

Who Is Jesus?

Jewish Messiah, Christ of Faith or The Eternal God

by Frank Selch, Dip.C.Min; B.Th. (A.C.T.)

I believe that there has never been a time when a clarification of the core meaning of these terms has been more important than now. The chief aim, in seeking to define the title of this talk, is in the defense of truth that, I believe, was brushed aside by the various Church councils in the 4th and 5th centuries for the sake of church politics and political point scoring.

Paradoxically, the Christian establishment **is not afraid** in allowing a challenge to **the clear Biblical injunction** concerning the practice of homosexuality among consenting adults. Yet, when this self-same establishment is challenged on non-biblical doctrines, it comes out with all guns blazing.

Although various men (so-called heretics), throughout the Christian history, have attempted to turn Christian theology back to its Biblical Roots, the established Christian mainstream has always managed to silence these voices by either killing them outright, or sidelining them one way or another.

Not much has changed!

This meeting today is not about theological point scoring!

However, I believe that the time has come when ordinary men and women, who follow the Messiah Jesus (Yeshua) rise up and begin to address these issues without fear of retribution from the various denominational hierarchies.

A quote from Ed Murrows:

*"We will not walk in fear, one of another. We will not be driven by fear into **an age of unreason**, if we dig deep in our history and doctrine and remember that we are not descended from fearful men, not from men who feared to write, to speak, to associate and to defend causes which were for the moment unpopular. We can deny our heritage and our history, but we cannot escape responsibility for the result. There is no way for a citizen of the Republic to abdicate his responsibility." "No one man can terrorize a whole nation unless we are all his accomplices." "We must not confuse dissent with disloyalty." March 9, 1954*

As men and women of God we have a grave responsibility to those who will come after us, that the truth is passed onto them. Truth **MUST** no longer be a mere mental assent to an objective reality, but **MUST** be a living reality among us.

Absolutes must again become absolutes, lest the vacuum created by us will be filled by the forces of darkness.

The Apostle Paul makes an astonishing claim in his letter to the Thessalonian Church, when he says that **a delusion from God** would come upon the human race, because the love of the truth was not in them— because they chose to believe what was false (2 Thess.2:7-12).

This meeting is primarily about truth; let us therefore not forget that it was Church dogma and departure from the truth that brought about the Dark Ages and with them a deception on a massive scale!

With the ascendancy of Islam, the gates of an even darker period are beginning to open widely to swallow a gullible humanity! It is again the leaders of Christendom who are asking their followers to abandon reason as they acquiesce to the demon of tradition and political correctness, as they march headlong into disaster.

Languages have always undergone a degree of cross fertilization through 'loan' words – or plain adaptations of foreign words to express something that could have adequately been expressed by means of the existing vocabulary. Eventually this resulted in new languages being formed. And it continues to this day.

In most instances this has little bearing upon our society— it simply reflects a need to be in tune, or in step, with norms outside our sphere of existence.

One could say that this could also be applied to the topic in question, because when we look at the bulk of Christian theology, ethic and morals, we can clearly see an expression of Greek philosophy, and not a Hebrew religion from whence Christianity sprang in the first place.⁴

This however, is infinitely more serious and far-reaching than mere changes in linguistics that result in cultural changes. The net-consequence is a Replacement Theology that is not only concerned with substituting the church for

⁴ Greek philosophy is more concerned with rhetoric – the theory of doing – whereas Hebrew thought is practical first. The term antinomianism, which was coined by Evangelical thinkers seeking to describe this phenomenon, ironically means *Replacement of Torah, or Divine Instructions*.

Biblical Israel, but chiefly with the substitution of a NT god for the God of Creation!

So, what we have today is a theological language that is far removed from its Biblical parent!

Beginning with the 2nd cent, Greek terminology began to enter the Bible that was foreign to Hebrew thought and with it a distortion of what the Scriptures actually taught.⁵

The Christian leaders, who followed the apostles did not allude to a Trinity, but rather affirmed their belief in the monotheism of the Old Testament and accepted without question the divine origin and the humanity of Jesus. Since these leaders emphasized the doctrines associated with Oneness, it can be assumed that the post-apostolic church accepted the oneness of God.

It is certain that they did not teach the Doctrine of the Trinity, as it later developed, and as it exists today.

Even after the emergence of the Trinitarian doctrine in the latter part of the second century, the Doctrine of the Trinity did not replace Oneness as the dominant belief until around 300 A.D., and it did not become universally established until late in the fourth century.

Abelard (1079 - 1142), rejecting the Trinitarian doctrine, taught that *"...the first key to wisdom is this constant and frequent questioning.... For by doubting we are led to question, by questioning we arrive at the truth!"* Abelard sought to demonstrate in 'Sic et non' (yes and no) that tradition and authority were not enough to answer questions such as 'Is God omnipotent?', 'Do we sin without willing it?' and 'Is faith based upon reason?' In 1121 the Council of Soissons condemned his views on the Trinity without a hearing. For the next twenty years he lived a harassed existence as he moved from place to place, persecuted by the authorities and pursued by a large number of students.⁶

Another prominent anti-Trinitarian, at the time of the Reformation, was Michael Servetus (1511 - 1553), he was burnt at the stake at the order of Calvin.

Servetus built a theology, which maintains that the belief of the Trinity is not based on biblical teachings but rather on what he saw as deceiving teachings of (Greek)

⁵ Church historians agree that the Doctrine of a Trinity, as we know it today, did not exist in the immediate post-apostolic age. Modern day theologians, however, are doing their utmost to prove the existence of a Trinitarian theology in the immediate post apostolic era, but without recourse to Hebrew thought as expressed in the Bible.

⁶ In *The History of Christianity*

philosophers. He saw himself as leading a return to the simplicity and authenticity of the Gospels and the early Church Fathers. In part he hoped that the dismissal of the

Trinitarian dogma would also make Christianity more appealing to Judaism and Islam, which had remained as strictly monotheistic religions.

Servetus affirmed that the divine Logos, which was a manifestation of God and not a separate divine Person, was united to a human being, Jesus, when God's Spirit came into the womb of the Judean (Jewish) maiden Miriam. Only from the moment of conception, was the Son actually generated. Therefore the Son was not eternal, but only the Logos (HaDavar Elohim), from which He was formed.⁷ For this reason, Servetus always rejected that the Messiah was the "eternal Son of God", but rather that he was simply "*the Son of the Eternal God*". This theology, although totally original, has often been compared to *Adoptionism* and to *Sabellianism* or *Modalism*, which were old Christian heresies – or perhaps attempts in explaining the inexplicable.

Under severe pressure from Catholics and Protestants alike, Servetus somehow modified this explanation in his second book, *Dialogues*, to make the Logos coterminous with 'Christ'. This made it nearly identical with the Pre-Nicene view, but he was still accused of heresy because of his insistence on denying the dogma of the Trinity and the individuality of three divine Persons in one God.

Servetus went so far as to call the doctrine of the trinity a three-headed monster. He believed it necessarily led to polytheism and was a delusion from the devil. He also believed that because the church accepted trinitarianism, God allowed it to come under the rule of the papacy and so to lose Messiah. He could not understand why the Protestants would come out of Catholicism, but still insist upon retaining the nonbiblical and man-made doctrine of the trinity.

Opposition to the Trinitarian doctrine kept on resurfacing throughout the centuries, but produced little more than non-biblical churches; e.g. Swedenborgianism, Christadelphians, Jehovah's Witnesses, Oneness Churches, etc.

A number of Oneness Pentecostal organizations exist today including Jesus-Only Churches. Many of them have simply replaced the Trinity with a 'New Testament god' called Christ, or Jesus Christ.

⁷ In my view, the major problem for theologians in accepting a non-personal view of the Word of God, prior to the birth of Jesus, is a total misunderstanding of the Nature of the Elohim and His Word (Gr. Logos; Hebr. HaDavar). Greek mythology has no problems about separating the gods of its pantheon into individual parts that eventually take on a life form on their own. Not so in Hebrew thought; in fact John encapsules this One-ness of the Creator in the first three verses of his "*Good News*" about Jesus. He clearly states that the Almighty cannot be separated from His Word. But this Word is not a separate person, rather His active power that produces a child in Miriam.

The major ones with headquarters in the United States of America are: *The United Pentecostal Church International (by far the largest), The Pentecostal Assemblies of the World, The Bible Way Churches of Our Lord Jesus Christ World Wide, The Assemblies of the Lord Jesus Christ, The Church of Our Lord Jesus Christ of the Apostolic Faith, and The Apostolic Overcoming Holy Church of God. Oneness Pentecostal groups with headquarters in other countries include The United Pentecostal Church of Colombia, an indigenous church and the largest non Catholic church in the country; The Apostolic Church of the Faith in Christ Jesus, with headquarters in Mexico; the Oneness Pentecostal movement in the U.S.S.R.; and the True Jesus Church,* an indigenous church founded by Chinese believers on the mainland but whose headquarters is now in Taiwan. There are many smaller organizations (approximately 130 worldwide), independent churches, and charismatic fellowships that are Oneness Pentecostal in doctrine.

1st Council of Nicaea:

Council of Nicaea (325) lasted two months and twelve days. Three hundred and eighteen bishops were present. Hosius, Bishop of Cordova, assisted as legate of Pope Sylvester. The Emperor Constantine was also present. To this council we owe The Creed (Symbolum) Of Nicaea, defining against Arius the true Divinity of the Son of God (homoousios), and the fixing of the date for keeping Easter (against the Quartodecimans).

2nd Council of Nicaea:

First Council of Constantinople (381), under Pope Damasus and the Emperor Theodosius I, was attended by 150 bishops. It was directed against the followers of Macedonius, who impugned the Divinity of the Holy Ghost. To the above-mentioned Nicene Creed it added the clauses referring to the Holy Ghost (qui simul adoratur) and all that follows to the end.

Council of Ephesus:

Council of Ephesus (431), of more than 200 bishops, presided over by St. Cyril of Alexandria representing Pope Celestine I, defined the true personal unity of Christ, declared Mary the Mother of God (theotokos) against Nestorius, Bishop of Constantinople, and renewed the condemnation of Pelagius.

Council of Chalcedon:

Council of Chalcedon (451) -- 150 bishops under Pope Leo the Great and the Emperor Marcian defined the two natures (Divine and human) in Christ against Eutyches, who was excommunicated.

I appreciate the work done in various parts of the world, particularly in the US, by **Anthony Buzzard** and the **Tzemach Institute**. My profound thanks go to Anthony, for it was his book on the Trinity that encouraged me to begin speaking out on this important subject once more. Although, Australia thus far, only has the Jehovah's Witnesses and the Christadelphian Churches (to a lesser degree the World Wide Church of God) who have been staunch defenders of an anti-Trinitarian position. Although the JWs profess faith in Jesus as the Saviour of the human race, they nevertheless see Him as a *lesser (created) god*.⁸ Tragically, most JWs are people who had professed to be Christians of one kind or another (usually RC) prior to be confronted by them on the subject of the Trinity. But together with the Christadelphians they are steeped in legalisms that have seriously crippled many of their adherents.

However, I feel that the views presented by Anthony Buzzard, as well as the J.W.s et al, fall short of the actual Biblical definition of the Son of God. Anthony Buzzard's Jesus becomes too human and the model, presented by the Watchtower, simply takes the Arian position of making him into another, albeit lesser, god.

We need to ask, therefore, if Jesus is not merely a human, but powerfully anointed, messenger of the Divine, nor a lesser god, how can we possibly define Him without attributing to Him some sort of hybrid quality.

It is not my intention to dissect the above mentioned views, rather to present something fresh and hitherto not touched upon (to the best of my knowledge), but what I believe to represent the true reason for the appearance of Jesus.

⁸ The Watchtower religion is merely a revamped Arianism. Arius (4th cent. C.E.) was the major catalyst for the Council of Nicaea and all subsequent Church Councils. He insisted that Jesus was not the Creator God, as claimed by some of his contemporaries (ie. Athanasius, et al.), but a lesser, created divine pre-existent being in human form.

The Progenitor of the New (redeemed) Humanity: Eternal God, Christ of Faith or Jewish Messiah?

Hindsight grants us the privilege to recognize that God's work of Redemption began with and continued through Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. The Scriptures clearly draw a line from Abraham through the Jewish Patriarchs and finish in Jesus, Who was declared to be the Son of God by the messenger Gabriel and Messiah by Shim'on Kepha;⁹ but then, Israel is also called *Son of God* (Hos.11:1).

It is a tragedy of immeasurable proportions that the Son of the Most High became absorbed into this Greek pantheon, called a Trinity. He is at once the '*Prophet like Moses*' and '*the Son of Man*' spoken of by Daniel (7:13-14). We need to pay attention to the parallels at work here. Where Moses kept the destroying angel away from Israel by means of the blood of a lamb and opened the Red Sea with his staff, Yeshua brought deliverance from death and entrance into immortality by means of His own blood.

As a consequence He alone is entitled to be called the first fruit of a redeemed humanity; but it is humanity unlike the one that sprang forth from Adam's fallen seed. The New Redeemed Human race has again the divine spark present in Adam at his creation.

Yeshua was not only full of the Divine Spirit, but He also has the power to pass it on. Not only did Yeshua have the Divine Spirit without measure, He was indwelt by the fullness of Deity. In other words, '*all authority in heaven and earth was bestowed upon Him*' (Dan.7:13-14). But, as Paul teaches, '*although the power of the Almighty was present in Yeshua, He did not count this equality with God a thing to be grasped!*' (Phil.2:5-11).

The Apostle Paul clearly states, that since the appearance of Yeshua of Nazareth, humanity was comprised of two streams:

- the race of Adam, bearing the image of the man made from dust (1 Cor.15:48-49, and

⁹ See also John 1:41; Matt.16:16; Matt. 1:25;3:17; the Apostle Paul continually refers to Jesus as the Son of God, e.g. Rom.1:1-9; unclean spirits called Jesus the Son of God, Mark 3:11

- the race of the Last Adam, destined to bear the image of the heavenly man (Rom.8:29; c/f. 1 Cor.15:49).

Paul seems to be building on Jesus' own statement that the primary condition for immortality was a spiritual rebirth (Jn.3:1-17).

Indeed all of Scripture seems to point to a transformation of the human race after the resurrection. For me, Paul's dialogue in 1 Cor 15 is most telling of all. It is summed up in v. 28 where he says that 'the Son will also be subjected ... so that God may be all in all.'

Here we have the Son of God, Who is also referred to elsewhere as the first born of the 'New Creation' subjecting Himself to the Father, thus affirming that the Father is greater than He. Paul agrees here with the Son of Man visions of Daniel.

Eternal God

When I became a follower of Jesus at the end of the 70s, there was a clear focus of worship directed toward the Creator God. However, sometime in the 80s this focus started to become blurred when the language of prayer began to merge Jesus with God the Father and the Holy Spirit and prayers to God were concluded with 'in your name, etc'.

By the mid 90s it was clear that the names and titles like Jesus, Christ, God, Heavenly Father, Holy Spirit, etc. had become interchangeable terms, but ultimately meaning God.

A shift had taken place, probably through our Bible Colleges and *Theological* institutions, which had removed any Biblical distinctives between Jesus, God and the Holy Spirit. Although I think that the excessive familiarity, that began to develop during the days of the Charismatic Renewal, was a major contributor to this shift.

Should there be a distinction made?

I firmly believe so because the Bible makes these distinctions, e.g. Paul clearly distinguishes in all of his epistles between God, the Father and the Lord Jesus (the) Messiah.

What we have been witnessing is a subtle expulsion of the (OT) Creator God, Who dispenses justice and the installation of Jesus as the New Testament God of Grace. An example of this can be seen in many Pentecostal 'Oneness, or Jesus only Churches'

(referred to above). Now, many of these 'Oneness' Churches actually reject the Trinity, which they see as representing three gods.¹⁰ Oneness teaching, however, identifies Jesus at once as Son of God, God the Father, God the Son and the Holy Spirit. Similar views can now also be found across many major evangelical churches, despite the fact that Jesus is never once called 'Father' in the New Testament, but he is explicitly referred to as the Son of God over 200 times. God the Father is also referred to as distinct from Jesus the Son - more than 200 times.

What can be observed here is confusion multiplying itself right across the Christian spectrum. Some people deny the Trinity, but make Jesus into God the Father, while others condemn this theology, but nevertheless insist that Jesus is God, but only as the Son - yet not distinct from the Father. Such have abandoned the reasonableness of language!

Probably the most significant from the monotheism of the Bible is the creation of the Holy Spirit as a separate being from the Father. The Hebrew Bible knows no such distinction; nor do I believe that the New Testament departs from that. The Spirit of God is mentioned nearly a hundred times in the T^enach, but can never be regarded as a different, or separate being from El Shaddai. Jesus clearly defines the nature of God in John 4:24, viz. 'God is Spirit'. If then God the Father is a Spirit Being, does another Spirit indwell Him, who is the Holy Spirit? GOD IS HOLY and Jesus could therefore have also said '*God is Holy Spirit*'. The debate among Charismatics, whether one should worship the Holy Spirit, is very much a superfluous argument. As Jesus said, '*God is Spirit and those who worship Him must worship in spirit and in truth!*' (Jn.4:24).

In either case, we have a departure from the Hebrew Scriptures!

Christ of Faith

The 1800s saw a new development in Christian theology. Beginning with Julius Wellhausen, the study of Scripture took a turn, which began to regard a more scientific (Higher Criticism) approach as preferable to elucidate the actual meanings the ancient authors had in mind when they penned the various books of the Bible.

Regardless of the actual merits of this *Higher Criticism*, its positive consequences were a renewed zeal in the actual study of the Biblical texts to establish their veracity.

¹⁰ E. Calvin Beisner, *Jesus Only Churches*, (Zondervan: Grand Rapids, 1998), p.74

One of these approaches was the quest to discover the historical Jesus. The original "Quest of the Historical Jesus" was based upon the presupposition that there was a radical gulf between the historical figure of Jesus and the interpretation, which the Christian church had placed on this.

Albert Schweitzer (c. 1875-1965) was a leading German Protestant Theologian who was noted particularly for his work on the historical Jesus, which in turn led to a series of influential publications calling the validity and presupposition of the "quest of the historical Jesus" into question.

Then came the retreat from history altogether by **Rudolf Bultman** (c. 1884-1976). Bultman was a German Lutheran writer who was appointed to the Chair of Theology at Marburg in 1921. He is chiefly noted for his program of 'demythologization' of the New Testament, and his use of existentialist ideas in the exposition of the twentieth century meaning of the Gospel. For Bultman, it is only necessary 'that' Jesus lived, not to interest one's self in the actual historicity that cannot really be proven. In his view it is the *Christ of faith* that matters, not whether he has an historical basis for existence.¹¹ A second perspective, and one that is very much alive in a covert form, is the view expounded by Thomas Altizer in the early 20th c. that the primeordial God has ceased to exist, but in *Christ* is now totally immanent within the human race.¹² When Jesus died on the cross, the God of the OT died in Him, paying the price for human sin. In the resurrection a *New God* of grace and compassion arose from the grave— a view very much held by *Liberation Theology*.

The *Death of God* theology may have had only a short lifespan in the 1960s, but the concepts it espoused certainly continue to live on in one form or another. Erickson writes that these theologians recommended a '*thoroughly secular world-affirming faith*'— a factor that is quite obvious in many of our churches today.

A major factor in determining the true nature of Christianity, and flowing out of the above, is the increasing irrelevance of the Hebrew Scripture. If the God of the OT is dead, then most of what is written in the Hebrew Bible MUST of necessity be now irrelevant – especially the nation of Israel and the Jewish people.¹³

The major problem with the *Christ of Faith* approach is that it is totally subjective. The coming of the Messiah 2000 years ago was an objective event. It was not imagined

¹¹ It was not important to the Greeks either whether their gods ever existed in the earth or not- a mere belief in them was important.

¹² Millard J. Erickson, *Christian Theology*, (Grand Rapids: Baker Bookhouse, 1985) p.678

¹³ The true value of the OT is purely spiritual.

by people, but attested to by many historical witnesses. Jesus warned that many *Messiahs (Christs)* would come claiming to be He— unless there is an objective rule by which to measure/test His veracity, how could anyone know what is true?

Sadly, for many today, their 'Christ' is synonymous with the Creator – yet they have no way of verifying that claim. They have departed from the Scriptures and opened themselves up to a deception with eternal consequences. A '*Christ of Faith*' theology/Christology permits the very substitution implied by the term *Anti-Christ*.

Personally, I reject the use of the term Christ as a misleading term for Jew and Gentile. It is a deliberate mistranslation of the Hebrew word Mashiach, meaning *Anointed* or *Specially Chosen One* and points to the deliberate creation of a Gentile religion.

If the term had been translated correctly from the beginning, or at least from the time of the Reformation, people would have had to ask themselves the question, '*If Christ means 'the anointed and specially chosen one', and is synonymous with God, then who anointed and chose God, and why would He have to be anointed in the first place?*' Even if one is prepared to make a theological leap across such nonsensical mumbo-jumbo, the very rules of language and logic demand a rejection of such a concept.

Jewish Messiah

It is clear that the Jewish people expected – and still do so today – a Messiah who would deliver them from the oppression of the Gentiles, restore/establish the everlasting Kingdom of David and lead the human race into era of unprecedented harmony and bliss. It is a harsh truth that religious leaders through the ages, be they Jewish, Christian or otherwise, have rarely served their constituents well. More often than not have they been, and are, self-serving and prone to condemn those who dared to attempt to upset their personal kingdoms.

This self-serving is also seen in the disciples. Despite the fact that Kepha recognized Jesus for Who He was, he reproached his Master for not fitting into his concept of Messiah. Kepha's concept was firmly rooted in the understanding that the Messiah had to be a king in the manner of David. When Jesus informed his disciples that He would be killed, He stepped out of their line of vision.

This same principle still applies today. The only problem is that the people of Jesus' day only had a partial picture; we have the completed Scriptures as well as the lessons of 6000 years of history as our guide.

In order to understand, we need to begin with Adam.

Prior to his rebellion, Adam's nature, etc. was *'in the image and likeness of God'* (Gen.1:26-27; c/f. Col.1:15). When Adam sinned, the light and life of God in him died and all of creation entered into a process of decay and death. However, the Almighty in His grace foreshadowed an ultimate redemption, viz. *'And I will put enmity between you (the serpent) and the woman, and between your seed and her seed; He shall bruise you on the head and you shall bruise him on the heel'* (Gen.3:14-15). The continuation of this process can be seen in the rescue of Noah and his family, but taking on a defining role, in the Covenant the Eternal makes, with Abraham and his seed through Isaac and Jacob.

Egypt, the Exodus, Sinai and the Torah, the Wilderness, conquering the Promised Land with life under judges, kings and prophets, the Temple, the Exile and the return and 400 years of prophetic silence, all served to shape the people into a unique body—unlike any other people on this earth. As Paul says, *'the Torah served as a tutor, to lead the people to Messiah'* (Gal.3:24-25). For the Hebrews, the Torah is not just a book, or the contents of a book— it is all of life's experiences, since all of life is meant to be shaped by the Instructions of the Almighty.

Therefore, it was Torah that prepared the people for the coming of the *Anointed One*, the One specially chosen by God. He was foreshadowed by the prophets as long as 800 years prior to His coming and He was referred to as the *Righteous Branch, the Suffering Servant of God and the Son of Man*.

From this, the religious leaders should have recognized that this Coming One would be no ordinary being. Statements by Isaiah, like calling Him *might hero; everlasting father, prince of peace*, etc. should have alerted them— alas it did not! And then there is Psalm 2!

Scripture points to a being of extraordinary quality!

If this one was the redeemer of the human race, it could not be just an ordinary man! Our clue lies in the word redemption! All of mankind lies under a curse of death. The only way to escape this curse is a complete restoration to a pre-fall condition. The only one who could accomplish such a feat had to be impervious to this curse.

As I said above, the Torah prepared the people of Israel over a long time. It says, that in the fullness of time... *'When the fullness of time had come, God sent forth His Son, born of a woman, born under law...'* (Gal.4:4). This is in direct fulfilment of the words God spoke to Moses in Deut.18:18, viz. *'I will raise up for them a prophet from among their brethren, like you, and I will put my words into his mouth and he shall speak to them all that I command him.'* And again, *'...the Word became flesh and dwelt among us.'* Jn.1:14.

The child born of Miriam was not conceived as any other child. The New Covenant writers inform us that the conception took place as the Spirit of God came upon her. Therefore, the child born of her is more than, and different to, a mere mortal human. But note the similarity in origin between Adam and Jesus – both had God as their total source. In Adam's case, it was a vessel of clay that served as receptacle for the Breath of God – in Yeshua's case it was the womb of Miriam, a young woman prepared by the Torah. God created Adam in His image – Jesus too was *the express image of the Divine* (Heb.1:3). When Adam was created the dust of the earth was uncontaminated by sin and Adam would have reflected the glory of God. When Adam sinned the God-Spirit in Adam died and with it Adam's connection to the Divine. If God was to restore humanity to a pre-Edenic condition, a New Adam (or father of the redeemed human race) had to come into being. However, no human father was capable of producing an offspring untainted by the sin of Adam. For this reason, it was the Almighty Himself Who acted upon a human vessel to *beget* this new and *Last Adam*. Although this offspring of human and divine interaction was fully human, his essence was divine – no less than that of the first Adam. When we look at the (Hebrew) text of Genesis 1, we find that the Bible refers to all creatures as living beings. However, it is only Adam who receives the breath of God in his nostrils! This should make us stop and think, for this alone is the reason that human beings are different from the animals. It is the breath of God, which separates and elevates us from the rest of creation, enabling us to speak and sing of the glories of our Creator.

When we come to consider the origin of Jesus, we find that because the God Spirit dwelt in Him in fullness, we see in Him the accurate reflection of Adam's pre-Fall condition; including all the powers that would have been inherent in Adam. The only factor missing is the glory! However, when we follow the Master to the Mount of Transfiguration, we can see that too!

Our problem in understanding this lies in the fact that we are thinking with Greek minds, which demand a box for everything. In other words, for today's Christians, as well as for the early Church Fathers, Jesus had to be either fully God or fully human. Since neither of that was totally acceptable, successive church councils constructed the Trinity of Father Son and Holy Spirit, but with a Jesus who had a dual nature in one— an insane doctrine, that cost the lives of countless thousands throughout the ages, simply because they could not grasp this theological monstrosity.

In summary

Why is it necessary to define the nature of Jesus, whether in His person or that of His office as Messiah? Why is it necessary to go beyond the Biblical boundaries?

I believe that any foray into philosophical realms that cannot be defined by Scripture must lead to factionism and strife. The Scriptures clearly tell us that we must believe that Jesus is the Son of God and that He came in the flesh, i.e. that He was an human being.

Yes, Jesus was fully human, however, He also possessed a divine component no-one before Him ever had. But this does not make Him any more into the Creator God (there is not a shred of evidence that He ever thought of Himself as such) that He is portrayed as by the bulk of post-Constantinian Christianity.

Messiah MUST be Hebrew (Jewish); i.e. Anointed and specially chosen, because His coming was foretold by the Scriptures (Deut.18:15-19; Isa.11:1-10; Dan.7:13-14) and because **Salvation is of the Jews** (Jn.4:22).

Also, we need to hold the nature of Jesus in tension, for He is Someone Who cannot be clearly defined in human terms; simply because **there has never been anyone like Him Who could be observed and touched**. The Scriptures clearly teach that the Almighty created humans to be like Him in appearance and likeness. That God breathed into Adam, indicates the intimacy He sought with the human race. The breath that generated Adam came from the same *bosom* Jesus said of Himself to have originated from (i.e. The creative word emanated from the bosom, or inner being, of the Almighty, Jn.1:1,18). Greek philosophy loves to break every thought into the smallest components; God, however, cannot be divided. Although the Bible speaks of God having body parts, these are merely anthropomorphisms, for the Eternal One acts through His Spirit. But even His Spirit cannot be separated from Him, for HE IS SPIRIT.

Therefore there cannot be a location where He is not— we call it Omnipresent, and when His breath goes forth from Him it is as though He is doing the action. There is never a time or a place when God is not present to us, despite the freedom we have to shut Him off at our choosing.

The conclusion I am drawing from the Scriptures is this, human beings must regain the divine spark if we are to emerge from this valley of sin and death. Jesus is the source of this spark. If we reduce Him to a mere human being – period – we have no hope of regaining that. Also, to deny, that the conception of Jesus through the Spirit of God is no different to any other pregnancy, except in accident, moves us into a dimension that comes perilously close to pagan mythology.

Jesus is the perfect man in Whom dwelt the fullness of Divinity (Col.2:9). As such He WAS able to

- pay the price for Adams rebellion (Mk. 10:45), and
- restore the human race to God's favour.

The only thing God **ever** asked of humans was obedience and He found it only in one: Jesus (Phil.2:8). ***“Therefore God highly exalted Him and bestowed upon Him a Name above all other names...”*** Phil.2:9-11.

This obedience merited Him also the Resurrection and to become the First Fruit of the New Creation.