enduring as its existence. The pattern philanthropist is found just where we should expect to find him — in the model man: the complete and universal philanthropist, in the complete and universal man. Of all men, he could appropriate the language of the Roman poet:

"Homo sum; nihil humani a me alienum puto."

"I am a man; nothing of all that pertains to man do I deem foreign to me." Nay, he calls himself by a name which expresses yet more tenderly his peculiarly near and endearing relationship to the race, and his wonderful love and sympathy for them. He delights to call himself the *Son of Man*, as if that most significant word alone could express his affectionate devotion to the well-being of the family. He repeats the name and dwells upon it, as if he would fain emphasize his filial and fraternal love. Hear him: "*The Son of Man* came to seek and to save that which was lost." "*The Son of Man* came not to destroy men's lives, but to save them." "*The Son of Man* hath power on earth to forgive sins." "*The Son of Man* hath not where to lay his head." "*The Son of Man* came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many." "Betrayest thou the *Son of Man* with a kiss?" "Except ye eat the flesh of the *Son of Man* and drink his blood ye have no life in you." "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood dwelleth in me and I in him." How touching!

Do you think it is merely accidental that he calls himself by this endearing name in these and so many similar passages? Or would he appeal to all that is tender and sympathetic, all that is *human*, in every human breast?

And in order to feel all the power and pathos of those words we must remember that "Son of Man" was not his original title; that originally he was more than human. "Son of God" was his rank and title in heaven, where all the angels of God worshipped him as very God; and it was love for mankind that brought him into our world in human nature — born of a woman, a babe in Bethlehem, a member of the great human family, the Son of Man among the children of men. "He was made a little lower than the angels [that is he became man] for the suffering of death, that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man." "Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren." Prodigal sons they are, indeed, who have wandered away from their father's house, and fallen into the snare of the devil, who has set them to feeding swine, and lets them starve after all their despicable service. But he will go and tell them how their Father waits to receive them back; and many of them will return to their Father and his Father, to their God and his God; and that Father will run to meet them, and fall on their neck and kiss them, and will rejoice over his sons that were dead, made alive again, that were lost, found. And whosoever will hear his words, and do the will of his Father in heaven, the same he will own as his brother and sister and mother. And he will ever reward any kindness shown to them as shown to him, and resent any injury done to them as done to him. For even when the world shall have come to an end, and he shall have gathered all nations before him, he will pronounce sentence on them as the "Son of Man" (Matt. xxv. 31). "For the Father hath committed all judgment unto the Son, because he is the Son of Man" (John v. 22, 27) therefore especially qualified to judge men.

And "when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of his glory," the test of character on which their final destiny will turn, will be their sympathy, or want of sympathy, with him in love and charity to their brethren, especially to the poor and needy, the sick and afflicted, of the children of men. "Inasmuch as ye did, or ye did it not, unto one of the least of these my brethren ye did, or ye did it not, unto me." Then woe to all the uncharitable and the misanthropic, the haters and oppressors of their race. Yea, woe to all who turn a deaf ear to the cry of the afflicted and the oppressed when he pleads, "Am I not a man and a brother"; but pleads in vain. But blessed are they who have visited the sick and the prisoners; who have knocked off the chains of the slave; who have given a cup of cold water to a brother of Jesus; who have been followers of him who was anointed to preach the gospel to the poor, to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives and recovery of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised. The Son of Man will stretch out his hands towards them, in the sight of an assembled universe, and say: "Behold my family. Behold my mother and my brethren."

The person of Christ is a mine of wealth, in which the church has been digging ever since the opening of the Christian era, and yet she has only just begun to discover its treasures. The truths which are directly involved in this one title, the Son of Man, we cannot but see, are surpassingly rich. The lessons of practical wisdom suggested by our discussion are scarcely less precious. They are too numerous and copious to be developed in this Article; but we cannot refrain from a brief statement of a few of them.

1. The view which we have taken of Christ as the Son of Man may shed light on the interpretation of many passages of scripture, especially on the prophecies of the Old Testament as interpreted in the New. Not a few of the passages which are quoted in the Gospels and the Epistles as prophecies of Christ, when examined in their connection,

appear to have had quite another original meaning and application. Hence has arisen that anomaly in the interpretation of the scriptures, the doctrine of a double sense which has been carried to such extravagant lengths by many well-meaning commentators, and which has brought so much scandal on the sacred writings. Does not our view of Christ as the Son of Man establish a rational foundation for a twofold application of many scriptures which is not at all arbitrary, but grounded in the very nature of the case.

Take, for example, that earliest and most comprehensive of prophecies contained in the third chapter of Genesis "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." The enmity between the serpent and the whole race, who are the offspring of our first parents—in other words, between mankind and satan, who was a manslayer from the beginning—is the most obvious reference of this scripture. But Christ is still more truly and emphatically *the* seed of the woman, *the* "man from the Lord," to whom so many godly women, from Eve to the Virgin Mary, hoped to give birth; and in his conflict with and triumph over satan, the race wins its only real victory over its great adversary. In him, and him only, the seed of the woman effectually bruises the serpent's head.

So Christ was emphatically *the* seed of Abraham and *the* son of David—the noblest offspring of the patriarchs and kings of Israel; the richest product of the Jewish nation, in whom all other nations were indeed blessed,—nay, the embodiment, in one person, of all the truths and all the blessings which the posterity of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob and the offspring of David were designed to convey to mankind.

Again, look at the eighth Psalm, and its interpretation in the second chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews: "When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers, the moon and the stars which thou hast ordained: What is man that thou art mindful of him, or the son of man that thou visitest

him? For thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honor. Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands." Nothing can be more obvious than that the primary application of this Psalm is to the rank of man, that is, the human race, in the creation, and the Creator's intention that he should have dominion over the inferior creatures in this lower world; yet the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews applies the passage to Christ. And in the light of this discussion, and only in that light, we see that the application is not forced, not arbitrary. Christ is the Son of Man in the fullest sense. Christ is *man* in the largest sense — the representative of the race; nay, its impersonation and embodiment. The rank in which man was created — a little lower than the angels — involved the condition to which the Son of Man, the representative of the race, must needs humble himself, that he might bear their sins and be made in all respects like unto his brethren. On the other hand, the glory and honor with which Christ is crowned as the risen and ascended Saviour, is the exaltation of the race of which he is the natural and the official representative. And, what is perhaps the chief significance both of the Psalm and the Epistle, the human race can attain to its proper manhood, and its full dominion over the material creation, only in and through Christ. When, under the transforming power of the gospel of Christ, man is regenerated, redeemed, disenthralled, transfigured after his likeness, and earth is subdued, purified, beautified, glorified into an image of heaven, then, in the latter days, the glories of God's condescending love to the children of men will be seen as they never were before, and then that Psalm will be sung with some just understanding and appreciation of the opening and closing verse which constitutes its key-note: "O Lord, *our* Lord, how excellent is thy name in all the earth."

On the same principle, how natural and beautiful is the application to Christ of not a few scriptures of the Old Testament which originally had reference to David and Solo-

mon and the line of Jewish kings and captains, to the patriarchs, priests, and prophets, also, in their long succession.¹ In his very constitution as the Son of Man, as well as in his official relation to the race, Christ is patriarch, prophet, priest, and king of humanity; and all that is true and good in any of the great and good men, especially of the chosen people, is only a fragment, only a type and shadow, of perfect truth and goodness in him, the great antitype; all that is valuable and enduring in the history of mankind before the coming of Christ foreshadowed him, and he is the substance of all that is permanent and truly excellent in the history of the nations that have lived, or are yet to live, under the Christian era. Educated men, scientific men, should be the last to harbor a prejudice against types. The material world is full of them. The pre-Adamic earth foreshadows in every stratum of its rocky surface, *prophecies* on every page of its great volume, the coming of man to possess it and to rule over it. Every inferior animal that has ever lived on our globe contained in its bodily structure the type and prophecy of man. And human nature, human history, is all one great type, shadow, prophecy, promise of the Son of Man, who is at the same time the Son of God, and God's anointed king over the world. Why then should it be thought strange that the Bible and the spiritual world are full of types and prophecies of him who is the representative of humanity, and "head over all things to the church?"

2. Our subject suggests the inquiry whether we are not in danger of undervaluing and neglecting the human, or, which is only another form of the same word and another aspect of the same thing, the *humane* side of our religion. This side was made very prominent in the teaching of our Lord; and what is more, it was pre-eminently exemplified in

¹ For example, the promise (Deut. xviii. 15): "I will raise them up a prophet," etc., was fulfilled in Joshua first, then in the whole line of the prophets and leaders of Israel, but most emphatically fulfilled in the Great Prophet and Captain of our Salvation.

his life, and especially symbolized in his person. He distinctly declared in his first sermon, the sermon on the mount, that no service to God was acceptable in his sight, while the offerer was at enmity with any of his fellow men: "*First* go and be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift." And he repeated the lesson — a lesson taught also in the Old Testament, with all its pomp of outward ceremonials — over and over again, by his words and by his actions. "I will have mercy, and not sacrifice." "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath." *Man* is more sacred, more precious, than the Sabbath. "Therefore the *Son* of Man is Lord also of the Sabbath." With this agree also the writings of the Apostles: "Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father," says James, "is this: to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world." "If a man say I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar," says John; "for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen." And even Paul, the most strenuous advocate of justification by faith, declares that knowledge and faith without charity are nothing. That splendid eulogium on love as the chief of the graces is not from John, the apostle of love, but from Paul, the apostle of faith, and the logical and eloquent expounder of Christian theology.

While the word of God thus magnifies the duties of humanity and charity, he is now forcing the subject upon the attention of the people of this land by his fearful judgments and his wonder-working providence. The salvation of our country in this solemn crisis of American history is probably suspended on the question whether the American people, and even the American churches, are willing to recognize in every one of those lowly and oppressed human beings, who have been so long crying in vain for deliverance, a man and a brother. They *are* men. They *are* our brethren. They are the brethren of the Lord Jesus Christ. Will we as a nation, will we as Christian churches, own and treat

them as such? or will we let the spirit of aristocracy and caste, the spirit of pride and prejudice, nay, we must call it by the right name, the spirit of hatred to an oppressed race, prevail, and thrust them back into slavery, or thrust them down into a condition little better than slavery, when Christ is pleading, in almost bodily presence, for the rights and liberties of his brethren, and when God, as with an audible voice and the plagues of Egypt, is saying to us: "Let my people go." This is the vital question. All others are accidents and trifles, when compared with this. Oh how much we need a revival of the religion of charity, fraternity, and universal love; of the religion of Christ, as he taught it by his own lips and lived it in his own blessed life, through the length and breadth of our land, now tost as with a tempest and flowing with blood! "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart," is the first and great commandment; but the second is like unto it: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." "This ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone."

Closely allied to this is the question, whether we give due prominence to the human side of the character, the human nature in the person, of Christ. It was this side, as we have seen, which he himself made prominent, by calling himself so frequently and so emphatically "the Son of Man." And, as we review the ideas which are involved in that chosen appellation, we cannot but feel that there are in his human nature the elements of the greatest moral power. The power of sympathy with men of all classes; the power of universal genius and universal love; the power of example, perfect and yet human; the power of representative man; the power of world-wide philanthropy — these have always been the ruling and enduring powers in human history. What elements of moral power to move and win, to bless and save mankind, centre, then, in "the Son of Man" — in the human nature of him who is the perfect pattern of mankind, the representative of his race, and the embodiment of humanity. This is the moral power by which his teachings

and example *have* taken hold of men of all ranks and classes in every age and nation where his name is known, and through which his religion is advancing with steady and irresistible progress to be the religion of the world. And in these same elements of moral power, so wonderfully adapted to the nature and necessities of man, we see a pledge of the final and universal triumph of the religion of Christ. It is demonstrably a religion from God. But it is no less manifestly a religion for men—for *all* men of all ages and nations—and it will certainly prevail. Of course, we see in the progress of Christianity, and in the very perfection of the human nature of Christ, evidence of something supernatural and superhuman. But there is power, great power—power which has not been fully developed; power which has scarcely yet begun to be applied in the human elements themselves; and the perfection and the power of these human elements is the very channel through which the divine comes in contact with the hearts of men, touches their sympathies, moves their wills, and transforms their lives. This is one grand design, if it is not the chief purpose, of the incarnation; and to overlook it is to defeat the end of that “great mystery of godliness.”

It may be that the Catholic church, and some of the Reformed churches, make too much of the human nature of Christ. Doubtless they misrepresent it in the doctrine of transubstantiation, and of the real presence of the very body and blood of Christ in the sacrament of the supper. We do not believe in the omnipresence or omnipotence of the human nature of Christ. We can hardly accept the doctrine of an “objective grace and power in the sacrament, independent of the moral and spiritual character of the communicant.”¹ But there is in the humanity of Christ a kind of *moral* omnipresence and omnipotence which it is not

¹ See the very able Article on “The German Reformed Church,” Bib. Sac., Jan. 1863. The doctrine of the Sacrament and of the Church in this Article we cannot but regard as extravagant and transcendental, too “mystical” to be embraced, or even comprehended, by the common mind. At the same time there

easy to exaggerate. Regeneration, sanctification, the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting—all that deserves the name of life for the individual or the race, to the body or the soul, in time and in eternity—comes to men through the body and blood of Jesus Christ. Is not all this, and more than this, taught in those significant words of our Lord which we have already cited, but which we can hardly repeat too often; for the Master repeats them in various forms, and with all possible emphasis: "Verily, verily I say unto you, except ye eat of the flesh of the *Son of Man* and drink his blood, ye have *no life* in you. Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat, indeed, and my blood is drink, indeed. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father, so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me" (John vi. 53-57). These words are not to be limited to the sacrament of the supper. They doubtless have a far wider application—to the entire person and life of "the Son of Man." They are not to be taken in any material or even "mystical" sense; but, interpreted in their obvious *moral* and spiritual significance, "they are spirit and they are life. Life can come to men dead in trespasses and sins only through the life of Christ; manhood, only by union with his humanity, and thus with his divinity.

3. In conclusion, we cannot but be impressed with the sacredness of that common humanity which was assumed by our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, which was impersonated in the Son of Man, and is still represented by him, though he now sits on the throne of the universe. How dare we—how can any one who has any belief in the divine-human personality of Christ—have the hardihood to injure or neglect any human being, when every human being, however lowly

is important truth in that direction, which the ministers and churches of New England might well seek and discover without much danger of imbibing the Mercersburg philosophy.

or degraded, stands in such sacred relations to so exalted a personage! Enslave a *man*! Buy and sell a *man* as if he were no better than a sheep; beat him with a cruelty which you would not inflict upon an ox or an ass; hunt him down with bloodhounds and shoot him with as much indifference as you would a wild beast! Despise a *man* because he is poor, or of low caste, or has a skin not colored like your own! Neglect a *man* when he is in sorrow and suffering, and let him die neglected and uncared for when he is sick! It is neglect and contempt of the Son of Man; a denial of the fundamental truth of his religion; an indignity to his sacred person. Every blow thus struck at the meanest member of the human family falls, as it were, upon his own blessed body. And when you stand before him in judgment, he will remember and recompense every wrong done to his brethren as a wrong done to himself, saying: "I was hungry and ye gave me no meat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink; I was a stranger and ye took me not in; naked and ye clothed me not; sick and in prison, and ye visited me not."

In Christ as the Son of Man we see what man was made to be, and what, by reconciliation and union with God, he is capable of becoming—the true nobility of man's unfallen nature, and the exalted dignity and glory of humanity, as it will be when it is redeemed and regenerated. Christ represents the unity of the race—its *solidarity*, as philosophers are fond of saying in their speculations; its universal brotherhood, as it is revealed in the scriptures and as the Christian believes it will actually exist in the latter days, when every man will see in every other man a brother, and do to others, in some measure, at least, as he would that they should do to him, and the golden rule shall be the law of individuals, families, and nations; in one word, its regenerated and perfected manhood, when the ideal of humanity, as it is exhibited in the person and the life of Jesus, shall be realized so far, at least, on earth that it shall be a pledge and earnest of a perfect realization in heaven. And as in the

divine beauty of Christ's humiliation we see an image of man's proper rank and intended character on earth—of man like God and earth like heaven,—so in the divine glory of his exaltation we see at once the means and the security for the ultimate accomplishment of that high destiny. The Son of Man—humanity personified—sits at the right hand of the Almighty Father, and all power in heaven and on earth is given into his hands. And he is crowned with glory and honor as a sign and pledge of the future glory and honor of his race—not indeed of every individual in it, for some, alas! persist in rejecting the Son as well as the Father—but, we must believe, a sign and seal, a pledge and earnest, of the future elevation and final salvation of the great majority of the entire human family. Let, then, all who love their species, rejoice in the Son of Man as their sympathizing and almighty Redeemer, and await with undoubting confidence the day of redemption; but let all the incorrigible enemies of God and man tremble; for he comes, the Son of Man and the Son of God, to avenge the wrongs done to both. And if there is anything more dreadful than the wrath of a holy God, it will be the righteous indignation of the neglected and despised Son of Man—neglected in his own person and despised in the person of his poorer brethren—when he comes in his own glory and in the glory of his Father to judge the assembled nations.