

## *The Purple Pulpit*

Installment #20

September 30, 2018

### **On the Human Soul of Jesus**

In the mid-fourth century of the Lord Jesus Christ epoch (Heb. 1:1,2) a Christian overseer of the church in Laodicea named Apollinaris proposed the teaching that in Christ incarnate the Logos (the Son in His Deity) occupied the place in His humanity that would (in any other human) be the soul or the mind. This effectively meant that the Lord Jesus Christ's humanity was limited to His body. It affirmed that the Deity of Jesus Christ our Lord filled the slot of the rational soul in man, and therefore the mind of Christ was really the Deity that Christ is, filling the slot of the rational part of man. This teaching purports that the incarnation was simply the putting on of a body over the Logos. I think that you can see that this makes our Lord Christ not fully human. That is the problem. This doctrine (as so many before and after it) took the name of its principal proponent and was dubbed "Apollinarianism." I'm going to stand apart from so many interpreters of church history and say that I believe Apollinaris to be a true believer. He was a staunch opponent of Arianism, and a believer in Jesus as God in flesh. His Christology was inaccurate, but understandable, in my opinion. But we must do more

than simply make statements and declarations. We must go on to Scripturally establish why one should believe the Lord Jesus to have a human soul's mentality.

If omniscient Deity of the Logos inhabited mere flesh, rather than fill humanity in the incarnation of Christ, then how would we make sense of Lk. 2:52 that asserts that Jesus advanced in wisdom as a boy? If, however, we believe in His assumption of a rational mind as part of His human soul, this verse now makes sense. Without understanding Jesus to have taken on a human soul with its mind, we're left to imagine the all-wise God of Jude 25 knowing all things without development from birth to adulthood. But this experience of the boy Jesus is denied in Lk. 2:52. This verse demands the taking on of a human soul/mind on the part of the incarnate Christ.

Then there is the fact that the soul of Jesus was given as a ransom for our sins (see e.g. Isa. 53:10+12; Mk. 10:45; Jn. 10:15). A perfect human soul (united with Deity in a monoprosoponic Entity) was offered as a representative of all other human souls, so as to redeem human souls. Just as the penalty of "life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burn for burn, wound for wound, stripe for stripe" was prescribed in Ex. 21:23-25, so Christ, paying our penalty, would die for men body for body, soul for soul, mind for mind, full humanity for full humanity as our Representative (Rom. 5:6-19; 1 Cor. 15:45-49).

This is the reason why, though I have no issue against the term “incarnation” and use it frequently, I prefer “inhumanation,” because the coming of Christ in flesh was more than just acquiring a body, but “He was obligated to become like His brethren according to all points....for the propitiating of the sins of the people” (Heb. 2:17).