

JESUS THE PSEUDO MAN

Greg Deuble: www.thebiblejesus.org

Few Christians today know that the Council of Chalcedon defined for subsequent Christian generations the person of Christ. In 451 A.D. that Council declared that God the Son united himself to “human nature”, that is, a *personless human nature*. The Chalcedonian creed declared we must not say “Jesus is a man”, because that would make him “two Persons” --- a God Person plus an individual man. Thereafter, it was mandated that Jesus is ‘man’ in a generic sense, but not ‘*a man*’. Chalcedon became the standard for all future “orthodoxy”.

Ever since it has been official --- Jesus did *not* have a human ego! Christ’s human personality was *replaced* by the Divine Personality of the eternal ‘God the Son’ (a description of Jesus found nowhere in the Bible). They said Jesus has human nature, but is *not a human person!* The average Christian today is unaware of these facts.

You may be tempted to think I am making this up and telling you whoppers. I will therefore cite a few *Trinitarian* theologians to verify this. Norman Geisler and William Watkins in *Trinity Journal*, (1985, Vol. 6, p. 189) write in their article, *The Incarnation and Logic: Their Compatibility Defended*,

[It is true that in Chalcedon orthodoxy God the Son united himself to a personless human nature.](#)”

[Thomas Hart](#) in *To Know and Follow Jesus* (Paulist Press, 1984, p. 44) writes:

[The Council of Chalcedon tells us that Jesus is called ‘man’ in the generic sense, but not ‘a man.’ He has human nature, but is not a human person. The Person in him is the second Person of the Blessed Trinity; Jesus does not have a human personal center. This is how the Council gets around the possible problem of split personality.](#)”

[Leslie Simmonds](#) in *What Think Ye of Christ* (p. 45) writes also from Trinitarian orthodoxy,

[Now the doctrine of the Incarnation is that in Christ the place of a human personality is replaced by the Divine Personality of God the Son, the Second Person of the Most Holy Trinity. Christ possesses a complete human nature without a human personality. Uncreated and eternal Divine Personality replaces a created personality in Him.](#)”

So I am not telling you whoppers. Official Trinitarianism declares Jesus to be pseudo-human.

Nor is this an academic question for the cloistered halls of theology. It bears directly on the whole matter of our salvation. Here is a simple question we must ask: Was there a human person dead on the cross? Remember, belief in the Trinity insists there are Three

Persons (Members) in God, but at the same time it is careful to maintain Jesus was 'man' or 'human', but definitely not a human person.

Since the Divine Person is the only person who *is* Jesus with two natures in one Person, it was only his impersonal human nature that died on the cross. The Son who assumed human nature did not die! There was no dead human being on the cross according to the creed.

If the Divine Son did not die, then where is our salvation? If there is no dead person we have no Saviour! Thus Trinitarianism suffers from the docetic heresy the apostles warned us against: Jesus only *appears* to be a man, but his centre of personality is really God. Jesus is 'man' but not 'a man'.

Let's go back to the beginning of the story of the man Jesus Christ...

After Adam & Eve had rebelled God promised Satan, "I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your seed and her seed; He shall crush your head, and you shall bruise his heel" (**Gen. 3:15**). So the very first promise of the Coming Redeemer was made by Yahweh God Himself. One of Eve's descendants, a man of her "genes" was to come to the rescue. And note it well, this prophecy was from the very mouth of God Himself. Theologians call it the *proto- evangelium*, the first Gospel announcement.

Eve fully expected the Coming One was going to undo all their mess by arriving there and then. For when her first boy Cain was born, she said, "I have gotten a man-child with the help of the LORD" (**Gen. 4: 1**). [The LXX reads, "I have borne a man through God."] Eve understood the prophecy that one of her children would come to the rescue. But it turned out Cain was not that promised "seed", the Coming One.

God's promise of the Coming One was later specified and narrowed through Abraham. One of his descendants would come to save mankind. As Paul put it ...

The promises were spoken to Abraham and to his seed. He does not say, "And to seeds," as referring to many, but rather to one, "And to your seed," that is, Christ" (Gal. 3:16).

A direct genetic descendant of Abraham and Sarah, through the line of the promised son Isaac, would be coming into the world, he who would be the Christ. The New Testament puts this clearly...

And the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the nations by faith, preached the gospel beforehand to Abraham, saying, 'All the nations shall be blessed in you'" (Gal. 3:8).

Now we know the Coming One would be the "seed of the woman" and the "seed of Abraham".

Moses also predicted the Coming One would derive from the Hebrew family line. He will be a man "like me", Moses prophesied, "from among you, from your own brothers (i.e. countrymen)" (**Deut. 18: 15**). God will specially anoint this Jew to speak the very words God would give him.

Furthermore, every Jew understood the prophets had predicted the coming Messiah would be a direct descendant of King David. David himself prophesied the Coming One ...

And so, because he was a prophet, and knew that God had sworn to him with an oath to seat one of his descendants upon his throne, he looked ahead and spoke of the resurrection of the Christ ..." (Acts 2:30-31).

Indeed, God had made an unconditional covenantal agreement with David that one of his descendants would sit on the throne of Israel "forever" ...

And your house and your kingdom shall endure before Me forever; your throne shall be established forever" (2 Samuel 7: 16).

With such promises in their long prophetic tradition, is it any wonder that some discerning folk addressed Jesus as "son of David" when he walked among them? And the apostle Paul was convinced that recognizing Jesus as the promised descendant of David's family line was an *essential* part of the saving Gospel...

Remember Jesus Messiah, risen from the dead, descendant of David, according to my gospel..." (2 Tim. 2:8).

In this brief outline we do not have time to examine the whole list of prophetic utterances that looked forward to the coming human Messiah. Sufficient to say for now, that every single promise of the Coming One was that he would be a human being, a man, a descendant from the genetic pool of humanity. Generally, he would be of the same biological chain as Eve. Specifically he would be of Abraham, and David, i.e. a Jew from the tribe of Judah. Any other claimant could not have been the promised saviour. Is it not significant that Jesus has some 100 named human ancestors in Matthew 1 and Luke 3?

The discerning reader will immediately object, "But Greg, haven't you left out some key prophecies concerning this Coming One? You have only given us half the story. We agree that Christ would be a man. But wouldn't he be *more* than a man? What about those prophecies that indicate the Christ would also be God Himself in the flesh?"

Indeed, to be a part of the Christian Church today, one must believe Jesus the Messiah was God Himself who came from heaven to earth and took on human flesh. Indeed, one is told that if one does not believe in the Deity of Christ, one cannot be a Christian. So the objection runs, "You are not giving us the full story! Jesus was more than a mere man."

OK. Good point. So let's take a look at the Old Testament prophecies that allegedly prove the Coming One was to be God in the flesh. First cab off the rank is **Isaiah 9:6** ...

For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulders; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, Almighty God, Eternal Father, Prince of Peace ...

Whoa! Did you not spot my typing error? No? No! Well, I have had many Christians over the years, including pastors and priests, cite the verse just like that to me. They are fully convinced that is how the verse reads. And if not in the actual word I have

deliberately misquoted, then certainly with the same intention. You would be surprised how many think the verse says the Coming One will be “Al-mighty God”.

By now you realise the prophecy is that the coming son will *not* be called “Almighty God”, but “Mighty God” (there is no definite article), and there is a world of difference between the two, as I shall now prove.

First fact. The original Hebrew appellation, “Mighty God” is *el gibbor*. The leading *Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* by Brown, Driver and Briggs defines *el gibbor* as “divine hero, reflecting the divine majesty.” It refers to “men of might and rank, as well as to angels.” This is confirmed by the Septuagint reading that the coming son is “the messenger of mighty counsel.” Strong’s *Hebrew Dictionary* defines *el gibbor* as warrior, tyrant, champion, giant, valiant man, might man.

These authorities tell us that *gibbor* when used in association with God means a regal warrior who reflects the attributes of God. In **Ezekiel 31:11** where the NASB translates *gibbor* as “a despot” the margin says, “Or, *mighty one*.” In **Ezekiel 32** the word pops up again but our English versions wisely translate it as “the mighty ones” because it refers to men (**v. 21**). Again, in **Ezekiel 17** God says he has taken away “the mighty of the land” (**v. 13**).

This is to say, *el gibbor*, “Mighty God” is a royal title. By no stretch of the imagination does it mean the Almighty God Himself. Indeed, this is confirmed when we read the very next verse (context is always critical!) ...

There will be no end to the increase of his government or of peace, on the throne of David and over his kingdom to establish it ...” (Isaiah 9:7).

Thus, by definition the Coming One, the child to be born and the son to be given, will reign on David’s throne. And how will it be accomplished? Just read on ... “The zeal of the LORD of hosts will accomplish this” (**v. 7**). So, the prophet Isaiah carefully distinguishes between Messiah and his God, Who is the LORD of hosts. If Isaiah had meant to convey that the Coming One was to be the Almighty God Himself in human flesh, then a different Hebrew word altogether would have conveyed that nuance --- *el shaddai* --- used exclusively of Yahweh God!

Fact two. The embarrassing truth is, that if the Church today insists Jesus the Son is “the Almighty God”, then what is to be made of the next description of him being “the Everlasting Father”? Consistency demands that if “Mighty God” means Jesus is the Almighty God Himself, then “everlasting Father” must prove that Jesus is God the Father Himself! It is an argument that ends up proving way too much even for the convinced Trinitarian!

It ought to be obvious that something is wrong here. The solution is to keep in line with the Hebrew idioms being used. In Jewish parlance one could be called “a father of a nation” just as Abraham is called “father Abraham” because he was the progenitor of the Hebrew people. A few chapters along in Isaiah, God’s servant Eliakim is nominated, “a father to the inhabitants of Jerusalem and to the house of Judah” (Is. 22:20). God promises to invest Eliakim the king with a royal robe and entrust him with kingly authority (**Is. 22:21**).

The word “eternal” here -- “everlasting Father”--also has solid Jewish pedigree. To the Hebrew mind it carried the idea of being related to the (future) age. By calling the coming son “everlasting Father” Isaiah is teaching that Messiah will be the progenitor of a vast number of citizens of the yet future coming Kingdom Age. (According to the Hebrew Lexicon the word “eternal” in **Isaiah 9:6** means, “forever of future time” (Brown, Driver, Briggs *Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*.) In harmony with this, the LXX gives Messiah’s title as “father of the age to come.” Thus, the prophecy of the coming son to be “everlasting Father” means he will usher in an everlasting kingdom which his righteous children (citizens) will enjoy forever!

So, there is no support in **Isaiah 9:6** for the Coming Son to be Almighty God Himself in human flesh. The Coming One will be a “divine hero” who reflects the Majesty of God.

Second cab off the rank allegedly proving the Coming One is God the Son from all eternity: **Micah 5:2**...

But as for you, Bethlehem, Ephrathah, too little to be among the clans of Judah, from you One will go forth for Me to be ruler in Israel. His goings forth are from long ago, from the days of eternity.

When read by the modern Gentile reader this sounds like a remarkable prophecy to the effect the Coming Messiah has been existing since “the days of eternity” and will step down onto the earth as God in human form. His “goings forth are from long ago” sounds very much like a person Who steps out of a pre-existent past right onto the stage of human history. If it looks like a duck, quacks like a duck, waddles like a duck, it must a duck, right? Let’s get this duck out of the water and examine him closely!

The phrase, “**the days of eternity**” (*y’may olam*) occurs just a few chapters later. In Micah 7 God’s people are promised they will “feed in Bashan and Gilead as in the days of old” (*y’may olam*) (v. 14). Nobody reads this identical phrase to mean God’s people used to feed in eternity! The phrase also occurs in **Deuteronomy 32:7**, “Remember the days of old (*y’may olam*); consider the years of all generations. Ask your father, and he will inform you; your elders, and they will tell you.”

Clearly, these examples show “the days of old” do not mean from “eternity” past. They show the Israelites are to recall days their ancestors (fathers) knew, days of history long ago. (The same meaning is seen in **Isaiah 45:21; 63:9,11; Amos 9:11**, etc.). In none of these instances is eternity, as we understand it, indicated.

Our English Bibles put a nuance in **Micah 5:2** not at all warranted. The *Hastings Bible Dictionary* gives the sense of our phrase beautifully ... “from remote antiquity.” Which is to say, the prophecies announcing the Coming One, the Messiah, can be traced to “the distant past” (as per the *New International Commentary*). Have we not seen in fact, such prophecy goes all the way back to “the distant past” with God’s announcement to Eve in the Garden that her “seed” would come?

It may be safely stated that the prophecies in the Old Testament concerning the Coming One unanimously testify that Messiah will be a true human being, of the genetics of humanity, and specifically, of the gene pool of Israel. It may also be safely stated there are no prophecies to indicate Yahweh God is going to take on human flesh Himself (indeed, there are many statements by God Himself that He is *not* a man, and that He

Himself can never change into one!). The Messiah the Jews were told to look for was to be a specially anointed man endowed with God's very wisdom and power in order to rescue hurting and lost humanity.

Oh, what's that? I hear another objection ... But the Jews misunderstood their own prophets! They just didn't get it. The Jews did not understand their own Scriptures and the many "hints" that the Coming One really was God after all. Well, let's hear what the Messiah says about this. Speaking to a Samaritan woman he stated,

You worship that which you do not know; we worship that which we know; for salvation is of the Jews (John 4: 22).

We have the word of Jesus Christ himself that the Jews did know what they worshipped and that salvation came from this knowledge. The ignorance was not on the side of the Jews. Certainly many of the Jews had a problem with the Messiah whom God had sent. But their problem was not over whether Jesus was 'the God Man' and whether he could embody the "hypostatic union of the two natures"! Their problem was they thought he should be trouncing the Roman legions and setting their nation up as the world-beaters they wanted there and then. He was a Messiah way too gentle for their liking.

Furthermore, Jesus categorically announces that the pagans and Gentiles would soon come to this Jewish knowledge of salvation too ...

But an hour is coming, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and truth; for such the Father seeks to be His worshippers (John 4:23).

According to Jesus the Jews were not ignorant of the essentials of salvation. There was no misunderstanding their prophets that the Coming One would be a true man specially endowed by Yahweh God for the mission of saving the world. Their Old Testament was replete with prophecies concerning the Coming Christ being truly human.

The Coming One was also foreshadowed by the use of many "types" (patterns). Perhaps the best-known type of Christ Jesus is the Passover Lamb that foreshadowed the crucifixion of Christ. Another classic "type" concerns the first man Adam as the blueprint for the Last Adam, Jesus (**Rom. 5:14**).

The Coming One corresponds in many comparisons and contrasts to the First Adam and it bears a little scrutiny...

So also it is written, 'The first man, Adam, became a living soul.' The last Adam became a life-giving spirit. However, the spiritual is not first, but the natural; then the spiritual (I Cor. 15:45-46).

Then comes a verse that *seems* to many to say that Jesus stepped right out of Heaven and became a man, just like Adam...

"The first man is from earth, earthy; the second man is from heaven" (I Cor. 15:47).

However, let's get out of this habit of reading things superficially and out of context. The context of **First Corinthians chapter 15** concerns the resurrection (**v. 12ff**). A series of

parallel contrasts between Adam and Christ are painted. These contrasts are between the earthly and the heavenly (v. 40), between the physical and the spiritual (v.44), between the first man Adam and the last Man, Jesus Christ (v. 45), “where”, as James D.G. Dunn correctly notes, “it is clear enough that the second half of each contrast refers to the resurrection state. This includes the description of the second man as ‘from heaven,’ for it is precisely his heavenly image which provides the pattern for the resurrection state of others (v. 49).” (Dunn, James D. G. *Christology in the Making*, Foreword to Second Edition, p. xv111.)

By his resurrection Christ has become the first-fruits of those who have fallen asleep (v.2ff). As risen from the dead, and as God’s first immortalised man, Jesus is the archetype of a new resurrected humanity.

Paul insists that the spiritual does *not* precede the physical (v. 46). I Corinthians expressly warns against any view of Adam and Jesus which reverses their order of appearance and origin. The physical man preceded the spiritual man. Not the other way round! But the modern Church since Chalcedon wants you to define Jesus as a Spirit Being (God) who pre-existed his becoming ‘man’. Nice switch! Nice trick!

So, in relation to the first man Adam, Christ is *last* Adam (v.45). As Dunn insightfully observes, “It would throw his argument into complete confusion if he was understood to mean that ‘the *second* man from heaven’ was actually the pre-existent one, and therefore actually first, *before* Adam.”

It is worth noting that this quote appears in Dunn’s foreword to the second edition of his book. It is his response to those who continued to challenge his exegesis that “the man from heaven” cannot be a reference to the apostle Paul’s supposed belief in Jesus as the eternally existing Son of God. Dunn confesses that his critics’ failure to take full note of the resurrection context in I Corinthians 15 is ‘astonishing’!

Indeed. There is no support in this passage to claim the Coming One existed in Heaven before his appearance on earth. How much clearer can it be ... the physical man Adam precedes the spiritual man, Christ ...? Popular teaching *reverses the order*.

In the post-apostolic book *II Clement* (written early in the second century) this sabotage became entrenched for future Church councils. *II Clement 9: 5* reads, “Christ, the Lord who saved us, *being first spirit became flesh.*” The prince of church historians, Alfred Harnack incisively remarks on Clement’s statement,

That is the fundamental, theological and philosophical creed on which the whole Trinitarian and Christological speculations of the Church of the succeeding centuries are built, and it is the root of the orthodox system of dogmatics.” Harnack went on to describe this fateful development as “the history of the substitution of the historical Jesus by the pre-existing Christ, of the Christ of reality by the fictitious Christ in dogmatics, the victorious attempt to substitute *the mystery* of the person of Christ for the person himself.” (Harnack, A. *History of Dogma*, vol. 1, p. 328, italics original.)

The implications of this switch from the historical Jesus of the Bible to a mythical non-human Christ are tragic. The Council of Chalcedon (451 A.D.) dictated that Jesus be called a ‘man’ in the generic sense, but *not ‘a man’*. They declared for all time that Jesus

has a human nature, but he is not a human person! The Person in him is the second Person of the Trinity. Therefore, *Jesus does not have a human personal centre*. The Church pronounced Jesus non-human! Shocking. This Christ of the modern Church creeds is not the human Messiah the prophets predicted.

On the Day of Pentecost Peter told Israel to,

“Listen to these words: Jesus the Nazarene, a man attested to you by God with miracles and wonders and signs which God performed through him in your midst, just as you yourselves know ---“ (Acts 2:22).

John in his Gospel and in his epistles makes belief in Jesus as *the human Christ* the non-negotiable basis of true faith (1 John 4:2; 2 John 7). A Messiah who is *less than* a real human being, or a Messiah who is *more than* a man from the human biology, is anti-Christianity, according to the inspired apostle.

The apostle Paul endorses this sentiment. He wrote, **“For there is one God, and one mediator also between God and men, the man Messiah Jesus” (1 Tim. 2:5)**. Thus, Jesus the real human being, the man Messiah, is distinguished not only from the One God, but also from the person-less man of Trinitarian confession.

But let's allow Jesus himself to have the last say on this matter. Let's ask Jesus himself, “Jesus, please tell us. Are you a real human being, “a man”? Or are you (as one preacher I recently heard put it) “God dressed in human skin”? Jesus' answer is in **John 8:40**:

But as it is, you are seeking to kill me, a man who has told you the truth, which I heard from God ...

What a tragedy the Council of Chalcedon killed the man Jesus after all! What a deception when Chalcedon built its Church on a Jesus who is not *“a man” on personless human nature!* But according to our Lord Jesus himself, His Church against which the gates of Hades will not prevail, is built on the confession that he himself is the man Jesus the Messiah of God (**Matt. 16:16**). Our salvation depends on **“the man Messiah Jesus” (1 Tim. 2:5)**!

