

# CHRISTOLOGY: THE DOCTRINE OF CHRIST: WEEK THREE

Darin Latham/www.broadwaychurch.com

## A. The Incarnate Christ

1. What does it mean?

- a. The word "incarnation" refers to the experience of God, in the second person of the Trinity, (literally and fully) \_\_\_\_\_ the form of humanity. The "incarnation" is not "God \_\_\_\_\_ a human" because the second person of the Trinity did not \_\_\_\_\_ to be God. He simply \_\_\_\_\_ the new experience of being fully human to His ongoing experience of being fully God. The "incarnation" was not the \_\_\_\_\_ of the divine nature but the \_\_\_\_\_ of a human nature.

### *Understanding Our Terms...*

*"Nature"*: the essential properties that make something what it is.

*"Divine nature"*: to have 'great-making' properties such as omnipotence, omniscience, omnipresence, moral perfection, eternity...

*"Human nature"*: to have the property of being a 'rational animal', an 'embodied person.'

i. Philippians 2:5-8; John 1:1, 14; 1 Timothy 2:5; 3:16; Colossians 2:9

b. The "incarnation" means that Jesus Christ was \_\_\_\_\_ human but not \_\_\_\_\_ human...

2. Why was the incarnation necessary?

a. Humanity faced a dilemma: we owed a moral debt that only God was morally qualified to pay. We needed the impossible: we needed a "\_\_\_\_\_!" We needed an "incarnation."

b. Jesus the "Christ" (Messiah) came to do the unthinkable: the second person of the Trinity took on \_\_\_\_\_, to save us from our sins.

i. Romans 8:3; 1 Peter 1:18-19

3. Attempts at understanding and explaining the incarnation throughout history...

a. Docetism (1<sup>st</sup> century): Jesus only \_\_\_\_\_ to be human but was entirely divine.

i. The problem: If Christ was not human, He could not \_\_\_\_\_ humans.

b. Ebionism (2<sup>nd</sup> century): Jesus was merely a \_\_\_\_\_ with a unique, God-given spiritual \_\_\_\_\_.

i. The problem: If Christ was not divine, His sacrifice was \_\_\_\_\_.

c. Arianism (4<sup>th</sup> century): Jesus was a uniquely \_\_\_\_\_ that God commissioned to create the world and then redeem the world.

i. The problem: If Christ was not divine, His sacrifice was \_\_\_\_\_.

d. Apollinarianism (4<sup>th</sup> century): Jesus was fully God but \_\_\_\_\_ fully human. He had a human body and a human spirit, but He did \_\_\_\_\_ have a human mind/soul.

i. The problem: If Christ did not have a human mind/soul, He was \_\_\_\_\_ human.

e. Nestorianism (5<sup>th</sup> century): There was a "divine Jesus" who dwelt \_\_\_\_\_ the "human Jesus". The "human Jesus" died while the "divine Jesus" lived on.

i. The problem: If Christ's death was only experienced by the "human Jesus" it would \_\_\_\_\_ its divine power. This also meant that Jesus of Nazareth was actually "\_\_\_\_\_."

f. Neo-Apollinarianism (20<sup>th</sup> century): The immaterial, Divine Word (John 1:1, 14) is the \_\_\_\_\_ of Jesus of Nazareth. As part of His experience of humility on earth (Philippians 2:5-7), the Son only had conscious access to a \_\_\_\_\_ of His full knowledge and, as part of His humility and chosen submission to the Father, He only accessed His omniscience when the Father \_\_\_\_\_ it.

i. The problem: I, personally, don't see any problem with this view (which is why it is the view I hold.)

***Could Jesus of Nazareth Have Sinned?***

Being God, it would have been \_\_\_\_\_ for Jesus to have sinned (Hebrews 1:13). However, during His formative years, as part of His experience of humility and humanity (Neo-Apollinarianism), Jesus would \_\_\_\_\_ have been aware of His inability to sin. Therefore, His experience of temptation would have been \_\_\_\_\_ (and not play-acting) and His calling upon the Spirit for strength would have been \_\_\_\_\_.