

# Essay 1 – Was Jesus a God-man? A Chronological Look at the Councils

## An Essay on Christology

### A Chronological Review

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

*A Doctrine adopted by the Church through Councils and without clear evidence in Scripture, allows perpetuation of the Old Man's Sinful nature and all but ignores the work of grace in Christ in the New Nature Salvation secures.*

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

By William Ireland, ©2026 [b1erie@yahoo.com](mailto:b1erie@yahoo.com)

<https://bydesignbiblestudy.com>

<https://doctrinesofexcuses.com>

# Essay 1 – Was Jesus a God-man?

## A Chronological Look at the Councils

### Foreword

This study examines the relationship between biblical language, doctrinal development, and the authority claimed for the early ecumenical councils. Its governing thesis is that the scriptural vocabulary of sonship, begetting, participation, and union deserves to remain primary in theological interpretation, even where later conciliar formulas sought to settle disputed meanings. The essay reveals that challenges can be made to long held council-based conclusions and sets forth a substantive theological argument. The importance of this review lies in testing whether doctrinal conclusions attributed to councils rest firmly on Scripture or on explanatory frameworks that moved beyond it. Rather than assuming the councils were either divinely guaranteed or wholly invalid, this study examines them as human historical deliberations whose conclusions shaped Christian interpretation for centuries. The result is a chronological and comparative study designed to help readers assess where biblical language, doctrinal precision, and theological disagreement converge and where they diverge.

### Introduction: The Central Claims

The core claim of this study is that biblical language about Christ and believers 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 “born of God” or “partakers of the divine nature” are understood by the author to indicate a real participation in divine life, with implications for eternal life, judgment, and accountability for deeds done in the body. After weighing the council arguments and positions, the author then presents an argument in agreement or disagreement with those doctrinal systems. In the author’s view, the councils create too sharp a distinction between the biblical and extra-biblical language applied to Christ and the biblical language applied to the redemption of sinful humanity through the work of the cross. More specifically, the author questions whether later doctrinal formulations about Christ’s divinity during his earthly mission may have shaped views about temptation, obedience, sin, and even the place accorded to Mary in ways that extend beyond the scriptural record or are blatantly false narratives when inconsistent with the text alone.

The opposing doctrinal claim developed in Nicene and Chalcedonian traditions is that Scripture itself requires distinctions concerning Christ’s nature and person. The author challenges that conclusion by arguing that the councils did not simply describe the biblical witness but often interpreted it through frameworks that did not arise directly from the 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.

# Essay 1 – Was Jesus a God-man?

## A Chronological Look at the Councils

### Rationale Challenging Jesus Ministry as being Divine and/or Flesh

That the Spirit of Christ was the 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 or was made flesh. This state of Change from Spirit of Christ to being made flesh is the fundamental description of Christ pre-incarnate and Jesus Christ becoming an Adamic man. 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 possessed any “essence” of divinity. The coequality that Jesus had was not with God but with 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. 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). He gave it up to become the second Adam and the second was the second chance for 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 stated 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 no earthly father and of a virgin birth. He was the Word and divine preincarnate but became flesh by divine origin, and as sinless flesh at the starting line the question to answer was could Jesus remain obedient by faith with his will submitted to the Father? Faithfulness was the engine of his submissive will and obedience to do as the Father willed. 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? This framework of Jesus with divinity maintained is unable to be supported by scripture or logic once you learn the legal existence of Jesus as the second Adam not of divine right.

One critical understanding in the legal framework of the Adamic man was that Satan did not realize that the sinless man Jesus was not subject to the law of sin and death as he lived. Therefore when Satan killed him, it was illegal in the larger court of heaven and gave Jesus’ victory. The victory over sin and death resulted in a new law called the law of the Spirit of life in Christ that brought salvation to God’s lost man. Therefore, it is not merely about words, but about how scriptural words should be interpreted together. Given prior research into who is Jesus Christ the author developed an eternal life line that identifies the changing nature of the

# Essay 1 – Was Jesus a God-man?

## A Chronological Look at the Councils

Christ through pre-incarnation, birth to death, the proceedings over the three days in the center of the earth, resurrection and restoration to glory using the term Christological Arc that fully accounts for the legal basis and the spiritual battle that first observed 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 plan redemption.

### 1. Biblical Foundation Before the Councils

The earliest layer of the discussion is biblical rather than conciliar. Several passages are especially central to the debate. 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 Christ as uniquely related to the Father. 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.

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. The traditional counterclaim is that these texts describe adoption, union, grace, and foreknowledge, not equality of status with the eternal Son.

### 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. 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 consistently identify the divinity of Christ 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 defend Christ's full divinity. It asks whether the conceptual grammar introduced there became more determinative than descriptive of Scripture itself. 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

# Essay 1 – Was Jesus a God-man?

## A Chronological Look at the Councils

argument is that this conclusion remains open to re-examination rather than being treated as beyond dispute.

### 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 is commonly treated as the 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-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. 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's position, however, is that the human deliberations of the councils should not be assumed to carry final interpretive authority simply because they became tradition.

### 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 adjudication 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 author's criticism is not directed at the participants personally, but at the broader question of whether influential human assemblies may sometimes formulate conclusions that extend beyond

# Essay 1 – Was Jesus a God-man?

## A Chronological Look at the Councils

the explicit language of the biblical text or overlook lines of interpretation the author considers significant.

### 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. These characteristic identifiers beg reexamination. Standard historical accounts present Chalcedon as the most influential but not in agreement scripturally with the entirety of scriptures 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 divinity – yet without supporting biblical standard. Its definition became a durable 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 schisms.

One argument of this document addresses the Chalcedon Council with particular caution because its precision became, for many traditions, a lasting rule for how Christ is to be described. 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. The counter-position is that Chalcedon preserved essential truths about Christ's person but missed the mark understanding why Christ had to be only flesh as in the Word made flesh. This study, continues to present the author's 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" should therefore be used carefully in this study. After 451, it does not describe a single undivided Christian reception. Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, and later most 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. 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.

### 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 addressing the Three Chapters controversy in order to defend Chalcedonian

# Essay 1 – Was Jesus a God-man?

## A Chronological Look at the Councils

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.

### 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 with 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 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

<b>Key Word Usage and Meaning</b>	<b>Author’s Position</b>	<b>Council-Derived Position</b>	<b>Who typically holds the Council-Derived Position</b>
Begotten	“Begotten” should be read with strong continuity	Christ is uniquely begotten in a way	Nicene Christians broadly, including Roman Catholic,

# Essay 1 – Was Jesus a God-man?

## A Chronological Look at the Councils

	across biblical usage, as both Jesus and believers are described in filial relation to God.	not shared by believers; believers are born of God by grace and adoption, not in the same mode as the Son. Yet similar.	Eastern Orthodox, and most classical Protestant traditions.
Foreknowledge and pre-temporality	Texts such as Jeremiah 1:5 may suggest a deeper pre-temporal identity than mere foreknowledge.	Such texts refer 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	Texts such as 2 Peter 1:4 and John 17:21–23 imply a profound sharing in divine life.	Participation is real, but it is participation by grace, not identity with God’s essence or equality with the Son’s eternal status.	Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, Oriental Orthodox, and most classical Protestant traditions, though they describe participation in different theological vocabularies.
Council use of scripture and metaphysics	Councils may have introduced conceptual frameworks that weakened the direct force of scriptural language by placing it under extra-biblical categories.	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 affirm the earlier councils but reject Chalcedon’s definition.
Chalcedon (451)	The Definition of Chalcedon formalized categories that, in the	Chalcedon states that Christ is fully divine and fully	Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, and most classical Protestant

# Essay 1 – Was Jesus a God-man?

## A Chronological Look at the Councils

	<p>author’s view, risked over-systematizing Scripture and contributed to division through non-biblical metaphysical framing. Interestingly both orthodox wings are each wrong subscribing just differing personages of deity to Christ as dual or single willed.</p>	<p>human in one person, without confusion, change, division, or separation.</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>Unity</p>	<p>Institutional settlements often failed to produce the spiritual unity they sought.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Broadly held across traditions that defend councils, although communions divided over which councils and formulations best express that truth.</p>
<p>Jesus and divinity in the earthly mission</p>	<p>The author’s central dissent is that Jesus should not be described as exercising divinity during his earthly obedience in a way that removes the force of his true human victory; the stronger claim stated in the draft is that Scripture does not directly say “Jesus was divine” during the earthly mission in the later conciliar sense.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, Oriental Orthodox, and the overwhelming majority of classical Protestant theology, though explained through different Christological formulas.</p>

# Essay 1 – Was Jesus a God-man?

## A Chronological Look at the Councils

### 9. Table of Scriptures

Scripture	Author's Position	Council-Derived Position	Who typically holds the Council-Derived Position
John 1:14	The incarnate Word's glory supports a strong reading of sonship that should govern later doctrinal reflection. In the author's view, this verse does not require the claim that Jesus exercised divinity throughout his earthly mission in the later conciliar sense.	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.	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" is central to the argument that biblical language should not be prematurely narrowed by later systems.	The verse is commonly read as speaking of the Son's unique status and mission in a way consistent with the church's reading of eternal sonship.	Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, Oriental Orthodox, and most classical Protestant traditions.
John 3:18	The uniqueness of the Son must be interpreted carefully in relation to wider biblical language about sonship, flesh, and divine purpose.	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.

# Essay 1 – Was Jesus a God-man?

## A Chronological Look at the Councils

1 John 4:9	The sending of the only begotten Son highlights the centrality of sonship language in salvation history and supports the author’s insistence on the reality of Christ’s fleshly 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 sonship in a way that invites close scrutiny of how “begotten” functions in biblical argument and how it relates to Christ’s humbled condition.	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 language than many Protestants.
2 Peter 1:4	Believers as “partakers of the divine nature” supports 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.

# Essay 1 – Was Jesus a God-man?

## A Chronological Look at the Councils

Jeremiah 1:5	The verse may be read as implying more than foreknowledge, possibly a deeper pre-temporal relation.	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 life.	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 selection of Matthias is used to question whether institutional procedures always capture divine initiative, especially when compared with Paul’s later calling.	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 with institutional process as an example of the frailty to discern God’s will and where God chooses whom He wills for apostolic selection.	The exceptional nature of Paul’s calling is not usually taken to negate ordinary ecclesial discernment but sometimes it is clear that it should.	Broadly across Roman Catholic, Eastern 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.	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.	The verse is read as cautioning pride without excluding disciplined theological reasoning.	Broadly across Christian traditions that defend doctrinal theology.

# Essay 1 – Was Jesus a God-man?

## A Chronological Look at the Councils

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 later reflection on the transformed life of the believer and the “new man.”	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, 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 – 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

# Essay 1 – Was Jesus a God-man?

## A Chronological Look at the Councils

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. 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, 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 wording of Scripture and the significance to the believer to fail to endure to the end as is required to be recorded in the Lamb’s book of Life rather than blotted out.

### 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. This study maintains that Scripture may speak with breadth and immediacy about sonship, participation, and union in ways that later doctrinal systems may have narrowed. The opposing doctrinal claims remain historically important, but the essay does not treat their authority as self-proving. Instead, it presents the author’s contention that conciliar conclusions remain open to re-examination wherever they appear to reach beyond the scriptural witness.

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.

### 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.

# **Essay 1 – Was Jesus a God-man?**

## **A Chronological Look at the Councils**

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 1 – Was Jesus a God-man? A Chronological Look at the Councils**

**Notes:**