

consign it to hell, unless the grace of God may yet prevail to soften a doubly hardened heart, and lead it back to repentance and faith. As the judge of the court pronounces the sentence of death upon the guilty culprit, only when commanded by the solemn obligations of his office, so the minister gives the erring soul over to perdition, only as his divine Commission constrains him to utter the judgment of Almighty God.

---

ART. II.—THE HUMANITY OF CHRIST.

BY PROF. T. G. APPLE, A.M., OF MERCERSBURG COLLEGE, PA.

When man was first created and placed in the garden of Eden, he was perfect and complete, so far as it was possible for him to be perfect and complete, by an act of creation. A great and important work still remained to be done before he could reach his true destiny. This much is already intimated by the trial on which he was put in regard to the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, and also by the presence of the mysterious tree of life, mention of which is first made after man fell. We infer from these things, 1st, That it was necessary for man to act freely and willingly in accordance with the laws of his being, before he could attain perfection, and 2ndly, That in doing this, he would be met by some provision on the part of God, by which he might attain the destiny for which he was created.

These inferences are confirmed by the light that is thrown upon the subject of man's destiny in the salvation provided in Christ. The work of Christ in saving man more than repairs the damage of the fall. Man is elevated to a condition far above that of his creation. Was this an after-thought of God? or was it only possible thus to elevate man after he had sinned? Neither of these positions are tenable. Rather, we would suppose, it was God's *original* design to link man's nature in everlasting and blissful union with Himself through the Son.

We are thus led to the conclusion that humanity, as originally created, was designed to reach its full perfection in Jesus Christ, who is represented in the New Testament as the absolute Head of the race, and that the effect of sin, instead of changing the original purpose of God in regard to man, only served to modify the form in which this purpose was now to be carried out. Without sin, there would have been no suffering, and while, therefore, there would still have been a mediator between God and man, yet there would have been no *suffering* Saviour.

Adam was the head of the human race, as he was also the crowning glory of creation. Christ is the *absolute* Head of the race, in whom alone the whole creation finds its *highest* meaning and perfection. Man's personality in his creation was relative; it becomes absolute in Jesus Christ, in whom humanity is joined in personal union with God. If we ask now, why man was not created in this perfect state, in union with God, our reply is, that this consummation could only be reached by a process after his creation. It could be attained only in the sphere of freedom, in the exercise of reason and will. Hence the union of the Son of God with the race, follows as a fact of history after the creation.

In the history of our fallen race, this union took place in the holy conception and birth of our blessed Saviour more than eighteen hundred years ago. In that conception and birth, the Son of God took human nature into everlasting union with Himself, so that in Christ, the divine and human natures are united in one person.

As to this, the teaching of Scripture and the symbols of the Church are clear. Christ is divine, being God over all, blessed forevermore. He is also human, possessing all the powers, properties and attributes of human nature. And yet there are not two Christs, but one Christ.

The teaching of the early Church, which has come to be regarded as substantially authoritative and final in all subsequent ages, in regard to the humanity of Christ, is contained in the decision of the Council of Chalcedon, A. D., 451. It is as fol-

lows:—"Following, therefore, the holy fathers, we all teach and confess with one voice (*συνμψώνως*), one Son, one Lord Jesus Christ, to be perfect as respects Godhood, and perfect as respects manhood; that He is truly God, and truly man of a rational soul and body; that He is consubstantial with the Father as to His Godhead, and consubstantial with us as to His humanity, and like us in all respects, sin excepted. He was begotten of the Father before creation as to His deity; but in these last days, for us and for our salvation, He was born of the Virgin Mary the mother of God, as to his humanity. He is one Christ, *existing* in two natures, without mixture, without change, without division, without separation, the diversity of the two natures not being at all destroyed in the union, but the peculiar properties of each nature being preserved, and concurring to one person and one substance, &c." (Gieseler, vol. I, p. 240, note 8.) This decision was based upon the noted letter of Leo, Bishop of Rome, *Epistola ad Flavianum*, which was, indeed, made the rule of faith, the Council only adding new illustrations and explanations. (Gieseler, *ibid.*)

The controversy on the subject was, indeed, opened subsequently in the rise of the *Monophysite* heresy, and still later, by an attempt to reconcile the Monophysites in the Monothelite heresy; but this last was finally condemned in the 6th Œcumenical Council, A.D., 680, and the matter finally put to rest.

Having this clear and full decision before us, our object now is only to inquire what we are to understand by the human nature of Christ, or his manhood, or humanity, as it is variously termed.

In the inspired words of St. John, we are told that "The Word became flesh," not that the Word became a man. By human nature, or humanity, in the Chalcedon Creed, we understand the same thing as the flesh, *σας*, of St. John. Olshausen comments on this as follows: "Just as little, moreover, could the Evangelist have said: *εγενετο ανθρωπος*, *became a man*, which would represent the Redeemer as one man among many, while *He*, as second Adam, represented collective human nature

in a sublime, comprehensive personality." The error against which we are to guard here is, that the Logos joined Himself to an individual man, the son of Mary. The danger of falling into this error arises, no doubt, from the fact, that it is difficult for us to conceive of human nature, as a reality, except as it exists in a human person. If we consider its parts, the body and soul, or the soul, body and spirit, wherever these are united ordinarily, we have a man. It was, no doubt, an honest effort to maintain this conception of the real humanity of Christ, that led Nestorius to the conclusion that, as there are two natures in Christ, there must be also two persons or hypostases.

The humanity of Christ is impersonal, or anhypostatic, in itself considered. There is no human *ego* in Christ, as the centre of His human nature, that is as holding alongside the divine *ego*, for this would be Nestorianism in its most crass form.

The question now arises, how can there be a human nature, or a humanity, apart from its concrete existence in a human person. Did Christ assume human nature, or humanity, as a generality? There is a law of life or being which we hold to be not a mere abstraction, or conception of the mind, but a real entity, a power, from which all human existences, in individual form, proceed. This generality, while it is real, is, according to its very definition, impersonal. Was this the humanity which the Logos assumed?

So far as we are able to understand him, this is the view of Dr. Ebrard. "If we would correctly apprehend," he says (Herzog's Encyclopedia, pt. 12, p. 731, Bomberger's trans.), "the ancient Church doctrine of the two natures, we must take *φύσις* in the abstract sense in which it was used. . . . His" (Christ's), "human nature is the man's nature, or mode of being and constitution, which for itself does not subsist, but which, as a *universal attribute*, exists in all other men, and since His incarnation, also in Him—the *natura hominum*."

He makes use of the words, human form, human constitution, as expressing that which is designated by the term *φύσις*—nature. The passage of Scripture in Phil. ii. 6, "Who being in the form of God (*εν μορφη θεου*), thought it not robbery to

be equal with God; but made Himself of no reputation, and took upon Him the form, *μορφῆν*, of a servant, and was made in the likeness *ομοιωματι* of men; and being found in fashion, *σχηματι*, as a man, &c., &c," is referred to as teaching this view. According to it, God the Son, by an act of self-privation, places Himself within the limits of time and space, of human existence, and assumes the constitution of human existence.

But what is this general law of human life, this generality, apart from individual existence? In such a separate view, it is an abstraction. Ebrard explains further his meaning, when he says, "To have human feeling, will and thought, and as a human soul to animate a human body, is human nature." This language we are prepared to adopt. To say that the Logos assumed human nature as a generality, is doubtless true, otherwise we are in danger of running into Nestorianism; only we must guard equally against the error of Eutichianism on the other side. This we do, when we hold that the Logos united with Himself really human nature of the flesh and blood of the Virgin Mary. It was a human soul-germ, which stood livingly in the race, *through which* He linked with Himself the mode or law of human life, which we call humanity as a generality. We may say, therefore, that He had a human soul, and a human body of the substance of the Virgin Mary. There is no absurdity, we think, in supposing that the Saviour resembled His mother, according to the ordinary law of human life, that He was affected by her peculiar personal traits, so far as these hold in the relation between parent and child, though, at the same time, whatever of imperfection (we mean now sinless imperfection) may have attached to these, was overruled and made to disappear by His perfect fulness of life. While, therefore, Christ realized in Himself the perfect ideal of humanity, as a universal man, and therefore was free from all individual one-sidedness, or faulty idiosyncrasy, so that no one temperament predominated, but all were fully and perfectly balanced; yet His humanity started, not from an abstract general law, but a concrete soul-germ. Not only was the law of this human

life truly human, but the material which this law acted upon was really and truly human, of the flesh and blood of the Virgin Mary. In any other sense, we could not accept Dr. Ebrard's view, that the Logos assumed humanity as a generality. The humanity which He assumed, was not merely human, but it was of a peculiar type. Christ was, for instance, a Jew, yet this national type in Him was subordinate and subservient to the universal type which He realized in His life.

Beyond thus defining it against error, we, of course, cannot fathom the mystery of the incarnation. How such human nature, as body, soul, and spirit, including a human will, could be held in personal union with the divine, so that His humanity was complete without a human personality, or *ego*, we cannot understand, but we believe it as a mystery revealed for faith.

To the humanity of Christ, then, belong all the parts, elements and properties which belong to us men, the accident of sin excepted.

In its commencement it was human nature, the same as that of His virgin mother, and therefore fallen. From the moment of the holy conception, sin was eliminated; and this was possible, because sin is not an essential part of human nature. But it fell heir to the full effects or consequences of sin, as well as to the weaknesses and imperfections of our nature which accrue to us—not only as sinners, but as having failed, in Adam, to attain our true glorified state. Christ grew, increased in wisdom and in favor with God and man. As the person of Christ was one and theanthropic, we can predicate of Christ everything that may be predicated of His human nature. Just as in the union of body and soul in man (an illustration used by Dr. Shedd, in his History of Christian Doctrine), if the body is injured, the person is injured; if the mind is tranquil, the person is serene. Christ hungered and thirsted, became weary, and sought repose.

His growth, or development, reached also to His intellectual and moral nature. He increased in knowledge, making use, doubtless, to some extent, of natural and ordinary means, though He enjoyed also extraordinary and supernatural means,

in His intimate fellowship with God. In the development of His human intelligence, there were doubtless unseen miracles, as these appeared in his outward life. But as the Saviour's recorded miracles were not merely divine works, but truly human works, and wonderful, because they were an exhibition of human faith and power when thus lifted up in union with God, so this intellectual progress, though unusual, and even miraculous, was truly human. Thus we can say of Him, that He came to a consciousness of God His Father, came to know Him, as His words, at His twelfth year, in the temple, intimate, "Wist ye not, that I must be about my Father's business?"

Where there is bodily growth and intellectual development, there must also be a moral or spiritual development. This also is intimated in the words, "He increased in favor with God." Also, in those words of the Apostle, "Though He were a Son, yet learned He obedience by the things which He suffered; and being made perfect, He became the Author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey Him."

We found in the commencement of this article, that human nature in its creation, while it was good, free from all sin, and inclined to all good, was yet not perfect, but awaited a process of free development and glorification, in order to become perfect. How much more was such a process of development and glorification, not only possible, but also necessary, in the fallen humanity which the Son of God assumed? By its very constitution, as resting under the burden or consequences of sin, and by reason of its surroundings in a sinful world, exposed to temptation from the world of darkness, it was necessary that Christ should elevate and perfect human nature by a real struggle and victory over sin and death.

We are brought here to the contemplation of the temptation of Christ. The proper understanding of this mysterious portion of His history involves a consideration, not only of His susceptibility of temptation as possessing a human soul, but especially the nature of His human will, inasmuch as His obedience was a free and willing obedience, and His victory over sin thus

a free, and not a compulsory victory. We assert here with *Lange*, that the very idea of temptation implies the possibility of sinning. Without such possibility in any sense, the temptation of Christ would have been the veriest sham. This will appear, if we consider that His triumph over the temptation of the Devil was a personal victory, a step in the process of His own perfecting of Himself, as well as for the benefit of His people. It was for His people, in that it was for Himself first a moral victory. But how could there have been a progress in His moral status, a perfecting of Himself in a real moral victory, where there was no possibility of doing aught else than what He did?

This view is required by the nature of Christ's human will. To be a truly human will, it must have what is essential to every other human will in a process of trial; that is, the power of yielding to evil. If the human in the person of Christ had been compelled by an overshadowing power to will as it did, then all freedom and virtue would have been gone. Indeed, we cannot see then why God could not have so controlled the will of Adam as to keep him from the fall.

There is a precautionary clause added to the decision of the sixth Œcumenical Council, already referred to, held at Constantinople, in the year 680, which was intended to be against any false conclusions derived from their decision by the Monothelites. "Two wills, and two natural modes of working, united without schism, and without confusion, as well as without change; so that no conflict ever existed between them, but the human will was invariably subject to the divine and almighty will."

This was evidently as far as they could go; and considering that their object was to meet the objections of the Monothelites, one of which, doubtless, would be, that if there were two wills in Christ, the one might contradict the other, it is strongly in favor of the position we have presented. It declares, not that there was no possibility of conflict, or that it was impossible for the human to be otherwise than subject to the divine will; but it merely asserts that it *was* invariably subject, and hence there *was* no conflict. To be in subjection with Him was to be willingly

obedient. He went to Nazareth, and was subject to His parents. He rendered a willing obedience. Thus His human will was in subjection to the divine. The divine will was one with the will of the Father, concerning which He declares: "I came not to do mine own will, but the will of Him that sent me."

The temptation of Christ was renewed, or repeated under a different form during His last sufferings. Then it was in the form of terrible fears, as the first addressed itself more to desire. "Who in the days of His flesh, when He had offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears, unto Him that was able to save Him from death, and was heard in that He feared." Who that reads the account of the agonies of Gethsemane, when the prayer was offered, "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me; nevertheless, not as I will, but as Thou wilt," but must feel that there was not a compulsory obedience, but a free one? When He humbled Himself, and became obedient, even unto death, it was a free and willing sacrifice, and one that caused the terrible struggle in the garden and on the cross, which must always remain a profound mystery to us.

We are not, of course, required to answer supposed contingencies, as for instance, what would have been the consequence if the human will of Christ had not been subject to the divine? We might as well ask, what would have become of heaven, and the preparation made for the saints, and the promises in regard to them, if all men had rejected Christ, as they certainly had the power to do? It is sufficient for us to know that Christ our Lord was freely, willingly obedient in all things, and thus successfully carried our common nature through its necessary trial, with all the difficulties and burdens of the fall, and that He thus gained a glorious victory over sin, and wrought out a positive holiness and salvation for us.

Olshausen, using the proposition that you can predicate of Christ whatever may be predicated of either nature, teaches that both statements are true. It was possible for Christ to sin, and it was not possible for Christ to sin. Subjectively, *i. e.*, referring to his human nature, it was possible; objectively, that is,

referring to his divine nature, it was not possible. As we are considering only the humanity, and not the divinity as such, of Christ, we shall not stop to examine this position. The human nature of Christ was that in which He suffered. As Christ is the eternal Son of God, it follows that He who is God of God, very God of very God, suffered and died. "For it was no other person who suffered under Pontius Pilate, than He who was born of the Virgin Mary; He who was born of the Virgin Mary, was no other person than He who was conceived by the Holy Ghost; He who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, was no other person than our Lord; and that our Lord no other than the only Son of God." (Pearson on the Creed.) Yet Christ suffered, not in His divine nature, but in His human nature. "For, although the properties of each nature may be attributed to the one Person, the properties of the one nature cannot be attributed to the other nature." (Shedd.) "Christ suffered for us in the flesh." (1 Pet. iv. 9.) "He was put to death in the flesh, but quickened in the Spirit."

We follow, thus, that human nature which the Son of God assumed in His holy conception and birth, down through our Saviour's life, in His trials and sorrows, in His obedience and victory, to His death upon the cross. While His body lay in the grave, and His soul entered Hades, this same human nature remained personally united with the Son of God. On the third day Christ arose from the dead, and in His resurrection and ascension He entered into His state of exaltation and glory. We come now to consider, briefly, Christ's humanity in its glorified state, and in its relation to the Church, which is the body of Christ, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all.

We are taught from the Scriptures by the Church, that the glorified humanity of Christ is to remain in everlasting hypostatic union with His divine nature. This is a wonderful truth, which serves to give us a deeper insight into the meaning of Incarnation. Here is a form of being which the Eternal Son of God has joined to His Godhead as an eternal state, that is for an eternity to come. This, we say, serves to open up to our view the wonderful depths of the fact of the Incarnation.

It seems to indicate that the "Word was made flesh," not only for a merely temporary purpose, as, for instance, the subduing of sin, and the suffering for human guilt; for if this were all, then we might suppose that after this particular work was done the human nature would be laid aside, and the God-man return to His original state or form of being as the Eternal Word. The fact of this continuous union of humanity with divinity seems to indicate, that it still performs a function or office for the Church. Nay, more, it leads us at least to ponder the meaning of that *image* of God in which man was created, the eternity of that image, and its relation to its actualization, or revelation in the Incarnate Word. A relation of this kind in one of the persons of the Godhead, which begins in time to continue throughout the eternity *to come*, cannot be absolutely sundered, we would think, from the being of God in the eternity that *is past*. It has led to the inquiry whether man was not created for the Incarnation, as well as whether the Incarnation was not for man. This latter question is, of course, answered in the affirmative, but it has been a matter of earnest thought how far it may be explained also by an affirmative answer to the former. In other words, it has been asserted by some of the ablest theologians of this age, and of other ages, that there is in God an eternal aptitude for man, as we know there is in man's nature an aptitude for God. And this has been earnestly discussed without holding for a moment any error of pantheism.

But we do not desire to enter upon this point, which our subject naturally suggests. We desire further only to inquire into the relation of Christ's humanity, now that it is glorified, to the Church.

It was the humanity of Christ, as we have seen, that furnished the form for His life and work on earth. He came into the world through a human birth, he taught through a human voice, he suffered in human nature. Are we not warranted in saying, that the work which He now continues to perform in the Church, He performs through the same human nature, now glorified, in which He suffered and died? In attempting to

maintain the affirmative of this proposition, we assume the truth of the mystical union. When the New Testament declares that the Church is His body, and that believers are united to Him, we assume that it teaches the substantial, vital, union of Christ and His people. Assuming this, we may inquire still more particularly into the nature of this union. In Christ the divine and human are united immediately and directly, in a hypostatic union. This cannot be the case with man; for in that case he would be deified, and we would thus be involved in pantheism.

The same difficulty, it seems to us, is presented in the view, very commonly held, that the Holy Spirit, as the third person of the Trinity, directly unites Himself with man, and thus unites man with God. If this union is eternal, what have we here again but a pantheistic view of the believer's relation with God. Besides, the teaching of our Saviour in regard to the work of the Spirit seems to imply, that this work stands mysteriously related to the glorified humanity of Christ. "The Spirit was not yet given, because Christ was not yet glorified." "He shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall He speak. He shall glorify me: for He shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you."

If then man is not united directly to the divine nature, may we not say that he is united to God through Christ's humanity by the operation of the Holy Ghost? In this case we could see how the humanity of Christ now is the form or medium, through which the work of redemption is carried forward, just as that humanity was the form in which redemption was wrought out in His person. God communes with man only through a revelation. The highest and fullest revelation is that in the God-man. Here then it is that the way has been prepared for man to come into communion with God. The humanity of Christ is the link by which the whole creation is brought back, and bound in everlasting harmonious union with the great Creator.

This will serve to explain why our Saviour seems to be so emphatic, in presenting this side of His life, as the true meat and

drink of His people. "My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day." When we consider, in connection with these sayings the words of Christ in the institution of the Holy Supper, "This is my body," and the great mystery which the Church has always held to be involved in that Sacrament, we are challenged to ask why those terms, which denote the humanity of Christ, are so emphatically employed in this connection. It will not satisfy the case to say, that these terms are employed to turn attention the more emphatically to the sacrifice on the cross, as the ground of our salvation, in which sacrifice, though Christ suffered as a divine-human person, yet He suffered and died in His human nature. For we have seen already, that the continued union of glorified humanity in His person must lead to the inference, that this humanity still continues to perform an office in the work of man's redemption. If the office, which it performs lies wholly in the past, we could not see why it was not laid aside when that past work was done. Moreover the terms in which it is referred to imply a present and continuous work, a life-giving, sanctifying work. "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, *hath eternal life*, and I will raise him up at the last day." This points to our life, and looks forward to the final triumph of life over death in the resurrection.

We might have a merely moral union with God, as many hold the union with Christ to be, without any mediation. Such a union existed in man's creation. There could be no vital union directly with God without involving pantheism. But the tree of life in the garden, and the Sacrament of the altar in the Church, point to a more intimate and real union to which the first pointed and looked for its completion.

Now, in applying what we have said, to what may be regarded as a representative subject, the Lord's Supper, our view of the humanity of Christ leads us to see the necessity for the presence of the humanity of Christ in that holy Sacrament. It is not present as a mere accompaniment of His divinity which is omnipresent, but it is present as the medium through

which we are made partakers of the divine nature, and as the true spiritual nourishment of regenerated man. We might, and do, say, that the humanity of Christ is present in the Eucharist, because His life is present, and that life, being the-anthropic, includes the human as well as the divine. But we mean to assert more than this. For in this assertion we merely establish the truth of the presence of Christ's humanity without necessarily teaching any specific office or work for that humanity; whereas we wish to affirm, that the humanity of Christ is present in the Lord's Supper as that, in and through which He makes us partakers of the divine nature. It is thus only, as we think, that we can hold fast to the great mystery of the words of the institution of the Holy Supper.

Thus we find the deep significance of Christ's humanity in His glorification as well as in His humiliation. In His glorification Christ carries up humanity to its true and proper destiny, as contemplated and designed, shall we not say, in man's original creation. "Christ is the archetypal Man, in whom the true ideal of humanity has been brought into view." We behold Him now in His true character as the absolute Head of the race, in whom the humanity of Adam comes to its full completion. His glorified humanity is now the mirror in which the divine glory is reflected. He has elevated humanity to the crowning glory of the universe of God, while He is Head over all things to the Church, gathering into one, recapitulating, all things in heaven and on earth.

As such new and absolute Head of the race, He now unites to Himself in the mystical union, all who in the new birth of water and the Spirit are made members of His mystical body. As individual men are members of the first Adam by natural generation and birth, and partake of his nature, so by the new birth they are made members of Christ, and partakers of His glorified humanity. They are united to Christ through His life, which is truly a human life. Thus the glorified humanity of Christ becomes the medium of man's union with God in his state of salvation. Christians are united to the Logos, not immediately, as was humanity in the hypostatical union in the person

of Christ, but mediately through His humanity, by the operation of the Holy Ghost, in a mystical union.

The result of this union, when it is finally wrought out, is the glorification of the Church in the resurrection and the life everlasting. Here, at last, man attains his true destiny. He stands at the head of creation, ruler over all things with Christ. Here he attains to his proper consciousness, as related to creation below him, and to God above him. He now realizes that image and likeness of God in which he was created. The mystery of creation is solved in the mystery of redemption, and the dark shadow of sin is forever shut out from the kingdom of God.

---