

Jesus of Nazareth: Messiah and Son of God

SIDNEY A. HATCH, Th.M.

In Part One I explained that my transition from Trinitarianism to a biblical unitarianism was within the context of my pastoral ministry, not theological polemics. It was my hope always to exegete a passage before teaching it, the result in my own life being the unitarian view. In that article I set forth three propositions: (I) The Scriptures Present Christ's Birth and Human Development, (II) The Scriptures Clearly Assert the Humanity of Christ to the Exclusion of Deity, and (III) The Mystery of Christ's Preexistence Resides in the Omniscience and Purpose of God.*

IV. CERTAIN CLAIMS OF CHRIST INDICATE HUMANITY, NOT DEITY

There is a need to reexamine our Lord's claims and/or titles from a non-Trinitarian standpoint. They do not indicate membership in a Trinity at all. The unitarian aspect of Jesus' claims and titles needs to be brought out. I shall touch on several of them.

When Jesus asked the disciples, "Whom say ye that I am?"¹ Peter replied very simply, "Thou art the Christ" or "Messiah." Luke's account is a delightful variation but equally simple: "The Christ of God."² The

*Published in Vol. 1, No. 3.

¹Mark 8:29 (KJV). Scripture quotations throughout the article are from the Authorized or King James Version.

²Luke 9:20.

Greek text has the definite article before "God" (*theou*). If we wish to be baldly literal, we could translate the sentence, "The Messiah of the [true] God."³ Matthew's account adds "the Son of the living God" to Peter's testimony.⁴ But this does not alter the simplicity of the Petrine testimony. As indicated earlier in this article (Proposition I), "Son of God" needs to be understood in a biological, albeit miraculous, sense.

I fear that in today's evangelical environment, a simple assertion of faith in Jesus' Messiahship would be deemed inadequate. But for Peter it earned the commendation of the Savior, and for John it was considered sufficient for salvation.⁵

In this connection, let us consider the theology of Thomas as indicated in his wonderful confession, "My Lord and my God."⁶ First of all, any consideration of Thomas' theology must take into account his identity and background.

He was one of the twelve apostles, before and after Jesus' death and resurrection.⁷ He was an Israelite, sent by the Lord Jesus to "the lost sheep of the house of Israel."⁸ In today's parlance, he would simply be called a Jew.

Logically, then, Thomas' theology and faith would be that of the Hebrew Scriptures. This would include the pristine doctrine of the Old Testament, "Hear, O Israel: The LORD our God is one LORD."⁹ Also, Thomas' knowledge of the Scriptures would certainly include something else: those who represent God are sometimes called "God" or "god." This would include Moses,¹⁰ the judges of Israel,¹¹ the angels,¹² and more especially the Messiah.¹³

³The Greek phrase is *ton christon tou theou*. Do the articles have demonstrative force here? Perhaps the significance is: "the Messiah of the one true God." On the occasional significance of the definite article in the Hebrew phrase *ha elohim*, see *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, as ed. and enlarged by the late E. Kautzsch, 2nd English ed., rev. in accordance with the 28th German ed. (1909) by A.E. Cowley, Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1910, section 126(d), 405.

⁴Matthew 16:16.

⁵Matthew 16:17; 1 John 5:1.

⁶John 20:28.

⁷Mark 3:18; Acts 1:13.

⁸Matthew 10:6.

⁹Deuteronomy 6:4.

¹⁰Exodus 4:16; 7:1.

¹¹Exodus 21:6; 22:8. Hebrew *elohim*.

¹²Psalms 8:5; possibly Psalm 82:1, 6. Hebrew *elohim*.

¹³Psalms 45:6; Isaiah 9:6.

It is common knowledge that *elohim* is used in the Old Testament of those who represent God. On the other hand, the singular form *eloah* is used especially of the God of heaven. However, it is interesting that on a special occasion it is used of the Messiah. In Habakkuk 3:3 we read, “God [*eloah*] came from Teman, and the Holy One from mount Paran. Selah. His glory covered the heavens, and the earth was full of his praise.”

Habakkuk 3 is, I believe, a wonderful picture of the return of Christ in glory. It is the march to Zion. The Messiah is portrayed as advancing in triumph from Teman or “the south.” His glory covers the heavens. He is “the Holy One,” Jehovah’s representative, and as such he is called “God” or *eloah*.

What then is Thomas saying when he exclaims, “My Lord and my God”?

“You are the Messiah,” Thomas says in effect. “You are the One whom the prophets said would come. As such, you are ‘my Lord.’ As the One whom Jehovah has appointed to rule in the kingdom, you are ‘my God.’”

Thomas is not saying, “You are the God of heaven” or “You are the equal of God.” He does not see in the resurrected Jesus one who was a member of a pluralistic Godhead. Such thoughts would have been incomprehensible, even blasphemous, to Thomas. His faith existed in a different world.

There is a brief epilogue to the confession of Thomas. That he saw in Jesus the Messiah of Israel, the promised One of Scripture, is confirmed by John’s words which follow in verse 31: “But these [signs] are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ [the Messiah], the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name.” I look upon John’s words as being explanatory matter to Thomas’ words.

The subject of Christ’s claims or titles must include the phrase “I am” which occurs frequently in the Gospels. It invites exhaustive treatment and my examination here may therefore be cursory. I trust, however, that it will be sufficient to make my position clear. I observed as a pastor that the phrase “I am” is to many Christians irrefutable evidence that Jesus is claiming to be God. But is this what he is saying?

In the Olivet discourse, in Mark 13:6, Jesus says, “For many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ; and shall deceive many.” The original Greek expression is *ego eimi*, “I am,” and in translating it, the translators (KJV) have rightly supplied the word “Christ.” Other translations have “I am he,” but the point is the same.

Jesus is saying in effect that in later times many will come claiming his

title and office. In doing so, they will say, “I am Christ” or “I am the Messiah.” Recognition of this sense of “I am” in Mark 13:6 indicates that it means, “I am the Messiah,” not “I am God.”

Further evidence as to the meaning of “I am” is in the parallel passage in Matthew 24:5. The Greek text of Matthew has the full expression, *ego eimi ho christos*, “I am the Christ.” Perhaps Matthew was familiar with Mark’s Gospel. It would indicate then how he interpreted Mark’s words. He took them to mean “I am the Christ,” not “I am God.”

In Mark 14:61, 62 the high priest asked Jesus, “Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?” Jesus replied simply, “I am” (*ego eimi*). The context requires that we interpret his words as meaning, “I am, indeed, the Christ, the Son of the Blessed.”

“I am” occurs frequently in the Gospel of John. There too it would mean, “I am the Messiah.” This is proven by the familiar John 20:31 where the beloved disciple plainly says, “Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God.”

This would be true of John 18:5, 6 where Jesus said, “I am,” and those who came to arrest him went backward and fell to the ground. For a moment, the Messianic power manifested itself.

This would be true also of John 8:58 where Jesus said, “Before Abraham was, I am” or, as various translations have it, “Before Abraham was born, I am.”

It is argued that Jesus is saying here that he existed before Abraham. And, if he existed before Abraham, he must be God. Therefore we must understand John 8:58 to mean, “I am God.”

But when he said, “Before Abraham was, I am,” he simply meant that, even then, he was in the plan and purpose of God. This kind of “preexistence,” being in the plan of God, prevails throughout the Gospel of John. Abraham had seen the glory of the Messiah and his day in prophetic vision.¹⁴

The “I am” of the New Testament is often identified with the “I AM” of Exodus 3:14 (KJV) where God spoke to Moses from the burning bush. However, the two expressions are not identical and differ in several

¹⁴In John 8:12 Jesus has said, “I am the light of the world.” In John 9 he proves this claim by opening the eyes of the man born blind. Hence the sense of John 8:58 may be, “I am the Messiah, the Light of the World.” The marginal readings of verse 58 (RSV, NEB), and the Greek text of the phrase, “Before Abraham was,” may indicate that the passage looks to the future rather than the past. But this is another question and does not alter the simple Messianic sense of “I am” in verse 58.

respects. The “I AM” of Exodus 3:14 is a translation of the Hebrew verb *hayah* which means “become, come to pass, occur, happen, appear,” etc. It is the Hebrew “imperfect” or future tense and literally means, “I will become.” In effect, God is saying to Moses, “I will appear on your behalf.”¹⁵

The Hebrew *hayah* is a stronger verb than the Greek *eimi* of the New Testament. *Hayah*’s Greek equivalent would be *ginomai*, not *eimi*. This is proven by the Septuagint, the Greek Old Testament, where the Hebrew *hayah* is most often translated by *ginomai* which means “become, come into being, be born, etc.”¹⁶ The Septuagint does indeed use *eimi* for *hayah* in Exodus 3:14, thus making an exception to its own general practice. This would seem to contradict what I have written here. But we must remember that the Septuagint itself is a translation—the KJV of its day, and its rendering of the Hebrew phrase in Exodus 3:14 is not literal: “I am the existing one.” The distinction, I believe, between *hayah* and *eimi* still stands.

In the “I am” of the New Testament, the emphasis is on the word “I,” not “am.” The “am” is simply the copula. Thus Jesus is saying, “I am the Messiah, not someone else.” But in the “I AM” of Exodus 3:14, the emphasis is on the verb. No personal pronoun is present in the Hebrew text; it is simply a part of the verb form. Thus God is saying, “I will become” or “I will appear.” Jesus, in any case, never claimed for himself the divine title in Exodus 3:14, “I am the existing one.”

Mention must be made of such full expressions as “I am the bread of life,” “I am the light of the world,” “I am the good shepherd,” “I am the first and the last,”¹⁷ etc. These are glorious aspects of our Lord’s being the Messiah.

In the Old Testament, Jehovah is called the “Shepherd” and the “Light.”¹⁸ So as God’s Messiah on earth, these titles and prerogatives are granted to the Lord Jesus.

In the light of the foregoing evidence, it is only fair to conclude that the

¹⁵Cf. the article on the verb *hayah* in the various Hebrew lexicons, e.g. Francis Brown, S.R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, etc.*, 1st ed., 1907, reprinted with corrections, 1955, Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 224-28.

¹⁶Cf. G. Abbott-Smith, *A Manual Greek Lexicon of the New Testament*, 3rd ed., Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1937, 92.

¹⁷Revelation 1:17.

¹⁸Psalms 23:1; 27:1.

phrase, “I am,” when found on the lips of the Savior, means “I am the Messiah,” not “I am God.” The Scriptural evidence is against the latter interpretation. It may stem from a desire to exalt our Lord, but it must be recognized for what it is: reading trinitarian theology into Scripture.

Finally, in the category of claims and titles, we have in Jesus’ own words a warning against a fulsome Christology—a Christology which attributes to Jesus more than he claimed for himself.

That one whom we call “the rich young ruler” came to Jesus one day and asked him, “Good Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?” Jesus replied, “Why callest thou me good? None is good, save one, that is God.”¹⁹

Our Lord’s reply is, admittedly, difficult. His apparent rejection of any claims to a goodness of his own raises a host of questions—too numerous to mention here. I share, though, several thoughts which have been helpful to me.

The word for “good” is *agathos*. It occurs not only here, but also in Matthew’s and Mark’s accounts of the rich young ruler.²⁰

Agathos is both an adjective and a noun, and its usage is broad in the New Testament. According to Abbott-Smith’s lexicon, it properly refers to “inner excellence.”²¹ When used of God, Thayer says, it refers to the fact that He is completely, perfectly, and essentially good.²²

Jesus says that only God possesses this *agathos* or goodness. We may identify it with His principal attribute of holiness.

On the practical level, it means that God cannot sin. He could not sin, nor could he even be tempted to sin.²³ This is confirmed by 1 Timothy 1:17 which says that God is “immortal” or “incorruptible.” The Greek word is *aphthartos* which means not liable to corruption.²⁴

Here, then, is an astonishing thing. By saying what he does to the rich young ruler, Jesus rejects for himself *agathos*, that inner harmonious perfection which belongs only to God. In essence, he rejects this divine attribute of holiness and, on the negative side, he rejects incorruptibility.

This means, then, that our Lord’s trials were real. We think of the temptation in the wilderness, and the agony in Gethsemane. There was on

¹⁹Luke 18:18, 19.

²⁰Matthew 19:16, 17; Mark 10:17, 18.

²¹G. Abbott-Smith, *op. cit.*, 2.

²²Joseph Henry Thayer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, etc.*, corrected ed., New York: American Book Company, 1889, 2.

²³Isaiah 6:3; Matthew 5:48.

²⁴Thayer, *op. cit.*, 88.

those occasions the possibility of failure to do God's will, of falling, of sinning. He was, indeed, liable to corruption.

I must agree with William Barclay who, in discussing Gethsemane, describes it as an "agony" for our Lord, his "supreme struggle" in submitting his will to God's will. It was no play-acting, Barclay writes. The world's salvation hung in the balance and at that moment Jesus might have turned back.²⁵

The very thought makes us shudder, but it is unavoidable and inescapable.

Before we turn away from such a thought, let us consider the other side of the matter: not only were our Lord's trials real, but his victories were also real. He was truly "a lamb without blemish and without spot."²⁶ He was qualified to become "the lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world."²⁷ Consequently, as Paul told the elders at Ephesus, "he hath purchased [us] with his own blood."²⁸

Our Lord did have a certain goodness, a goodness unique in human history. It was the goodness which he acquired as he "increased (advanced) in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and man."²⁹ This was a goodness in growth—the possible goodness which Adam forfeited.

As the Captain of our salvation, he was made perfect through sufferings.³⁰ As our High Priest, he can be touched with the feelings of our infirmities, for he was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin.³¹ As God's Son, he learned obedience by the things which he suffered.³²

This is the goodness which qualified him to be "the good shepherd" who gave his life for the sheep.³³ The word for "good" here in John 10:11 is not *agathos*, but *kalos* meaning morally excellent, noble, and worthy of recognition.³⁴ Certainly this describes the Lord Jesus!

²⁵William Barclay, *The Gospel of Matthew, etc.*, 2nd ed., Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1958, II, 385.

²⁶1 Peter 1:19.

²⁷John 1:29.

²⁸Acts 20:28.

²⁹Luke 2:52.

³⁰Hebrews 2:10.

³¹Hebrews 4:15.

³²Hebrews 5:8.

³³John 10:11.

³⁴Ethelbert W. Bullinger, *A Critical Lexicon and Concordance to the English and Greek New Testament, etc.*, London: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1886, 336. W. J. Hickie, *Greek-English Lexicon to the New Testament, etc.*, New York: The MacMillan Co., 1945, 95.

"Orthodox" theology tells us it was not possible for Jesus to sin.³⁵ But Scripture presents to us something far more wonderful and dramatic: a victory over sin.

Alfred Plummer, in his comments on the rich young ruler, says that the title, "Good Master," was unknown among the Jews. It was, therefore, an extraordinary address, perhaps even a "fulsome compliment."³⁶ The words of the young man may have been not only excessive to our Lord, but also offensive. His response certainly indicates that.

In the light of our Lord's words to the young man, we must be careful that our conception of Jesus is not fulsome! We are not honoring or exalting him when we attribute to him what he himself rejected, and what belongs only to his heavenly Father.

V. THE MINISTRY OF CHRIST INDICATES MESSIAHSHIP, NOT DEITY

In this division of my article I have in mind the miracles of Christ, his authority to forgive sins, his mission to "declare" (KJV) God, and his "equality" to God.

The Scriptures indicate that Jesus healed all who came to him. I think it is safe to say that there were no exceptions and no disappointments. What is the secret of this amazing success? Was it intrinsic deity or was it something else?

Luke tells us, "The whole multitude sought to touch him: for there went virtue out of him, and healed them all."³⁷

The Greek word for "virtue" is *dunamis*. In this context it means "power" or "energy." A special power, a dynamic force, emanated from Jesus' person. He did not need to say anything. His presence alone was sufficient to heal.³⁸

In the epoch of the Book of Acts, Peter and Paul had this same power.³⁹ As Peter walked by, people were healed. The power of the apostles was in keeping with the promises of Mark 16:17, 18 and Acts 1:8.

³⁵This is the so-called doctrine of impeccability. Cf. Lewis Sperry Chafer, *Systematic Theology*, Dallas: Dallas Seminary Press, 1948, V, 50-51, 77-78.

³⁶Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke*, 5th ed., *The International Critical Commentary*, Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1922, 422.

³⁷Luke 6:19.

³⁸Luke 8:46.

³⁹Acts 5:15, 16; 19:12.

It is a rather common assumption that Jesus' power to heal came from an attribute of deity. He limited himself, but when the occasion required, he called on those divine powers. Even *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, in its article "Miracle," says that the miracles of Christ are "eloquent evidence" that he possessed powers which belonged to God Himself.⁴⁰

If by this statement the writer meant that Jesus was God, I must point out that Luke 6:19 gives a different reason for his healing power. Jesus healed because his Father gave him a *dunamis* or healing dynamic.

Our Lord's response to the imprisoned John the Baptist tells us that he considered his miracles to be evidence that he was the promised Messiah of the Old Testament, the One who, if accepted, could usher in the Messianic Era.⁴¹ Also, we must not overlook his reliance on prayer before working a miracle.⁴²

What about Jesus' authority to forgive sins? Does that prove him to be God? In seeking an answer to this question, we can do no better than consider the wonderful story of the paralytic let down through the roof.⁴³ In that story, Jesus forgave the man's sins. Then, to the astonishment of the crowd, he healed him.

In Mark 2:10, 11 Jesus explains why he healed the paralytic: "But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins . . . I say unto thee, Arise, and take up thy bed, and go thy way into thine house."

"Power" in this passage means "authority." And "Son of man" is equivalent to "a human being."

Here, then, is the reason our Lord healed the paralytic: to demonstrate that a human being on earth could have authority to forgive sins. That human being, of course, was our Lord. He was the Messiah, the one provided by God through the virgin birth.

The scribes misunderstood our Lord's motives in forgiving the paralytic's sins. "Why doth this man thus speak blasphemies? Who can forgive sins but God only?"⁴⁴ Like a later form of "orthodoxy," they read

⁴⁰*The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, 1939 ed., s.v. "Miracle," Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1946, III, 2064.

⁴¹Matthew 11:2-6; cf. Isaiah 35:5, 6.

⁴²John 11:41.

⁴³Mark 2:1-12.

⁴⁴Mark 2:7.

into this miracle a claim to deity. But if we read the passage carefully, we see that our Lord is not claiming deity, he is claiming "authority."

The healing of the paralytic demonstrates a great truth: to a "human being," the "Son of man," God gave authority to forgive sins.⁴⁵

I come now to the ministry of Jesus as the one who "declared" God. In this aspect of his ministry we find an answer to the question, *How* is Jesus the Word of God?

The Apostle John has written: "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him."⁴⁶

I have considered already, under Proposition I, Jesus being the only begotten Son. The statement that he is "in the bosom of the Father" indicates, I believe, a favored relationship with his Father.⁴⁷ However, the final part of the verse tells us that Jesus is the Word of God *because* he "hath declared" God.

"Declared" is the translation of the verb *exegeomai* which means to tell, explain, or unfold in teaching.⁴⁸ This is its usage in Scripture. From *exegeomai* come our words "exegete" and "exegesis."

Our Lord is the Word of God because he is the exegete of God. He has explained God. He had a "commandment" or commission from God as to what he should say.⁴⁹ Finally, in his "unfolding" of God, we must include his miracles or "signs," and his life, death, and resurrection.

Our Lord is not the Word of God because he was at creation. On that occasion God spoke directly, not "in a Son." (To speak "in a Son" comes much later.) Finally, John 1:14 tells us that "the Word [not God] was made flesh."

How is Jesus the Word of God? As the only begotten Son, he has explained God. He has unfolded him in his life and work, and in his redemption at Calvary.⁵⁰

What now about the assertion, sometimes encountered, that Jesus was "equal" to God? A passage sometimes cited to "prove" this contention is John 5:18: "Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he

⁴⁵Compare also that authority to forgive or judge sins given to men in John 20:22, 23 and Acts 5:1-11.

⁴⁶John 1:18.

⁴⁷Cf. John 5:20; 13:23; cf. also Luke 16:22.

⁴⁸Cf. Thayer, *op. cit.*, 223, and the lexicons.

⁴⁹John 12:49, 50.

⁵⁰1 John 4:10.

not only had broken the sabbath, but said also that God was his Father, making himself equal with God.”

“Equal” is our English translation of the little Greek word *isos* which means “equal, like, the same,” or “in agreement.” Instances of this last meaning of the word are found in Mark 14:56 and 59 where the testimonies of those who witnessed against Jesus “*agreed not together.*”

Thus we have several possible senses to John 5:18. By saying God was his Father, Jesus made himself equal with God, like God, the same as God, or in agreement with God!

In John 5:18 Jesus aspires to be like God in the latter’s will and work. As God’s Son, his will must *agree with* or be identical to his Father’s will.

That likeness to or equality with God’s will and work is the meaning of John 5:18 is indicated by the context of verses 17-31. “My Father worketh hitherto, and I work.” This involves complete submission and identification with the Father’s will (verse 19). It will even involve “greater works”: quickening the dead, judgment, *etc.* But in no sense will it include essential deity. Rather, it will always involve doing “the will of the Father which hath sent me” (verse 30).

Before forming our conclusion, however, one other passage must be considered. In John 10:30 Jesus said, “I and my Father are one.” Again the thought is “one” in purpose, will, and work, not one in essence.

The Greek word here for “one” is *hen*. It is a neuter form and so A.T. Robertson sees in it an indication of oneness in essence.⁵¹ However, Marcus Dods, writing in *The Expositor’s Greek Testament*, says that Christ speaks here as an ambassador might speak. The ambassador is doing the sovereign’s will. He does not claim royal dignity, but asserts that what he does, the sovereign does.⁵²

H.A.W. Meyer claims that oneness of essence must be “presupposed” in the fellowship indicated by the words of John 10:30. But he also writes that the orthodox interpretation, which makes this verse refer to unity of essence, goes beyond the discussion in the passage. Meyer writes here of “dynamic fellowship” or “unity of action.” Even Calvin, he says, rejected the idea of unity of essence in John 10:30.⁵³

⁵¹Archibald Thomas Robertson, *Word Pictures in the New Testament*, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1932, V, 186.

⁵²Marcus Dods, *The Gospel of St. John, The Expositor’s Greek Testament*, Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans, n.d., I, 794.

⁵³H.A.W. Meyer, *Critical and Exegetical Hand-Book to the Gospel of John*, trans. from the 5th ed. of the German by Rev. William Urwick, rev. and ed. by Frederick Crombie, New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1884, 330.

Unity of purpose and action is, indeed, the thought in our Lord’s claim, “I and my Father are one.” There is no need to read unity of essence into his words.

V. CONCLUSION: THE PRACTICAL VALUE OF A BIBLICAL UNITARIAN VIEW OF CHRIST.

“Of what value is this view to me?” To the man or woman in the church pew on Sunday morning, this is the “bottom line” of any doctrine. Unless some intrinsic value can be demonstrated, it remains, to all practical purposes, grist from the mills of theologians.

To the biblical unitarian there is a glorified man, not a glorified god, at the right hand of the Father in heaven. A victorious *anthropos* is our Mediator⁵⁴ and our Advocate (*parakletos*).⁵⁵

Where, I would ask, is the victory in the essentially Gnostic idea that a heavenly spirit assumed a human body?⁵⁶ The humanity of Christ is the common bond with our Savior. This, I believe, is theology’s “original intent.”

In the great story of the book of Job, Elihu comes to speak for God. He is the mediator.⁵⁷ In the midst of his suffering, Job has cried out, “[God] is not a man, as I am, that I should answer him, and we should come together in judgment.”⁵⁸ But when Elihu appears on the scene, he says, “Wherefore, Job, I pray thee, hear my speeches, and hearken to all my words. . . . Behold, I am according to thy wish in God’s stead: I also am formed out of the clay.”⁵⁹ That is to say, “Hear my words, Job; I also am a human being!”

⁵⁴1 Timothy 2:5.

⁵⁵1 John 2:1.

⁵⁶Cf. Adolph Harnack, *History of Dogma*, trans. from the 3rd German ed. by Neil Buchanan, Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1976, I, 239. I would call the reader’s attention to the evidence presented by Harnack in Volume I, Chapter IV, “The Attempts of the Gnostics to Create an Apostolic Dogmatic, and a Christian Theology; or, The Acute Secularising of Christianity,” 223-66.

⁵⁷Cf. *The Companion Bible, etc.*, London: The Lamp Press Ltd., n.d., 705, marginal comment.

⁵⁸Job 9:32.

⁵⁹Job 33:1, 6.