

Essay 01 – Was Jesus a God-man? A Chronological Look at the Councils

An Essay on Christology

A Chronological Review and Ecumenical Councils

Addressing the Need to Challenge the Church Doctrine of Jesus' perpetual Divinity as Causal for a Relaxed Attitude Toward and Accepting Sinful Lifestyles

“Fully God and Fully man” is a long standing and widely accepted doctrine in Christendom that was adopted by 1600-year-old Church Councils. There is a growing challenge to this doctrine that has effectively allowed perpetuation of the Old Man's Sinful nature. Scripture shows a different doctrine should be considered as the present doctrine all but ignores the work of grace in Christ in the New Nature that Salvation secures – sinless maturity and rationale obedience when one learns that the Spirit of Christ as the Word in John 1:1 was made Flesh. This is the sinless obedience revealed in the life of Christ as the second Adam that brings this victory to all who would believe the Gospel.

An Essay that is part of the By Design Bible Study group.

By William Ireland, ©2026 b1erie@yahoo.com

<https://bydesignbiblestudy.com>

<https://doctrinesofexcuses.com>

Essay 01 – Was Jesus a God-man?

A Chronological Look at the Councils

Foreword

The Church has drifted too far from Scripture in defining what it says it believes, often without sufficient rationale for many doctrinal claims that have developed over time. Rather than creating unity these councils brought division in the faith. The author observes that many of these doctrinal claims reflect the metaphysical philosophies of the ancient Greeks more than the teachings of the apostolic church. As a result, such doctrines have too often become excuses that weaken the call to righteous living among believers. A survey of the seven churches addressed by the Spirit in Revelation shows that, even with angels assigned to them, they had fallen into serious error—from abandoning their first love to tolerating Jezebel. Yet Scripture still makes room for the Church to repent. Judgment should begin with the house of God, rather than leave people to discover too late that He “never knew” them and that their names have sadly been blotted out of the Lamb’s book of life. This should sober us, especially when salvation is too often presented in the loosest terms.

This study examines the relationship between biblical language, doctrinal development, and the authority ascribed to the early ecumenical councils. Its central thesis is that the scriptural language should remain primary in theological interpretation, even when later conciliar formulas attempted to resolve disputed meanings. This essay argues that long-held council-based conclusions should be challenged with a scriptural and substantive theological case for doing so.

The significance in challenging the council formulated doctrines lies in examining whether doctrinal conclusions attributed to the councils are grounded in Scripture. One will find on examination that the councils depend on explanatory frameworks that move beyond the word of God. Rather than treat the councils as either divinely guaranteed or wholly invalid, this study considers them as historical human deliberations whose conclusions shaped Christian interpretation for centuries and have been considered by their adherents that they are beyond review. A rational chronological and comparative analysis will help readers discern where biblical language, doctrinal precision, and theological disagreement converge—and where these doctrines part ways with the Holy Scriptures.

Introduction: The Central Claims

The core claim of this study is that biblical language about Christ should be read with great seriousness and consistency. Passages that describe Christ as the “only begotten Son” emphasize his unique sonship, while passages describing believers as “begotten and born of God” are also “partakers of the divine nature” are understood by the author to indicate a real participation in divine life as part of following God’s will, with implications for eternal life, judgment, and accountability for deeds done in the body. After weighing the council arguments and positions,

Essay 01 – Was Jesus a God-man?

A Chronological Look at the Councils

the author then presents an argument in disagreement with the doctrinal systems especially regarding Jesus Christ in his earthly life.

It is the author's finding, the councils created doctrines that divided the church and failed to bring unity. By using extra-biblical construction to satisfy a narrative that imposes an incapability for the believer to walk victoriously over sin they created a unique being that was of divinity and of flesh to Jesus Christ ding to scriptures through metaphysical explanation. The councils say Jesus was not made flesh as the scriptures unambiguously states but was a God-man. This departs from the biblical language rendering powerless the redemption of sinful humanity as accomplished by the work of the cross. More specifically, the author questions whether later doctrinal formulations about Christ's divinity during his earthly mission have created a different Gospel and altered the Biblical understandings once commonly accepted in the early church. As such many core truths and their understanding have been altered including what is temptation, obedience, sin, and fabricated a to extend an improper role accorded to Mary as the mother of God. The veneration of Mary goes beyond the scriptural record and are blatantly false narratives inconsistent with the text alone causing havoc in the church for over sixteen hundred years.

This essay stands in opposition to the doctrinal claims developed in metaphysical rendering found in the Nicene and Chalcedonian traditions. This opposition may not be popular due to their wide application and religious investment in these council decisions. The book of Timothy contends that Scripture itself is to be the basis of sound doctrine. Christ's nature and person as it relates to the apostles' Gospel presents as the word made flesh and by many other proofs. The author challenges the conclusion of the councils by arguing that the councils did not simply describe the biblical witness but interpreted it through frameworks that did not arise directly from the scriptural text. In that sense, the disagreement is not over whether Christ matters uniquely, but over whether the councils explained that uniqueness faithfully or defining it incorrectly to fit a narrative. Another question remains as to why these doctrines have not been challenged more effectively as the outcome will affect the destination of one's eternal soul.

Rationale Challenging Jesus' Ministry as being Divine and Flesh

We know that the Spirit of Christ was a preincarnate deity with God and this Christ was uncreated with the Father, 1 Peter 1:11. This only son of God named the Word in John 1:1 became flesh. This state of change from Spirit of Christ to being made flesh is the fundamental description of Christ pre-incarnate and then incarnate Christ Jesus becoming an Adamic man. The coequality that Jesus Christ had is with the first Adam and not with God. He had oneness with the Father but his oneness with God was his volitional submission as an Adamic man, the

Essay 01 – Was Jesus a God-man?

A Chronological Look at the Councils

second Adam. The birth of Jesus was by a virgin (no earthly father) as the Spirit overshadowed Mary who obeyed the word of the Lord. Jesus was therefore not under the law of sin and death and just what that means is later explored.

This is a disagreement of the many who accept the doctrine that Jesus was fully God and fully man. Simply scripture never makes the claim that Jesus possessed any deity from birth to death. Scriptures never make a direct claim that Jesus was divine. To be honest to the scriptural record and the purposes of God, Jesus could not serve within the redemptive plan if he possessed any “essence” of divinity. The coequality that Jesus had was not with God but with the first Adam as an Adamic man and not a new creative class of being as a Hybrid God/man. The councils seemed to be focused on the impossibility of sinless behavior and therefore subscribed deity to Jesus at birth rather than an obedience by faith. However, on his earthly path he had to be flesh alone and as to his prior divinity he set it aside and put his powers in abeyance with the Father. Look to the declarations in Hebrews 1, 2 and 5 as stature as either above (pre and post incarnate) or below Angels (Jesus’ birth to death). The Spirit of Christ gave his divinity up to become the second Adam and therefore was the second chance for an Adamic man to obey and live sinless unto death. He was not under the law of sin and death but was in the similitude of creation as the first Adam. The Adamic creation explained by Paul in Romans and 1 Corinthians.

There is scriptural record that sets forth that the second Adam is coequal in creation to the first Adam, as both had no earthly father but of divine origin breathed life and the Spirit overshadowing through a virgin birth. The Spirit of Christ was the Word and divine when preincarnate but became flesh, and both Adams were sinless flesh at the starting line. The question to answer was could Jesus remain obedient by faith with his will submitted to the Father where the first Adam failed? Scripture reveals that faithfulness was the engine of his submissive will and obedience to do as the Father willed coupled with the joy that stood beyond the victory.

Jesus could do nothing of himself and only did what he saw the Father do. Therefore, even if you could say there was a bundled divinity then it was hushed and unable to function else total confusion would follow. In the temptation would the divine Spirit of Christ be invisible to Satan? Would the temptation in the wilderness have been a proper legal victory in the testing of obedience between the Adams as God cannot be tempted? This framework of Jesus with divinity maintained is unable to be a valid test. Such a challenge would be unfair and therefore Jesus had to be flesh. Scripture reveals the lawful nature of the battle for redemption with the logic necessary to provide a legal existence of Jesus as the second Adam. Only faithful obedience as a man could Jesus have victory and not of divine might. Simply, obedience of one man, Jesus Christ as Paul the apostle states.

One critical understanding in the legal framework of the Adamic man was that Satan did not likely realize that the sinless man Jesus was not subject to the law of sin and death as he lived.

Essay 01 – Was Jesus a God-man?

A Chronological Look at the Councils

Therefore, when Satan killed him, it was illegal in the larger court of heaven and gave Jesus' victory. The sinless life or more accurately the obedient life resulted in Jesus being as the lamb without blemish allowing the sin of the world to be placed on him. The victory over sin and death resulted in a new law called the law of the Spirit of life in Christ that brought salvation's invitation to God's lost man. Therefore, it is not merely about words, but about how scriptural words should be interpreted together. How are we to believe in God's word if they are so maligned by these councils. Fortunately, the scriptures were essentially left intact for us to read and with the Holy Spirit's help, we can know the truth. What has supported the orthodox creeds and doctrines from the councils are threats that if one did not follow these traditions, they were expelled. To accept them without challenge may have been politically expedient but division and not unity followed the councils.

Given prior research into who is Jesus Christ the author developed an eternal life line that identifies the changing nature of the Christ through pre-incarnate, incarnate: birth to death, and finally the post-incarnate resurrection and restoration to glory as observing the term Christological Arc that fully accounts for the legal basis and the spiritual battle with the resultant outcomes of the two Adams. The heart of redemption includes the two Adams, the two laws and the two choices a lost man makes with one to death and the other to life unfolding the redemptive plan.

1. Biblical Foundation Before the Councils

The earliest layer of the discussion is biblical rather than conciliar. Several passages are especially central to the discussion. On the one hand, John 1:14, John 1:18, John 3:16, John 3:18, 1 John 4:9, and Hebrews 1:5 present the Spirit of Christ as uniquely related to the Father in this divine nature shared. In the traditional reading, these passages support Christ's singular sonship and eternal relation to the Father. In the reading advanced here, they also invite closer attention to the meaning of "begotten" and whether later doctrinal language preserved or narrowed the force of that biblical term to a sense of divinity to Jesus' incarnate life. Begotten simply means brought about as a child. We as believers have been given that same begotten of God when we are saved.

On the other hand, John 1:12–13, John 17:21–23, 2 Peter 1:4, Jeremiah 1:5, and Hebrews 2:14 are read here as showing that humanity is called into a profound filial and participatory relation with God. A oneness, a submission of will, and an obedience as the Second Adam. One in which Jesus says the Father is greater than he and in Hebrews this is affirmed as Jesus in his earthly ministry is lower than the angels and above the angels in pre and post incarnation.

Essay 01 – Was Jesus a God-man?

A Chronological Look at the Councils

2. First Council of Nicaea (325): Christ and the Question of Divine Sonship

The First Council of Nicaea, convened in 325, arose from the Arian controversy over the status of the Son and His relation to the Father. Arius's teaching was widely perceived as threatening both the church's worship and its account of salvation, since a Christ who was less than fully divine would seem unable to mediate divine life in the fullest sense. Here the council point of view is that Jesus as a man could not be obedient to the Father and points to their lack of understanding of the purpose of the Adamic man's federated nature to disobedience in the first Adam and obedience of the second Adam, Jesus. The council's decisive move was to confess the Son as homoousios, "of one substance," with the Father, thereby rejecting the claim that the Son was merely the highest among created beings. Standard historical summaries from the councils consistently identify the need to state there was a divinity maintained in Jesus earthly ministry and the rejection of Arianism as the central doctrinal achievement of Nicaea.

The critique advanced in this document does not deny that Nicaea attempted to define and defend Christ's full divinity. The critique asks whether the conceptual grammar introduced became more determinative than descriptive of Scripture itself with an overreach beyond scriptural framing. From this perspective, the language of "substance" may be viewed as a historically conditioned effort by church leaders to stabilize contested readings, while also raising the question of whether biblical imagery came to be interpreted through metaphysical categories not stated in the text. The counter-position is that Nicaea articulated what many believed Scripture implied as a doctrinal conclusion. The author's argument is that this conclusion remains open to re-examination rather than being treated as beyond dispute. There is strong evidence in Hebrews that may demonstrate as a proof rather than an inference or an implication that Jesus on earth was made flesh alone when scripture uses the stature of angels to define the core of the Christological Arc of Christ from preincarnate, incarnate and post incarnate.

3. First Council of Constantinople (381): Expansion of Trinitarian Doctrine

The First Council of Constantinople in 381 reaffirmed the Nicene settlement while extending doctrinal clarity to the Holy Spirit and further stabilizing trinitarian language. It was essentially a criticism of the Scriptures that they failed to have a word even remotely used as a trinity to explain the "Elohim" plural sense of the scriptural accounting of the council of God. It is the ecumenical council that secured the Nicene trajectory after decades of dispute, especially by affirming the full divinity of the Spirit and shaping the creed later known as the Niceno-

Essay 01 – Was Jesus a God-man?

A Chronological Look at the Councils

Constantinopolitan Creed. Historical accounts also note the council's importance for questions of ecclesial order, including the elevated prestige of Constantinople.

Within the argument of this study, Constantinople represents a further stage in the movement from scriptural proclamation to doctrinal codification that is to be obeyed rather than knowing and following God's will. The concern is that technical formulations increasingly determined in advance how Scripture could be read. In that sense, passages describing Father, Son, and Spirit may appear to have been governed by categories external to the biblical idiom itself. The opposing view is that such doctrinal development was necessary once rival interpretations had emerged. The author observes that the human deliberations of the councils should not be assumed to carry final interpretive authority simply because they started as church decrees and became traditions over time.

4. Council of Ephesus (431): Christological Clarification and the Rise of Fixed Formulas

The Council of Ephesus in 431 addressed the controversy associated with Nestorius and centered on how the unity of Christ should be confessed. Its defense of Mary as Theotokos was not intended primarily as a Marian development, but as a Christological claim: the one born of Mary is the one divine Son incarnate. Historical records consistently present Ephesus as a decisive attempt to protect the unity of Christ's person and to reject formulations that seemed to divide Christ too sharply.

In the framework of this document, Ephesus marks a significant turning point because it shows how doctrinal judication increasingly depended on "sanctioned" verbal formulas. The concern raised here is that once theological disputes are settled through authorized terminology, later readers may receive those conclusions as fixed rather than continue to test them against Scripture. The opposing claim is that Ephesus preserved the coherence of the incarnation. The criticism levied on the councils is not directed at the participants personally, but at the broader question of whether human assemblies may sometimes formulate conclusions that extend beyond the explicit language of the biblical text or intentionally overlook lines of interpretation that would be significant from the alternative positions in controversy. Once a position is codified then the unintended consequence includes terms that then deny the power of God to call man to live obediently and no longer serve under the law of sin and death. Consider such traditions splinters pursued as a halfway house if you were not good enough at death - purgatory similarly pay to play with indulgences or more modern teasers of grace with "once saved always saved" and then there is the veneration of dead saints that became agents that would hear the prayers of believers without any biblical record that the life after death is more than that revealed in scripture. None of this is found in scripture but rather itching the ears of the hearers that it is ok

Essay 01 – Was Jesus a God-man?

A Chronological Look at the Councils

to sin. Maybe sin less but not a call to sinlessness and certainly a call to uniformity to an organization.

5. Council of Chalcedon (451): Two Natures and the Limits of Analogy

The Council of Chalcedon in 451 sought to resolve continuing Christological disputes by affirming that Christ is one person in two natures, fully divine and fully human, without confusion, change, division, or separation. Why say without confusion if there was no confusion. Why say no division when it was replete with division. Why say fully divine when no one can explain what fully means and of what divinity? These characteristic identifiers beg reexamination. The fact that definitions altered came from Pagan philosophies. Standard historical accounts present Chalcedon as the most influential but not in agreement scripturally with the entirety of text on the person of Christ. This council's statement on Christ's person, was to be "balancing" the need to preserve both the integrity of Christ's humanity and the fullness of his alleged divinity – yet without supporting biblical standard. Its definition became a durable and suppressive reference point for later Christian theology, but misses the entire reason that Christ was of the Adamic race. Therefore, the council has contributed to long-term schism.

One argument of this document dresses the Chalcedon Council with caution because its precision became, for many traditions, a lasting rule for how Christ is to be described and to be followed with a sense of impossibility. The author's concern is that this kind of formal precision moves outside scripture and becomes an interpretive narrative that later adherents may be reluctant to question. One explanation to adopt the divine essence human personality is that Chalcedon wanted to preserve this as an "essential truth" about Christ's person as being divine to excuse their love of sin. It missed the mark understanding why Christ had to be only flesh as in the Word made flesh. This study continues to present the stronger claim from the overwhelming scriptural evidence that councils were human judgments and that their conclusions need to be tested against this compelling evidence and rejected where they are unsupported in Scripture.

The term "mainstream" often associated with the 1600-year-old council decisions should be used carefully. After 451, it cannot be said that the decisions describe a single undivided Christian reception. Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, and later Protestant traditions received Chalcedon as a normative definition, whereas Oriental Orthodox churches, including the Coptic Orthodox Church, rejected Chalcedon while still insisting on Christ's full divinity and full humanity but in a single nature. For that reason, several counter-positions in this essay should be attributed not simply to a generic mainstream, but to particular conciliar trajectories or communions.

Essay 01 – Was Jesus a God-man?

A Chronological Look at the Councils

6. Second Council of Constantinople (553): Pre-Existence, Souls, and the Limits of Participation

The Second Council of Constantinople in 553 is usually described in mainstream historical accounts as dressing the “orthodoxy against charges of Nestorianizing tendencies. At the same time, the period is closely associated in the broader tradition with anti-Origenist condemnations, including teachings about the pre-existence of souls. Some historical presentations include these condemnations directly with the council, while others note scholarly debate about whether the anathemas against Origen were formally conciliar or were instead associated with Emperor Justinian’s earlier interventions.

This council is especially relevant to the present study because one of its disputed margins concerns the status of pre-temporal existence. The document’s claim is that certain biblical passages, especially Jeremiah 1:5, may be read as pointing beyond mere foreknowledge toward a deeper pre-temporal relation between God and human persons. The mainstream response is that such a reading exceeds the intention of the text and risks collapsing creaturely dependence into an ontological continuity Scripture does not teach. Historical materials connected with the anti-Origenist tradition show that the church increasingly regarded explicit claims of pre-existent souls as incompatible with orthodox anthropology. Whether or not every associated anathema is formally attributable to the council itself, the theological direction of the period is clear. The real concern should not be in these margins while interestingly they fail to consider the value to Christ and him crucified and being rose again unto our salvation over sin and death. These discussions fail to consider the scriptures that man is appointed once to die then the judgement. The new man in salvation is required to renew his mind and not to discover a past or sameness of person life not given much revelation in the scriptures – and that it is this life that determines our eternal consequence.

7. Later Councils and the Consolidation of Doctrine

After 553, the conciliar process continued with the Third Council of Constantinople (680–681), which addressed the question of Christ’s wills, and the Second Council of Nicaea (787), which addressed icon veneration. Standard overviews of the seven ecumenical councils present this sequence as a cumulative process in which the “church” sought to preserve doctrinal continuity while responding to new forms of dispute. In that sense, the early councils may be read as an extended history of doctrinal consolidation rather than isolated events.

The interpretation offered in this document remains cautious about equating doctrinal consolidation with achieved unity or guaranteed correctness. Historically, the councils often clarified definitions while also revealing lasting ecclesial fracture. The opposing claim is that doctrinal precision remains necessary even when it does not secure immediate peace. The

Essay 01 – Was Jesus a God-man?

A Chronological Look at the Councils

author's position is that this historical pattern supports renewed scrutiny of conciliar conclusions rather than unqualified deference to them.

8. Doctrinal Comparison: Main Claims and Counterclaims

Key Word Usage and Meaning	Author's Observation	Council-Derived Position	Who typically holds the Council-Derived Position
Begotten	"Begotten" should be read with continuity across biblical usage, as both Jesus and believers are described in filial relation to God - begotten.	Christ is uniquely begotten in a way not shared by believers; believers are born of God by grace and adoption, not in the same mode as the Son. Yet similar.	Nicene Christians broadly, including Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, and most classical Protestant traditions.
Foreknowledge and pre-temporality	Jeremiah 1:5 may suggest a deeper pre-temporal identity than mere foreknowledge but there are no additional insights that impact the Gospel meaningfully and left to speculation	Refers to God's eternal knowledge and purpose, not the literal pre-existence of human souls.	Broadly across Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, Oriental Orthodox, and most Protestant theology, though the historical route to that conclusion differs.
Divine participation	2 Peter 1:4 and John 17:21–23 reveal a sharing in divine life by obedience to the father and by the authority of the Father. As believers we are to imitate and even do greater works by abiding in the Father and be one together as Jesus had prayed.	Participation is real, but it is participation by grace that is born in adoption not an identity with God having equality of status	Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, Oriental Orthodox, and most classical Protestant traditions, though they describe participation in different theological vocabularies.

Essay 01 – Was Jesus a God-man?

A Chronological Look at the Councils

Council use of scripture and metaphysics	Councils' adaptation of metaphysical frameworks weaken the direct force of scriptural language, Elevating extra-biblical categories is unscriptural.	Council formulations are viewed as interpretive clarifications intended to defend teaching judged to be scriptural.	Strongly affirmed in Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox traditions; also affirmed in substantial measure by many Protestants, especially regarding Nicaea and Chalcedon. Oriental Orthodox affirms the earlier councils but rejects Chalcedon's definition.
Chalcedon (451)	The Chalcedon formalized categories forced division through non-biblical metaphysical framing. In orthodox wings subscribing just differing personages of deity to Christ as dual or single willed. The councils do not recognize the Adamic lawful basis of Jesus made flesh or of his obedience.	Chalcedon states that Christ is fully divine and fully human in one person, without confusion, change, division, or separation. The other rejects duality but believes in one will mix human and divinity	Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, and most classical Protestant traditions accept Chalcedon. Oriental Orthodox, including the Coptic Orthodox Church, reject Chalcedon's definition as inadequate or misleading while still affirming Christ's full divinity and humanity and ignore the Adamic nature of Christ.
Unity	Institutional settlements often failed to produce the spiritual unity they sought. Christ is returning for an unblemished bride and the division by the councils do not demonstrate a following for Christ but of doctrine.	Visible conflict does not by itself invalidate doctrinal claims; unity is often said to require agreement about truth, though traditions differ on how that truth is recognized.	Broadly held across traditions that defend councils, although communions divided over which councils and formulations best express that truth.

Essay 01 – Was Jesus a God-man?

A Chronological Look at the Councils

Jesus and divinity in the earthly mission	Jesus should not be described as passenger or having any access to divinity during his earthly obedience. His true human victory of obedience by faith as Adamic man and is the key. Scripture is not of divinity.	Jesus Christ is truly divine and truly human; His earthly life and obedience are the obedience of the incarnate Son, not merely that of a non-divine man.	Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, Oriental Orthodox, and the overwhelming majority of classical Protestant theology, though explained through different Christological formulas.
---	--	---	--

9. Table of Scriptures

Scripture	Author's Position	Council-Derived Position	Who typically holds the Council-Derived Position
John 1:14	The unambiguous scriptural reference is found in “made flesh” and full of grace and truth are not intrinsic deity in that he grew in that knowledge. Never a claim other than to glorify the Father.	The verse is read as affirming the incarnation of the eternal Son and is commonly used to support Nicene and post-Nicene Christology.	Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, Oriental Orthodox, and most classical Protestant traditions.
John 1:18	The language of the Son's unique relation to the Father raises interpretive questions about how “begotten” should be understood. It is in submission to the Father doing nothing of his own will. No divinity here but Adamic equality.	The verse is read as affirming the Son's singular relation to the Father and as supporting classical distinctions between Christ and believers.	Nicene traditions broadly, including Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, Oriental Orthodox, and most classical Protestant traditions.
John 3:16	“Only begotten Son” highlights that his entry as an Adamic man was the challenge accepted by the Word made, begotten, flesh	The verse is commonly read as speaking of the Son's unique status and mission in a way	Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, Oriental Orthodox, and most

Essay 01 – Was Jesus a God-man?

A Chronological Look at the Councils

	as noting the virgin birth and not maintaining prior incarnate deity.	consistent with the church's reading of eternal sonship.	classical Protestant traditions.
John 3:18	The uniqueness of the Son is his Adamic creation by the Father. This refers to the name given under heaven whereby man can be saved. Divine purpose was an obedient will submitted son that took on the Adamic role and second chance in redemption	The passage is read as reinforcing the singularity of Christ's sonship rather than extending that sonship in the same sense to believers.	Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, Oriental Orthodox, and most classical Protestant traditions.
1 John 4:9	The sending of the only begotten Son highlights the centrality of sonship language in salvation history and supports the reality of Christ's Adamic obedience.	The verse is read as underscoring Christ's unique mission and identity, not a transferable mode of divine generation.	Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, Oriental Orthodox, and most classical Protestant traditions.
Hebrews 1:5	The text emphasizes the pre-incarnate sonship. As above the angels.	The verse is read as distinguishing Christ from angels and as supporting His unique divine sonship.	Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, Oriental Orthodox, and most classical Protestant traditions.
John 1:12–13	Believers are genuinely born of God, suggesting a real filial participation rather than a merely external status.	The passage is read as teaching adoption and regeneration by grace, not equality with the eternal Son's mode of being.	Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, Oriental Orthodox, and most classical Protestant traditions.
John 17:21–23	Christ's prayer for oneness suggests a profound participatory union between believers and God.	The oneness is taken to be real yet not equal to the Son's eternal mode of being.	Broadly across Nicene traditions, though Eastern Orthodox and Oriental Orthodox may use stronger participation

Essay 01 – Was Jesus a God-man?

A Chronological Look at the Councils

			language than many Protestants.
2 Peter 1:4	Believers as “partakers of the divine nature” support a robust doctrine of participation.	The verse is read as teaching real participation by grace while preserving the Creator-creature distinction.	Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, and Oriental Orthodox strongly affirm participation by grace; many Protestants affirm it more cautiously or in sanctification language.
Jeremiah 1:5	The verse may be read as implying more than foreknowledge, possibly a deeper pre-temporal relation yet this is speculative and not a focus of the Gospel’s power to save and call to sinlessness.	The text is read as referring to God’s foreknowledge and calling, not the literal pre-existence of the soul.	Broadly across Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, Oriental Orthodox, and Protestant traditions.
Hebrews 2:14	Christ’s participation in flesh and blood supports comparison between divine condescension and human participation in divine nature expression as to authority conferred by the Father through obedience.	The analogy is treated as limited: incarnation is unique, while human participation remains derivative and gracious.	Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, Oriental Orthodox, and most classical Protestant traditions.
Acts 1:21–26	The apostles perceived need to replace Judas by Matthias shows the fallibility of institutional procedures by the apostles thinking they had to cast lots to fill a vacancy in the apostleship to the loss of Judas’, especially when compared with Paul’s later calling by the risen Christ.	The passage is read as showing legitimate apostolic discernment within the early church.	Broadly across traditions that affirm apostolic and ecclesial authority, though they apply that principle differently.
Acts 9	Paul’s direct calling by Christ is used to contrast divine initiative	The exceptional nature of Paul’s calling is not	Broadly across Roman Catholic, Eastern

Essay 01 – Was Jesus a God-man?

A Chronological Look at the Councils

	with institutional process as an example of the frailty to discern God's will and where God chooses whom He wills for apostolic selection.	usually taken to negate ordinary ecclesial discernment, but sometimes it is clear that it should.	Orthodox, Oriental Orthodox, and Protestant traditions.
Matthew 17:5	The Father's declaration about the Son is used to prioritize direct revelation over later explanatory systems (generally Pagan philosophy).	Direct revelation and doctrinal reflection are commonly treated as complementary rather than opposed.	Broadly across conciliar traditions and most classical Protestant theology.
Proverbs 3:5	The text is invoked to warn against overconfidence in human explanatory systems (generally Pagan philosophy).	The verse is read as cautioning pride without excluding disciplined theological reasoning.	Broadly across Christian traditions that defend doctrinal theology.
Hebrews 4:9	The passage is used to orient the argument toward spiritual rest rather than endless dispute.	True rest is often understood as compatible with doctrinal labor undertaken in fidelity to truth.	Broadly across traditions that see doctrine and spiritual life as complementary.
1 John 3:9	The verse supports on the transformed life of the believer and the "new man" to be holy or having a oneness with the Father.	The text is read as concerning regeneration and holiness, not ontological equivalence with Christ.	Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, Oriental Orthodox, and most classical Protestant traditions.

10. Why the Doctrine of "Fully God and Fully Man" Had Been Considered Important

Historically, the doctrine that Christ is fully God and fully man has been regarded as important because it seeks to protect several convictions at once. First, it preserves the claim that the one who saves is not merely an inspired human teacher, but one who truly reveals God and acts with divine authority but not as divine intrinsically. Second, it protects the conviction that redemption occurs within real human life: if Christ is truly human, then obedience, suffering, temptation,

Essay 01 – Was Jesus a God-man?

A Chronological Look at the Councils

death, and resurrection belong to the realm that needed renewal, healing and redemption from the law of sin and death to the law of the Spirit of life. Third, it has often been understood to secure access between God and man, since the same Christ is said to represent God as an advocate before God on man's behalf. In that sense, supporters of the doctrine see it as safeguarding revelation, atonement, mediation, and the hope that human nature itself can be changed from death unto life.

Even where this study questions the conciliar language used to express that doctrine, these are the principal benefits that have historically made the formulation persuasive to many Christian traditions. Where this paragraph only removes the claims they make that it was deity of Jesus that secured the victory and not obedience by faith which would leave man without hope and doomed to the sin cycle invoked by temptation that man will succumb. This view fails by not giving the clear scriptural rendering of the new man where in the old has passed away with the lusts there of unto victory to the believer in Christ to sin no more. This is not aspirational, but it is what the new life in Christ is calling all believers to overcome.

A related concern raised in this study is whether, once Jesus is explicitly declared to be God by these councils then Mary must also be elevated in a corresponding way. This also goes beyond the scriptural record, especially since neither conclusion is stated in Scripture in the council's doctrinal terms. This is another schism concerning Mary that arises out of calling her the "mother of God." Their reasoning is that Christological claims about Jesus' concern who Christ is in his person, whereas Marian titles concern her role in relation to the incarnation. There was an allowance that demoted Mary from divinity if there was the allowance of an elevation of her nature aligned with divinity. Thus, when traditions used language such as *Theotokos*, they generally intended to protect a claim about Christ's identity from the later traditions rather than to declare Mary divine. Yet this is the exact outcome.

At the same time, the author's objection remains significant within the logic of this essay: if later theology adopted non-biblical terms to secure one doctrinal conclusion (Jesus was God/man), readers may reasonably ask why some later developments are treated as necessary safeguards while others are treated as excess. For that reason, this question serves as an important test case in the document's larger argument about how far theological reasoning may move beyond the explicit scriptural wording if the acceptance of being sinless is denied by the councils then an incapability. The consequence falls to the believer who is then set up to fail in the new man's life in Christ that is to endure to the end. The scriptures are clear that it is required of the believer to endure to the end in order to be recorded in the Lamb's book of Life. The consequence of accepting sinful living that a belief in man's inability to live righteously because the God/man Jesus had divinity to do so. The consequence to the errant believer under this doctrine would result in his name being blotted out of the Lamb's book of life.

Essay 01 – Was Jesus a God-man?

A Chronological Look at the Councils

11. Conclusion

When the argument is arranged chronologically, a central pattern emerges biblical language comes first, and conciliar formulation comes later as an effort by historical church bodies to settle disputes about meaning where the metaphysical view was dominant rather than the apostles doctrine. This study maintains that scripture speaks with breadth and immediacy about sonship, participation, and union in ways that later doctrinal systems have abridged the original meaning of the Gospel. The opposing doctrinal claims remain historically important as what influenced the organized church, however, this essay does not treat their authority as self-proving or as reaffirming what was original in the church. Instead, it presents the author's observation that conciliar conclusions remain open to re-examination wherever they appear to reach beyond the scriptural witness and therefore the church should reject the metaphysical claims outright.

The enduring question, therefore, is not whether doctrinal language exists, but whether later doctrinal precision should govern the meaning of scriptural speech. Terms such as “begotten,” “one,” and “partakers” remain focal because they bear both exegetical and doctrinal weight. This revision seeks to clarify that dispute while preserving space for the author's objections to be considered on their own terms alongside inherited theological systems and when not represented in scripture to be rejected in favor of following the Christ of the scriptures. This herein is not addressing the significance of the Pagan foundations found within the councils decision making wherein lies a greater threat to Christianity.

References

1. Standard historical reference materials on the chronology of the first seven ecumenical councils and their principal doctrinal concerns.
2. Historical summaries and documentary introductions for Nicaea, Constantinople I, Ephesus, and Chalcedon.
3. Historical materials on the Second Council of Constantinople, the Three Chapters controversy, and the debated status of anti-Origenist condemnations concerning the pre-existence of souls.
4. Reference materials discussing the biblical passages commonly associated with the language of the “only begotten” Son and related questions of uniqueness and participation.

Essay 01 – Was Jesus a God-man?

A Chronological Look at the Councils

Notes: