

## Jesus Fully God- Part 2

### 1. Jesus Deity was Necessary.

- Only someone who is infinite God could bear the full penalty for all the sins of all those who would believe in him—and finite creature would have been incapable of bearing the penalty.
- “Salvation is from the Lord” - Jonah 2:9  
The scriptures make it very clear that no human being, no creature, could ever save man—only God himself.
- Only someone who is fully God could be the one mediator between God and man (1 Timothy 2:5).  
With the purpose of bringing us back to God, and also to reveal God most fully to us. (John 14:9)

#### Summary:

If Jesus is not fully God, we would have no salvation and ultimately no Christianity.

“Any one who goes ahead and does not abide in the doctrine of Christ does not have God; he who abides in the doctrine has both Father and the Son” – 2 John 9

### 2. Understanding Jesus Being Full God and Fully Man

When examining Jesus’ humanity and deity, there are several passages that seem difficult to fit together. For an example, how could Jesus be all powerful and yet weak? How could he leave the world and yet be present everywhere? How could he learn things and yet be all knowing?

Jesus’ Human Nature	Jesus’ Divine Nature
1. He ascended to heaven and is no longer in the world – John 16:28; 17:11; Acts 1:9-11	1. Jesus is everywhere present: “Where two or three are gathered in my name, there am I in the midst of them- Matthew 18:20  I am with you always, to the very end of the age. – Matthew 28:20
2. Jesus was about thirty years old- Luke 3:23	2. Jesus eternally existed- John 1:1-2; 8:58
3. Jesus was weak and tired- Matthew 4:2; 8:24; Mark 15:21; John 4:6	3. Jesus was omnipotent- Matthew 8:26-27; Colossians 1:17; Hebrews 1:3
4. Jesus died- Luke 23:46; 1 Corinthians 15:3	4. Jesus did not die, but was able to raise himself from the dead – John 2:19; 10:17-18; Hebrews 7:16.  Caution: It is true that when Jesus died his physical body died and his human soul (or spirit) was separated from his body when he passed into the presence of God the Father in heaven (Luke 23:43,46). In this way he experienced a death that is like the one we as believers experience when we die before Christ’s return. But it is not correct to say that Jesus divine nature died, or could die, if “die” means a cessation of activity, consciousness, or a diminution of power. Therefore, Jesus’ divine nature did not actually die, but Jesus went through the experience of death as a whole person, and both human and divine nature somehow shared in that experience.

5. Jesus was certainly tempted in every way as we are, yet without sin- Hebrews 4:15

5. Jesus was not tempted because God cannot be tempted with evil- James 1:13.

Let's take a look and see what approach we should have when applying the truth that Jesus was fully God and fully man at the same time.

The approach we will be looking at is called the "Chalcedonian Definition". It speaks of two distinct natures in Jesus that retain their own properties yet remain together in one person."<sup>1</sup>

a) One nature does some things that the other nature does not do

Example:

In Matthew 8:26-27 we see Jesus asleep on the stern of the boat, presumably because he was weary (Matthew 8:24). But he was able to arise from his sleep and calm the wind and the sea with a word. Jesus was tired and yet omnipotent. Jesus had weak human nature which completely hid his omnipotence until his omnipotence broke forth in a sovereign word from the who is Lord of heaven and earth.

b) Anything either nature does, the person of Christ does.

Anything that is true of the human or the divine nature is true of the person of Christ. As a result, Jesus can say, "Before Abraham was, I am" (John 8:58) Jesus did not say, "Before Abraham was, my divine nature existed.

Another example: "Christ died for our sins" (1 Corinthians 15:3). Even though actually only his human body ceased living and ceased functioning, it was nonetheless Christ as a person who died for our sin. **This is simply a means of affirming that whatever can be said of one nature or the other can be said of the person of Christ.**<sup>2</sup>

**Conclusion:**

"It is by far the most amazing miracle of the entire Bible—far more amazing than the resurrection and more amazing even than the creation of the universe. The fact that the infinite, omnipotent, eternal Son of God could become man and join himself to human nature forever, so that infinite God became one person with finite man, will for eternity the most profound miracle and the most profound mystery in all the universe."<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Wayne Grudem, Bible Doctrine, 245

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., 246

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

### 3. Miracles

Today people will say things like, “There are no good reasons to believe in miracles” or “miracles do not exist”.

David Hume, an eighteenth century Scottish philosopher did not believe in miracles and his writings still can influence people’s thinking today.

His argument in a nut shell:

Human experience confirms the certainty of the laws of nature. Since miracles violate the laws of nature, it would take an enormous amount of evidence to confirm any miracle.

How much evidence? An impossibly large amount.

Because such evidence does not exist, belief in miracles is therefore irrational.

Hume supported his primary argument with four supporting claims:

- 1) No miracle has been attested by a sufficient number of educated and rational witnesses.
- 2) There is a human tendency to believe the spectacular.
- 3) Most reports of miracles occur among ignorant and barbarous people.
- 4) Claims of miracles occur in all religious traditions, thus nullifying one another.<sup>4</sup>

**How would you respond to this argument?**

#### a) The Definition

A miracle is commonly described as an event ‘that is not explicable by natural or scientific laws

A miracle is a special act of God that interrupts the natural course of events. Miracles are unusual, irregular, and specific acts of God.

*Norman Geisler*

#### b) Working through the Argument

- i) According to Hume’s worldview, the universe is a closed system of cause and effect and therefore miracles are outside of this realm. As a result, miracles are impossible.

Response:

- The scientific method has nothing to say about the events that occur outside the material world.
- Nothing in Hume’s argument rules out the intervention of a god to alter the expected pattern of nature.
- Although miracles may be outside the realm of scientific method (investigation), they are not outside the realm of historical investigation. The historian’s role is to find out what happened, not assume what could or could not have happened.

---

<sup>4</sup> <https://zondervanacademic.com/blog/david-hume-and-jesus-miracles>

- ii) Evidence for what occurs repeatedly (or regularly) ought to outweigh evidence for what occurs rarely. Since miracles occur so infrequently and are rare in our uniform experience, Hume argued that we shouldn't believe in them.

Response:

The 'Standard Cosmological Model' for the origin of the universe (the theory accepted by most astrophysicists) is 'Big Bang Cosmology.' This model describes a universe that came into existence from nothing. If all space, time and matter began at a point in the distant past and came into existence from nothing, the cause of the universe must itself be non-spatial, non-temporal and non-material. That means the cause of the universe 'is not explicable by natural or scientific laws.' Since the cause and the origin of the universe already falls into the definition of 'miraculous,' why would anyone doubt the veracity of other miracles?"

Since miracles<sup>5</sup> occur so infrequently and are rare in our uniform experience, Hume argued that we shouldn't believe in them.

But miracles are – by definition – rare events that violate natural laws and common experience. If we are willing to accept the evidence for rare events (like the evidence offered by 'Big Bang' Cosmologists), and our most common, uniform experience is non-material and non-physical (our experience of consciousness and free agency), why would anyone reject the existence of a miracle on the basis of its rarity?"<sup>6</sup>

- iii) human tendency to crave the spectacular, and the assertion that many religious traditions claim the reality of miracles, thus nullifying Christianity's claims.

Response: Although it is true that humanity has the tendency to crave the spectacular, this actually says nothing about whether miracles are possible.

- iv) Other religions' claims to the miraculous doesn't deny their impossibility in the Christian tradition.

Response: Reports of miracles in other religious traditions neither prove nor disprove the miracles of Christianity.

### **Conclusion:**

Whenever someone asks if miracles are probable (or believable) they are really asking, "is there a God?"

Hume at the start of his inquiry dismisses God as a criterion for support. Hume says we should judge miracles only on the basis of natural evidence - what we find occurring in nature as repeatable. The less common an instance, the less rational it is to believe.

---

<sup>6</sup> <https://coldcasechristianity.com/writings/quick-shot-there-are-no-good-reasons-to-believe-in-miracles/>

If one assumes that nature is the standard for judging the reasonableness of an event occurring, then Hume may have a point. But by assuming this, one assumes there is no God that rules over nature. What he does in effect is beg the question.

*Begging the question- a philosophical fallacy that occurs when an argument premises assume without proof the stand/position.*

“However, if we have strong logical reasons for believing the existence of the Christian God - apart from miracles - then a belief in miracles is not illogical. The argument can be stated thusly:

**The Bible asserts that an omnipotent God created the universe ex nihilo and governs natural laws.**

**If God governs natural laws, God can suspend natural laws**

**A suspension of natural laws is a definition of a miracle.**

**Therefore, if the God of Christianity exists, He can perform miracles.”<sup>7</sup>**

## **Deployment**

How many miracles need to occur in order to prove that miracles can happen in our world? We only need one with good historical evidence. Jesus death and then resurrection three days later is that miracle. However, we will meet people who will claim that Jesus never rose again. Other religious leaders and scholars have made these claims....

A prominent Hindu leader declared in a 2007 speech that Jesus never died on the cross. “He was only injured and after treatment returned to India where he actually died,” insisted K. S. Sudarshan, leader of a nationalist Hindu organization in India.

Muslims interpret the Qur’an as saying that Jesus never actually died on the cross, much less returned from the dead.

Tabor (chair of the department of religious studies at the University of North Carolina), postulated that Jesus’ tomb was empty not due to a resurrection but because Jesus’ body had been moved and then interred elsewhere by members of his own family.<sup>8</sup>

**Your deployment is to choose one of the above claims, and then think about how you would respond to their claim towards Jesus?**

---

<sup>7</sup> <https://www.comereason.org/david-hume-on-miracles.asp>

<sup>8</sup> Lee Strobel, *The Case For The Real Jesus*, 103-106.