

ON THE DIVINITY OF JESUS

Ester Blomerus

All power is GIVEN unto me in heaven and on earth.
(KJV, Matt.28.18).

Why does theology propagate that God created within the virgin, Miriam (Mary), a perfect creation, a body carrying a holy nature that would indeed befit the indwelling of the Messenger of God, the Son of God of the Old as well as the New Testaments – the one formerly revealed, i.e. before the Son was made flesh, the other after He was born and walking in the midst of God's People, the Jewish nation, who was to receive this special visitation from God? – Messiah or the Anointed of God made flesh and of course in accordance with the Bible, first to the Jews and then to the Gentiles (the goyim).

Fact is, Christological viewpoints had, since its theological debate and inception, been in place, i.e. on the Incarnation and the traditional viewpoints, especially from the Council of Nicaea (325) onwards. In fact, up until today. One of the salient issues was then concerning Christ's (true) nature and the question was therefore asked: Was it fully God or fully man, or both?

The following propagators denied His deity:

The Ebionites (also identified with the New Testament Nazarenes), however, note that there were more than one sect resorting under this umbrella so that “Ebionites” must not be generalized although it seemingly is often the case. Fact is the total development of, e.g., any Jewish sect after 68 A.D. (the destruction of Qumran) and 70 A.D. (the Second Temple destruction), is indeed vague. We should therefore rather focus on mainline sects. Basically the early Ebionite Jews can be classified as Hellenist and “ultra” Jewish - “ultra” meaning bent on propagating a strict and exclusive adherence to the Jewish faith and traditions. The Hellenist Jews would then have been more open to establishing liaisons with the Gentiles, i.e. moving them to faith in God.

Dynamic Monarchianism subjecting Christ unto the eternal, invisible God, and which subject

matter must of course be approached cautiously, especially in comparison with the Trinitarian doctrine which too has its own peculiar deviations from Scripture – that is if we remain objective and open to a Biblical interpretation of Scripture, i.e. over against a one-sided *traditional* stance. These two viewpoints have been at loggerheads since the earliest days of post-apostolic (historical) theological interpretation. Those resorting under the latter school of thought, are often labelled as “Biblical” scholars and who would then reason according to the traditional, exegetical and systematic model, generally accepted as a sound scientific approach to Scripture.

However, such reasoning on the Bible and Biblical matters is often steeped in a philosophical approach to Scripture, at a time in the history of the Church depicted as “Christian philosophy” and this is of course the reason why a triune God is portrayed as one God and naturally to conform to monotheism, the strict Mosaic Law prescription concerning God and His existence (Deut. 6.4). This is of course the reason why Christendom and Judaism will never be able to share a total affinity and for this very cause, and especially with alternative viewpoints well in place and also worded as “apostolic” – that is over and above the traditional Trinitarian perspective - the early Christian (New Testament) literature and history is still eagerly probed, and especially in comparison with post-apostolic theology.

Ignorance sometimes still prevails on the following sects and their viewpoints:

The Gnostics who denied his humanity – propagating the psychic Christ indwelling the body – however, what we must never lose sight of is that the seeds of a trinitarian approach to the Godhead were, during its primitive phase, sown by none other than the Gnostics. There were, again, diverse sects grouped among this generic designation. Although their type of doctrine or rather philosophy would then by far not have underscored that of Athanasius' Creed, fact is that the seeds of a trinity in the deity is clearly detectable in Gnostic literature. The Docetists are also related to Gnosticism and they too are sometimes linked to Marcion. But basically the Gnostics denied, and what I would like to describe here as Jesus' specially or rather Holy Spirit endowed human nature - believing that the psychic Christ appeared in the man Jesus and that His body then was of little value. Christians of course believe that the body of Jesus wrought salvation on the Cross of Calvary (Isa. 53). There were many diverse Gnostic sects, both Jewish and Gentile.

Concerning the Nestorians whose doctrine is interwoven with the history of the Eastern Oriental Church : They seemingly denied his divinity, claiming one nature and then not two as the Trinitarians indeed had defined in their confession of faith, namely a holy body brought forth by the Holy Spirit in the Virgin Mary. The Nestorians' denial of Christ's deity of course corresponds with the first century apostolic Church. We are often made to believe that the earliest Christians, the apostles of Jesus and their fellowship (Acts 1 & 2), were Ebionites but it appears that the latter had joined the ranks of the apostles and they were then those who had later again severed ties with them – therefore receiving from the Apostles of Jesus the teachings as Christ had conveyed His revelation to them (=not vice versa). Consult the Eastern Oriental Church's confession of faith and draw your own conclusions for this had caused a very important post-apostolic schism. But let's dig a little deeper. (It sometimes seems as though the Ebionite impact on Christendom has not as yet been properly thrashed out and we must therefore tread cautiously for it also entails the so-called Nazarenes, another thorny issue we must approach objectively).

Nestorius was of course excommunicated for his “apostate” teaching, with the result that the Church is, to this day, still propagating the union of the so-called two natures of Christ yet seemingly forgetting that the Word of God never states that Christ had two natures – this issue was of course hotly debated relatively shortly after Nicea and a theology was subsequently worded to

accommodate the deity-within-humanity concept. (We know that Jesus was called Son of Man as well as Son of God but making a clear division between “human” and “divine”, i.e. defining two natures per se, is nowhere taught in the New Testament).

What the Word of God does indeed lie in our mouths, is that the body of the Son of God was utterly (totally) kadosh - separated from the secular world and therefore utterly holy and sanctified since Jesus' birth! His nature was then truly divine, that is in comparison with man's, however, this divine nature is surely not one and the same as though His body was housing the deity – as if God was made flesh - and as though Mary was indeed Theotokos (Mother of God), also a traditional theological perspective that was planted by the post-apostolic Church, and which of course had spilled over to later Christendom. However, if we remain objective, and should we then indeed depict Mary as “God-bearer”, the following crucial question arises: Wasn't she indeed the mother of the unborn child? Although we, regardless, must again keep in mind that Scripture merely tells us that God sent forth His Son into the world (Gal. 4) and that the Son was indeed made flesh for us and for our Salvation (Phil 2; 1 John 4). Scripture, in other words, does not give us all the theological detail derived from post-apostolic reasoning, i.e. on Christ's Incarnation and which of course boils down to the doctrine of His revelation and, once again, devised by mere human beings!

Therefore, should we refuse to depict Mary as “God-bearer” (theophoros) rather opting for Theotokos (Mother of God), what we must still keep in mind is the way we reason on the Incarnation and fact is, whichever way we may be looking at this thorny issue, she is to this day generally made the Mother of God (Theotokos) because she was the one who carried the holy, unborn babe. And this is why we must once again objectify the traditional doctrine on the Incarnation and especially concerning the so-called two natures of God. Fact is, decisions that in the end had triumphed, were decisions made in accordance with a majority ruling and then naturally coming from the leaders of a Church that was following within the parameters of a specific tradition! Therefore, and for this very cause we must always ask ourselves: Why did the apostles so earnestly warn against the impact of apostasy and apostatising the first-century apostolic faith had they not been aware of an alternative tradition which was already manifesting in their day and age and which was of course threatening to lead the believers astray? (see. 2.Pet. 2.1; Rom. 1.25; Acts 20.17+; 1 John 2 and 4; 2 Tim. 4; 2 Thes. 2).

If we carefully read Psalms 2, clearly depicting God and His Christ (His Messiah), we will immediately see that the Son was begotten by the Father. He was in other words brought forth by the Father – something which definitely implies a heavenly creation, i.e. over and above an earthly creation like that of Adam - Jesus Himself declared His Sonship before the Jews (John 10.33+; John 5.23; John 14.28). His divine authority, also His pre-existent divinity was then bestowed upon Him, especially after His resurrection, i.e. by His Father. However, He still remained “Son of God” even after His resurrection (Matt. 28.18; Rom. 1.4). Jesus was then raised in His (former) body - brought forth through God's intervention, namely a body that was kept kadosh unto God the Father so that even in death it had not seen corruption, although His resurrected body was then glorified (Acts 2.31; Acts 2.36; Acts 2.24-27, also v.33-36). And in His resurrected body He ascended on high (Acts 1.10-12). It should therefore be clear that God the Father again “recreated/restored” His Son from the grave just as He had also brought Him forth from the womb in order to fulfil His earthly mission - God the Father called Him forth yet not in spirit but in body (Gal.4; 1 Pet. 1.3; Luke 24.36+; Heb. 10.5+; Ps.40.7-9; Acts 2.30-36).

“Created” was of course the big contention at early post-apostolic (Catholic) Councils, yet we must see this creation as a calling forth, or the bringing forth/calling into existence a heavenly being out

of nothing. God then spoke and His Son was brought forth and this theology the apostle Paul substantiates in 2 Cor. 4.6, also in Heb. 1.3. This is often called “Aryan”, yet what we must realize is that the Trinitarians also, and since the very beginning of Christendom, had their own peculiar type of theology in place - discussed in greater detail on this website - refer to our *Bible Enrichment podcasts*. And it was reasoning on the Godhead that had eventually ascribed two natures to the incarnated Christ, one human, one divine.

But, and this is a very important question, wasn't it for a definite cause that Jesus had longed to once again be clothed with the glory (the divinity) that He indeed had (shared) with His Father, i.e. while He was with Him in His pre-existence (John 17)? In other words, while He was performing the will of His Father in the heavenlies and clearly as God's Messenger or Go-between – a very important position as man could only see God in and through His Christ! (Ps 2; Prov. 8.22+)? And this singular Mediator status He indeed had retained after His resurrection (1 Tim. 2.5). It should then be clear that Jesus is indeed, and in Paul's very own words, the very same, i.e. yesterday, today, and forevermore (Heb. 13.8). Surely, there should be no problem to see continuance between the Old Testament pre-existent Messenger of the Covenant (Ex. 23.1+) and the New Testament “Lord of Glory!” who also now carries the revealed Name linked to deliverance, namely Yeshua/h (1 Cor. 2.8; Phil. 2.7-11; Heb. 1.7-9).

NOTE : Just to briefly wedge in here: Jesus is the English for the Latin Iesus, which is derived from the Hebrew /Aramaic “Yeshua” (I = Je, spoken with a soft J as in Afrikaans and German and as “Jesus” was rightly pronounced in Middle-English), the Greek being “Iesous” (pronounced Jesoos, also with a soft “Je”) - the Greek pronunciation is for us modern-day Christians sometimes quite peculiar yet compare it with the Latin version. Yeshua was of course a Roman citizen/subject and He was most definitely then also addressed the Roman way, i.e. Iesus and then not only as Yeshua, i.e. among the Latin speaking Christians. Although the Jewish Name is of course Yeshua (=deliverance which again ties in with Anointed or Messiah) we must also consider and acknowledge the tongues of the many nations who honour Him as risen Lord. Abraham was indeed the father of many “nations”! (I will later discuss the weird Zeus or deZeus sometimes linked to Jesus, a connection which has a definite early Christian history).

Wasn't the fullness of the Godhead not then dwelling bodily in the Son of God (Col. 1.15) and rightly as Image of God (the Unseen, Invisible God: John 4.24; John 1.18)? Surely, the fullness of the Spirit of God is not God, the Spirit Being that can never be seen by man, but it is indeed His revelation, His full representation, His full projection, His active Presence, in other words, His full Holy Spirit anointing! And of course always operative in and through His special heavenly messenger of old.

Now, had Jesus not indeed, and for this very cause, stripped Himself of His divine nature – His status of omnipotence in and through His Father (= His divinity) - and for this very purpose, namely to become equal to man in every aspect. Yet to be clothed with a holy nature, i.e. like that of the first Adam (only He was from heaven, as the apostle Paul rightly states in his letters). He then had one will and one holy nature although He was made flesh for our sakes. And this is the crux, although He was indeed made flesh fully, also equipped with one, holy, sanctified body, He could still (in fact He had to) apply His will, just as the first Adam indeed also did, i.e. to either please God, His Father fully or to lapse into sin! Had this not been the case, surely, why did He then have to toil in prayer as Paul indeed tells us in his Letter to the Hebrews (5.17)? And what is of course so wonderful about Paul's insight into, and what we today word as “Christology”, is that Jesus never sinned (Heb. 4.12)! He indeed kept Himself kadosh unto God up until the Cross! Many want to blame sin on Jesus but was there ever evidence of moral sin that could be brought in against Him, that is apart from many mythologies that have always been woven around His earthly existence, also His character, up to this day?

Proof that Jesus (Yeshua) had kept His will subjected unto God's will, is of course His crucifixion, for He had clearly willingly handed Himself over in Gethsemane to empty the cup fully. And such obedience only implies one thing, namely that He remained from His birth to the grave kadosh unto His Father. (Consult Eph. 4.24 re the image of God). Therefore He was rightly raised as Son of God (Rom. 1.4) and clearly meaning that very One who was heir to God's Throne since the beginning of creation (Pro. 8.22+)! And see for yourself how Paul, the well educated Jew, student of the illustrious Gamaliel, explains the “wisdom of God” after His encounter on Damascus Road (1 Cor.1.24; Acts 9)!

Jesus was then that very One who had kept Himself holy and dedicated to His God just as He had done in His pre-existence. Therefore, those who want to lay claim to the honor of being called a “son of God” must know that they will first and foremost have to bide by the foundational Covenant prescriptions (the Old Testament from which Salvation has come – John 4.22), for God clearly singles out one, heavenly Son of God, King of Zion, and He alone is therefore Heir to God's Majestic Throne (Ps. 2)! And because He was Israel's Guardian of old, He, the New Testament Jesus, is indeed, in Paul's words, the same, yesterday, today and for evermore for, even in the flesh, He remained the Holy One of God (Heb. 13.8; Mark 1.24). And those who honor Him, will be known by God's Name (Ex. 23.20-21; Mic. 5.1; Mal. 3.1). Only Him and none other! Also refer to Rev. 12 – satan, unlike the Son of God, had lapsed into sin when He rebelled against God.

NOTE: There is a tendency to delete any references of “Son of God” from the Bible, yet, what is in fact then done, is to execute satan's wish for Jesus was sent to the Cross because of this very confession He had made! (Luk. 22.70-71). The Cross is therefore intrinsically linked to Truth and Jesus then had no option but to speak truthfully even facing the death on a Roman cross (John 14.6)!

Had Jesus then not willingly laid down His divine status of glory, something that indeed does not pertain to this world, there would have been no Salvation for man. For this very cause He had to empty Himself completely (to strip Himself of his divine status), i.e. of that glorious, exalted status, something that had clothed Him with full authority over man and God's creation for He was indeed that very chosen One on whom the Name of God had rested (Ex. 23.21). Because of His very identity as Son of God, He was willing to put on the form of a servant for this world was indeed created for His glory (Phil. 2; Prov. 8.22+; Joh. 1). His pre-existent status is therefore integral to His divine nature, i.e. as God's only-begotten Son (Ps 2). It is then no wonder that God the Father had raised His Name after His resurrection - usually referred to as a “common Jewish name” - to such exalted position (Phil. 2.7-11; Eph. 1.17-23; Co. 3.17).

The glory Jesus then shared with His Father in His pre-existence does not only pertain to His divine attributes bestowed upon Him by His Father (!), but He as Son of God, on whom the sacred Name indeed had rested, was intrinsically adjoined to God, His Father, and especially with His Spirit Power in mind. Therefore, wherever that one particular heavenly Messenger had appeared in the cloud, or in the fiery pillar, the Glory of the Lord was there revealed and the Deliver of Israel was seen/visualized. Such vivid manifestations had especially taken place at the entrance of the Tabernacle. The Old Testament Scriptures often refer to Him as an “angelic being” - Angel of the Lord - and this is of course meaning a specific (!) “heavenly messenger” who could make Himself visible for a divine purpose to man so that it would instil faith in one Almighty God in and through this heavenly messenger.

Now, this was clearly Jesus in His pre-existence, and should we deny this one specific Messenger of the Covenant, also called this way, we would not have been able to determine Christ's pre-existence properly. To only depict Him as “reason” or “word” or (Greek) “logos” is just too abstract and unreal. And something that is not properly revealed in Scripture, Old and New, hinges on myth and

myths cannot pass as Truth! For this very cause we can resort to Mal. 3.1 and Mic. 5.1 as these two treasures of Scripture have a direct bearing on the Incarnation of Jesus as “Temple of the Living God”! The pre-existent One then indeed came to (He embodied) His Temple just as the prophet stated through God's Spirit.

Also note that it was since His baptism, and when God had indeed called Him His Only Begotten Son, that He could wrought awesome miracles and wonders for then the whole fountain of the Spirit of God was poured out upon Him, i.e. the anointing of the Holy Spirit (Acts 10.38). And this is where we would have benefited had we still have the full so-called apostate (!) Gospel according to the Hebrews at our disposal (the One Eusebius of Caesarea had in his possession and which was clearly rejected by mainstream Catholicism). Besides, how can we judge a document we have not even been able to read ourselves, for this Gospel had vanished! It is then not extant anymore. A fragment of this Gospel, the one that James deals with in his Apocryphal New Testament, clearly projects a Jesus full of the Holy Spirit Power of God Almighty! Much can still be said on this Gospel, but let's leave it for now here. But keep the aforementioned in mind when reading the following extract:

NOTE : The kenosis Christology focuses on how the eternal Son of God allegedly emptied Himself of divine attributes when He became man. This model is built on a faulty interpretation of Philippians 2:7. The model does not deny that Jesus has divine nature, but states that He (Jesus) laid down His divine attributes at the time of incarnation. Moody identifies the strength of this model thus: "This enabled theologians to recognize a limitation to the knowledge of Jesus on many matters without a denial of the unity of deity and humanity in Him".¹⁷ Lutheran theologian, Gottfried Thomasius subscribes to this view. (From <http://www.biblicalthology.com/Research/FolarinG01.html> : Functional Christology in the Fourth Gospel: Implications for African Christianity).

What we then Biblically can infer from Christ's particular nature and His special, divine conception, is that He was indeed the Pauline Adam “from heaven” - in other words He rightly had only one, holy nature and surely worked by God's Spirit in the Person of Christ, also clearly with the purpose of fulfilling His divine will and mission in and through His Son. Besides, the Old Testament indeed portrays for us a God who is Almighty and whose unique working/ability, i.e. His ways towards man and when and how He wants to accomplish His purpose, is indeed both marvellous and beyond man's understanding! Christ Jesus then came as SERVANT to perform His Father's will and He co-operated with His will because He was appointed over Israel as Israel's Guardian and Warrior of old (Ex. 23; Phil. 2; John 1; Isa. 42).

God clearly had a special purpose with the birth of His Son (His divine conception), and this purpose was not only to reveal God's glory to the Jewish nation – they had to be the first to receive the Gospel and then only the door to the Gentiles would open so that they too could be brought in, i.e. God's promise to Abraham as “father of many nations”, yet God especially sent His Son into the world to bring the perfect sacrifice. We can of course deduce this line of thought from Abraham's history and when he was commanded to sacrifice his son. This episode is of course a depiction of one of Abraham's lineage, i.e. to the flesh, who would have come in God's appointed time and in whose unique sacrifice all the animal sacrifices would have culminated! Therefore only one, special human sacrifice would have sufficed (satisfied) the strict commandments of the Law, and that very One who was to be God's eternal High Priest was therefore predetermined to bring it in His own body on the Cross for He was indeed that very One who annually had received the sacrificial animal blood, i.e. during Yom Kippur, the most holy day in the Jewish calendar, i.e. the Day of Atonement (Heb. 7.25; Lev. 16.2).

God the Father then had given His Son, born of a woman, born under the Law (Gal.4.4.) the same authority He had received from God in former times, i.e. when He was going before Israel in the

cloud, and He even had the authority to evade the Cross had He wanted to – that is when He began His ministry after His baptism and forty days fast! Yet He disregarded His claim to His unique Sonship – to call upon His Father to send angels to rescue Him, i.e. in Gethsemane - and He indeed denied Himself along with all His divine attributes and the authority He was clothed with since His baptism by John the Baptist, choosing the Cross on mankind's behalf! And this, surely is the clarity we have from Phil. 2, an apostolic stance of complete redemption in and through the Son of God!

Had Jesus then not remained kadosh unto His God and completely devout in every respect - His purpose was to bring a perfect (whole) sacrifice for the sins of the world – and so that He could perform God's will to the minutest detail, i.e. in body, soul and spirit, and, by doing so having been equipped to sign the agreement between Him and His Father with His very own blood - the world would have been lost forever! (Joh. 3.16; Heb. 7.25; Ps. 40.7-8).

Now, again coming back to doctrines and theologians, i.e. throughout the ages, and implicitly claiming a special capability to analyze Christ's nature and Incarnation to its minutest detail: we can indeed at times detect uncertainty, i.e. their viewpoints then not really standing on one solid theological declaration, and it then seems that viewpoints worded by man indeed requires reconsideration so that new, even better worded Christological perspectives can emerge. Those who remain objective, will sense this current trend and this is perhaps the reason why Biblical Theology does have a place among exegesis and systematic theology. It seems to be good then to constantly remind ourselves that we must remain true to Scripture!

However, and in retrospect, why are there still, to this day, not yet uniformity in the Body of Jesus, i.e. concerning doctrines? It seems, and regardless of all the hard work and time that had thusfar collectively been spent on reasoning Godhead issues, also putting pen to paper affecting so-called “solid” results, that spiritual pride seemingly still rules and it is then still regulating the final outcome. It then does seem that on the whole, Christianity just wants her main doctrines to remain steeped in one firmly outlined, “solid” traditional approach. And it also seems that the doctrinal “two-natures” of Christ has much to do with the inability to find common ground and it also seems that we do “indeed have a limitation on the knowledge of Jesus on many matters “!

Although Jesus the Man, born of a woman, was indeed fully human and fully holy, having been endowed with divine attributes, we cannot assume that He was both God and man for then the Cross and to sin or to stumble (derived from the Hebrew word hatah/xata, namely to miss one's goal) would have been no challenge for Him (again consult Phil. 2). This type of post-apostolic doctrine had indeed led to mockery and even unbelief. Jesus' greatness, His excellence, can then rightly be fastened for us in that one holy nature He was issued with, i.e. from conception, and which He indeed had kept pure and holy unto God, His Father, through complete dedication and obedience, and for a specific cause, namely to make the Cross unblemished and so that He could bring that one special sacrifice for all mankind in a body uncorrupted by sin! Jesus' main concern clearly was to remain faithful to His mission, the purpose He was sent into the world.

OUR WEBSITE BIBLE ENRICHMENT PROGRAM :

FOR THOSE WHO WANT TO PARTICIPATE IN OUR BIBLE STUDIES AND WHO ALSO NEED SOME DIRECTION AS TO HOW TO GO ABOUT IT:

It is said that if we do something ourselves, then we learn to think and this way we will be able to

gain confidence in the Scriptures. So, for those, who want to grow in the knowledge of the Word of God, the following assignment:

(1) Go to the Old Testament and, with the help of a Concordance, study the given text and then all the texts relevant to this subject matter :

On salvation/deliverance and the One who spoke to Moses from the bramble bush (Ex. 3.2): Ask yourself if this is the same One who time and time again helped the Israelites, steering them through their difficulties and dark patches in their history?

(2) Go the Acts of the Apostles and carefully read Peter's message, i.e. given after the resurrection and the outpouring of the Spirit on Pentecost Day (Acts 1-2).

Acquaint yourself with this particular time and festival in the Jewish calendar. Carefully note the days since Jesus' resurrection, His advent, and this very important "first fruits" apostolic event. Take note of the Jewish festival yet now with a new dimension, namely with Jesus (Yeshua) as revealed Messiah. Ascertain for yourself, via Joel's prophecy, why and how did the baptism with the Spirit of God coincide Jesus' revelation in the flesh?

NOTE : I have often spoken on the Shekhinah Glory (the Holy Spirit endowment or manifestation) that had rested on Jesus in Old Testament times yet is still resting squarely on Him for Paul clearly states that "The Lord is that Spirit and where the Lord (Jesus) is there is freedom" (2 Cor. 3.17). Try to probe the apostle's line-of-thought. Who was he addressing? From what background/s did they come? Was there perhaps a contention on what the Spirit of God was and was not and probably to strip Jesus of Holy Spirit Power? Why this emphatic, "The Lord (Jesus, clearly) is that Spirit"? As though it was a new dogmatic approach that could perhaps then have been busy emerging? If you can, try to get hold of the Jerusalem Bible, and especially one with commentaries, and especially then consulting this source on the apostle's Letters to the Corinthians and what had befallen him in that cosmopolitan city. Also, with reference to (2) above, tracing all the relevant texts, Old and New Testaments, will surely help you understand the meaning of Pentecost Day, and especially why Jesus had to leave (lay aside) His former glory, i.e. to come close to man, taking on the form of a human being (Phil 2). However, not only appearing in flesh as the Gnostics indeed had propagated, but born like all of us, however, conceived not only in a supernatural way, but brought forth holy and separated unto God, His Father.

Simultaneously acquaint yourself with Jesus depicted as Son of God in the New Testament. Fact is, Jesus was preached, even after His resurrection by the Apostles of Jesus as "Son" of God! Many Scriptures can be quoted and a Concordance can be consulted in this regard. Also, for those interested in Church history, the Eastern Oriental Church still lays claim to this day that they rightly have pre-eminence over the Roman Catholic Church. Likewise, Theotokos (Mother of God) and Theophoros (God-bearer) can be analyzed and compared. Fact is, the Son was made flesh and that, according to the New Testament message, God's Holy Spirit had overshadowed the virgin, enabling her to conceive without the intervention of a man and the child who was then born was indeed the Son of God since his birth (Luke).

For this very reason the Apostle John states that He (that child that was conceived this supernatural way), was not born of the blood or the will of the flesh (in the usual biological/physiological way), nor of the will of man (through the natural conception) but of God (John 1.13). And this holy fetus that was then nurtured within the special vessel God had separated unto Himself so that His Anointed would be born without the trace of sin in His DNA, i.e. carried over from one generation to the other (Job.14.4). Also consult a good physiology book on the human blood circulation, the blood system, the placenta during pregnancy and with special reference to the villi, i.e. if you feel like pursuing this issue further. What is remarkable is John's statement, "... was not born of the

blood or the will of the flesh”, something which is then substantiated by modern science.

God, whom man will never see and live, had then chosen Mary as being kadosh unto Him during that period of gestation so that the Christ, the Anointed of God, would carry holy, sanctified blood in His veins for only this type of holy, sanctified blood would have been able to bring that one, perfect sacrifice man was so earnestly waiting upon and which then would have been empowered by God, through His Spirit, to lead man to Salvation, i.e. Redemption (Heb. 9.14). Yet, indeed as the Apostle Paul, endowed with knowledge coming from God, had enlightened our minds.

As vessel of God, Mary, was then to remain kadosh while she was pregnant with her son, yet the fetus and His blood system was brought forth and maintained by God's Holy Spirit Power! Man's predicament was then not so much his sin as his sinful nature that was clamouring for one perfect sacrifice that could rid him not only from the blemish of sin but especially from the desire to sin. This alone would have enabled him to stand with his attained confidence in the presence of His God, clothed once and for all with perfect REDEMPTION!

Something to think about: If we give Jesus two natures, don't we make Him dubious? Yes, we may surely ask, isn't He then both human and divine? That is, isn't He simultaneously Son of Man and Son of God? Yet He was called “Son of God” since His birth and it seems that Son of Man is actually linked to the prophets and then naturally somebody with a biological father just as the Ebionites had ascribed to Jesus but which idea is of course contradictory to the Scriptures.

Also, if we give Jesus two natures, then surely it would immediately bring to our minds man's own inner-conflict between right and wrong and naturally steeped in a primal desire to succumb to sin - which is integral to all human beings but which was clearly never part of Jesus' make-up. Jesus' will was therefore not applied to strive against moral sin and sinful thoughts but to remain faithful to God, His Father's calling and so that He could indeed bring the perfect sacrifice for one and all on the Cross and setting man free from the power and dominion of sin so that he could live the victorious life IN HIM! (Consult a Concordance like Strong's and make a list of the texts that have a bearing on redemption through the blood of Jesus). Jesus' greatest onslaught was of course satan's earnest desire to eliminate Him before He was nailed to the Cross!

Jesus indeed lived a morally blameless life – He was not only dedicated to God, His Father, and fully obedient, but He also lived a life of prayer and separation from the spirit of the world (=kadosh). And this is the reason why His unique ministry was indeed a reflection of His special endowment with God's Spirit. Also the reason why His enemies could find no (factual) evidence of sinful conduct against Him, and this had of course urged them to set their own wicked schemes in motion, spreading all kinds of lies and false accusations against Him.

ADDITIONAL POINTS OF INTEREST FOR THOSE WHO WANT TO ALSO MAKE THE FOLLOWING PART OF THEIR JOINT BIBLICAL STUDIES:

For those who want to focus upon Jesus' earthly mission and His Passion : Study His personality traits and His conduct in the Gospels. Probe His character and of course based on the fulfilment of the Old Testament Scriptures concerning His three-fold office: (1) as Prophet, i.e. in the likeness of Moses, (2) as Priest, and in the likeness of Aaron as righteous High Priest; (3) as King, i.e. at His Second Coming as Perfect Heir to the Throne of David.

GUIDELINES:

1. With the aforementioned in mind : Focus on one portion at a time, however, if you wish, make it a small group effort so that you can multiple task and all the finer detail can then be dealt with not only in a much shorter period of time but like-minded Christians can this way make it a joint effort and simultaneously reaping the fruits of togetherness in Christ! One can therefore indeed bring one's friends/family together for this type of Christian gathering and this way new interest in the Bible may be instilled.
2. But remember to right from the word “Go” consult the Old and the New Testament using a good Concordance, e.g. Strong's.
3. Mark the relevant texts, i.e. for each topic, also in cross-reference.
4. Make notes as you go along.
5. Supplement your own studies with relevant books, articles, podcasts via this web site or on the broader Internet and if it is required, compare/discuss your notes with others.
6. If you wish to, try to get a Biblical program, e.g. Bible Discovery or Bible Analyzer which will assist you in many ways and especially with the deeper meaning of the text.
7. Write down your thoughts coherently, arguing your own viewpoint/s, and then draw a coherent conclusion.
8. Arrange a Christian get-together and begin a Home Altar Meeting. Use your own Bible Studies to give it a kickstart. But do make prayer and praise part thereof for this way we can bring glory to God, uplifting one another in the real spirit of Christ and the first-century home church meetings. Consult our Songs and download those you like so that everybody can sing along!

NOTE: This version was revised on 11 December 2011 by Ester Blomerus

Ester's Book series **CURRENTLY ONLY AVAILABLE IN AFRIKAANS** deals with many aspects outlined in this article. [Go to Documents : Books Available](#) and should you be interested, subscribe to our [Newsletter](#). The English translation is in process and individual books will be made available as and when translations are completed.