

A study guide on the nature of the Body of Jesus Christ

by Andre Bentrup www.heavenlyflesh.com ~ www.youtube.com/c/AndreBentrup

Study Material:

- Bible
- New Testament Interlinear Bible <https://biblehub.com/interlinear>
- Septuagint Interlinear Bible <https://studybible.info/interlinear/>
- Greek Manuscript Variants <https://greekcntr.org/collation/>

My interest in this topic got sparked by a statement of James White in his debate with oneness Pentecostal Roger Perkins at the minute mark 27:22 here: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=U-KMGuXC-c> where White is quoted saying "The one who took the body said: you have prepared a body for me."

Is this a true interpretation of Hebrews 10:5-7? A dialogue between a "pre incarnate God the Son" person and "God the Father", about a "pre fashioned body" that "God the Son" contemplated from heaven, realizing in heaven after reading a scroll that God had fashioned a body for him for 9 months that he was now about to "take"?

Soon after that, I came across similar statements by people such as John MacArthur in his 1970 sermon "Why was Jesus born" (<https://www.gty.org/library/sermons-library/1204/why-was-jesus-born>) where he is quoted to say: "**And on that first christmas eve** there was a farewell going on in heaven. The Son said goodbye to the Father, and the conversation that the Son had with the Father, at least a part of it, is recorded for us in the 10th chapter of Hebrews.... Now, **the body of Christ was divinely prepared by God** to be the instrument which was to bring God to men, and which was to be the perfect sacrifice for sin... **The Holy Spirit had taken nine months to accomplish His work.** He had on those nine months fashioned in the womb of Mary a body, a body inhabited by the second person of the Trinity, and the time was ready that Mary should be delivered. The fullness of time was come when Jesus would be made of a woman, **and thus that body came, and with it came the second person of the Trinity.**"

The reader is further advised to read Spurgeon's 1891 "Lo, I come", John Gill's and John Darby's commentaries on Hebrews 10, in order to see that this is the standard teaching of so called evangelical church, alongside the catholic and other churches.

My understanding of an "incarnation", which is derived from in and caro, meaning in-fleshing, was that Jesus actually was becoming flesh, not just inhabiting flesh. I had known from Gnosticism, that the Gnostics taught Jesus only to have a seemingly material body. I was soon to learn from sources such as "Excerpts of Theodotus", Hippolyt and others, that there was a branch of Gnostics that make up the fraction of the most successful and most important sect, the valentinian Gnostics, that in deed did believe in a 2 natured body of Jesus, one immaterial that he brought from heaven, made by Sophia, and one prepared by the "craftsman" (God), which was in deed material in a literal sense. This was established in the so called "eastern school" of the valentinian Gnostics. The founder, Valentinus, almost became pope. It is more than striking, troubling at the same time to make such a discovery.

According to men like John MacArthur and James White, there was no incarnation at conception in the womb. There was no God that incarnated in Mary's womb when Elisabeth saluted her, where the babe in Elisabeth's womb leaped for joy. It was a bodily shell, more than that according to the belgic confession, it was a body and a human soul, but not one that was the incarnated Word of God, but rather one that came from a distinct nature. Little did I know that this very topic had cost various Anabaptists their heads, such as Fije and Eelken of Leeuwarden. Also, Menno Simons, founder of the Mennonites, harshly rejected such an idea of a 2 natured divided messiah in his complete writings under section 31.3 Mennonites have long abandoned Menno's insight, which was founded on self bible study rather than a dogmatic obedience.

I was to find that this was also reflected in the athanasian creed, which makes a very bold statement: "Furthermore, **it is necessary to eternal salvation**; that he also believe faithfully in the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ. For the right faith is that we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and Man; God, of the Substance [Essence] of the Father; **begotten before the worlds**; and Man, of the **Substance [Essence] of his Mother**, born in the world. Perfect God; and perfect Man, of a rational soul and human flesh subsisting. Equal to the Father, concerning his Godhead; and inferior to the Father, concerning his Manhood. Who although he is God and Man; yet he is not two, but one Christ. One; **not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh; but by assumption of the Manhood into God.** One altogether; not by confusion of Substance [Essence]; but by Unity of Person. **For as the rational soul and flesh is one man; so God and Man is one Christ.**"

Mark the claim: Jesus Christ was divided into 2 essences where one was spiritual (like soul) and one was material (like body). One came from God, the other from Mary. It should be noted that according to this creed, which condemns everyone to hell that does not believe it, the Word of God never truly incarnated in the sense of flesh-becoming, but merely was a spiritual essence, supreme over a pre-fashioned body out of Mary, the other essence. Something is fishy about this as it very closely resembles the valentinian Gnostics' idea of the eastern school. 1 John 4:2-3 comes to mind:

"By this you know the Spirit of God: Every spirit that confesses that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh is of God, and every spirit that does not confess that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh is not of God. And this is the spirit of the Antichrist, which you have heard was coming, and is now already in the world."

Mark that the incarnation and making up of the body of Jesus is a highly important topic. Yet the people who claim the need of acceptance of a certain dogma in order to be saved are at the same time those who say "Mystery, do not study it !". This is in direct opposition to what Jesus clearly taught, namely that his Holy Spirit would "guide us into all truth" (John 16:13). It is never a good sign when dogmatic theologians force us under a dogma with supposed eternal consequences and at the same time say no one can truly understand it. Jesus promised to reveal himself and his Father to those whom he wills to reveal it to. Did that take place at councils under roman emperors? This is why I advise anyone to study this and come to his own conclusion. I can only serve as someone that will spark your motivation to do the same, by giving you scriptures and sources to analyze this. If you do it or not is up to you. I prophecy anyone doing this in all honesty to find out that by no means is that dogma true, but rather that God the Father has his holy Word proceeding forth from his own mouth (study the words ginomai, logos, theon and pros in the Septuagint and compare results to John 1:1, also mark Proverbs 27:19), preexisting in his own heart (study Job 37:2 in the Septuagint and the words exerchomai ek/para/apo in the words of Jesus), having become flesh in a most literal sense with a genuine human soul, and nailing that same Word to the cross (Colossians 2:14), slaying thereby the enmity of the ordinances (Ephesians 2:15-16) and spilling the Holy Blood of God (Acts 20:28) that was in the veins of the incarnate Word of the Father, that Word that was seen and handled (1 John 1:1) in a literal sense, which did not happen in the dogma of the church and veils this beautiful truth about the holy body of Jesus Christ, which he referred to as his "temple" (John 2:19-21), that the bible calls "God" and "The Lamb" (Revelation 21:22), all meaningless allegories in the church dogma of the hypostatic union. Yes, Mary was a surrogate mother, nothing more. Jesus in fact himself stated "What do I have to do with you, woman" (John 2:5), in the interlinear bible "What to me and to you?". It was Irenaeus of Lyon, who twisted the truth about the body of Jesus into the very foundation of marian worship that serves as a basis for the church dogmas, influenced by Ignatius of Antioch.

Jesus Christ came "in the likeness of sinful flesh" (Romans 8:3), where likeness is resemblance, a word used in the Septuagint for idols or any likeness made of something else. Mark that Jesus BECAME this likeness literally according to Philippians 2:7 and John 1:14. Here is the central point, namely a word that anyone should thoroughly study for this topic: ginomai (Strong's number G1096). EVERY TIME this is used to connect two nouns immediately without another preposition, it denotes a "transition from condition to condition". Such in water becoming wine, stones to become bread, the sea becoming blood, a seed becoming a tree and various other scriptures. The blue letter bible or the interlinear bible on studybible.info can be used to analyze this further. It is further used when an attribute or state is redefined, such as the garments of Jesus becoming white or Jesus "becoming dead". It would be outright arbitrary abuse of the bible to deny this literal clear wording to be true in John 1:14 where we read "And the Word became flesh", and degrade it to a mere spiritual meaning of God prefashioning some bodily shell that he pulled out of Mary's womb (Tertullian) and that "God the Son took" (James White). This also contradicts what Jesus said "I CAME OUT OF THE FATHER" (John 16:28) or "The Son of Man, which came down from heaven." (John 3:13). Jesus explains what the origins of his body are: Before he became flesh, he was that Word. This came down from heaven, likened to bread, and that bread was his flesh which he gave for the life of the world. (John 6:51) The Word MUST have become flesh in a literal sense upon conception, otherwise Jesus would have lied. Also, that Word can be eaten, and its blood (life is in the blood, eternal life is in the Word of God) can be drunken. Jesus explained the transition he took backwards.

Jesus transitioned another time by "ginomai dead" in Revelation 1:18. Did he not literally become dead here or did he simply add death as a nature to himself? Was he raised back up in another transition or not, did he merely add the resurrection as another nature to himself? Did Jesus further appear in different morphes (outer appearances) after his resurrection (Mark 16:12) or did he add all those natures to himself? Did that second Adam not transition at Pentecost when he BECAME a life-giving Spirit or was this merely a nature he added to himself? Why do these men rob Jesus of his most important "becoming", his Word-flesh-becoming? Is the reason found in Colossians 2:14-15, where we are told that his Father "**wiped out the handwriting of requirements** that was against us, which was contrary to us. And He has taken it out of the way, having **nailed it to the cross**. Having **disarmed principalities and powers**, He made a public spectacle of them, **triumphing over them** in it."? Most assuredly yes, because "we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, the hidden wisdom which God ordained before the ages for our glory, **which none of the rulers of this age knew; for had they known, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory.**" (1 Corinthians 2:7-8)

None of the argumentations of Irenaeus and others truly make sense in a biblical manner. They are simply nonsense. It is based on pure human understanding and philosophy where we often read "If he had not taken from Mary, then how could he....". Well, find the answers in the bible and you end up with quite the opposite statement. The only biblical arguments brought to the table are from genealogies. That Jesus was from the seed of David, that he was born of a woman, that he was from the Israelites. Verses often deliberately translated in a manner that they

seem to show that Jesus was made up of davidic flesh out of Mary's womb. Such verses are Romans 1:3, 9:5, 2 Timothy 2:8, Galatians 4:4 or Revelation 22:16. But an analysis of the wording and comparison with other uses, especially in the Septuagint show the student that this means just one thing: he was born into that family line to fulfill the promise made to Abraham. Jesus Christ in fact himself denied to be the Son of David.

Then Jesus answered and said, while He taught in the temple, "How is it that the scribes say that the Christ is the Son of David? For David himself said by the Holy Spirit: 'The Lord said to my Lord, "Sit at My right hand, Till I make Your enemies Your footstool.'" Therefore David himself calls Him 'Lord'; how is He then his Son?" And the common people heard Him gladly. (Mark 12:35-37)

The wording "how is he then" is used to negate the statement made. Such as found in "if satan is divided with himself, how then can his kingdom stand"? Jesus Christ clearly refuted to be made up of literal davidic flesh and blood.

A rather modern claim is made that the genealogy in Luke 3 is of Mary (see Doctrina Jacobi, the first mention of this claim by jewish unbelievers from Tiberia). However, this has various problems as it clearly says that the genealogy is of Joseph. Also, Salomo is missing in this line, a clear requirement for the promise of David to be fulfilled would be Salomo to be in that line. The line of promise clearly goes through Salomo (2 Samuel 7:12-15, 1 Chronicles 22:9-10, Psalms 72). Since this line also terminates with "Adam" as the Son of "God", we can see that this by no means refers to a flesh and blood tracking record, but rather a record of the line that Jesus was born into. The differences in genealogies stem from the levitic laws. Joseph's grandfather Matthan (mentioned in Matthew) married a woman named Estha, who bore him a son named Jacob. After Matthan died, Estha married his relative Melchi (mentioned in Luke) and bore him a son named Heli (marrying relatives was common among Jews at this time). Jacob and Heli were thus half-brothers. Heli died childless, so Jacob married his widow and fathered Joseph, who was biologically the son of Jacob but legally the son of Heli. This shows that both genealogies, the one in Luke 3 and in Matthew 1, are of Joseph. Salomo in fact is included in Matthew 1, so that the promise to David and Abraham is fulfilled through the line of Matthew 1. Since Joseph inherited the promise, Joseph is mentioned twice among Mary as "the parents of Jesus", so that these genealogy arguments can be easily refuted to be supposed proof and requirement of "marian flesh and blood", Also, Mary is stated to be a cousin of Elisabeth, a woman of the tribe of Levi, not Judah (see Luke 1:5-36). Mary thus was of the aaronite priestly lineage, something to be significant since Phineas was promised an eternal priesthood. (Youtube video on Mary as Levite Part 1: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Is15kxeSmmk> Part 2: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IlkQdIFOF-U>)

An interesting read is about the discoveries of the ovaries. They were made by Herophilus of Chalcedon (what irony this to be his birthplace, where the dogma of the hypostatic union was formulated) in the 3rd century BC and labeled the "female testicles". Clearly Herophilus had knowledge of the female ovum. Luke was a doctor familiar with that, yet he called Jesus "fruit of her [Mary's] kolpas" (that is, a cavity, referring to the womb he grew in) in Luke 1:42. If he wanted to drive home a dogmatic point, why not say Jesus was a fruit of her ovaries? Because he was not. He is the Word that became flesh. The conception and pregnancy are similarly very weak arguments from the marian flesh advocates, who deny that the Word became flesh. The "holding" in the womb clearly does not refer to the flesh being carved out of her womb. Such verses are found in Isaiah 7:14 and quoted in the book of Luke. Study them !

How about clear statements such as Jesus likened to Melchizedek who was "without Father and without Mother" (Hebrews 7:3) ? Why would the author of Hebrews mention that if Jesus was a literal flesh and blood makeup of Mary? Because the Word itself became flesh as it transitioned to flesh and blood. That powerful Word of God, preexisting as "meletao", the self-reflection of God's heart (Job 37:2 in the Septuagint and Proverbs 27:19) inside the Father's chest, translated bosom in Jn 1:18, did in deed become flesh in his conception in Mary's womb and was henceforth the incarnate Word of God. No difference between him that was conceived and him that was circumcised, not a person or nature added "on Christmas eve". **"And when eight days were completed for the circumcision of the Child, His name was called Jesus, the name given by the angel before He was conceived in the womb."** (Luke 2:21). As you will find the more you study this, the statements of John MacArthur, James White, Spurgeon, Irenaeus and others are but this: outspoken blasphemy and mockery of the most central thing in the bible: God nailing his own Word to the cross and spilling the blood of this, his only begotten Son for our sins. A deep truth veiled by a dogma, upheld by a mystery label and fear mongering to be cast into hell if not accepted.

I will now list relevant bible passages pertaining to this topic to help the reader get acquainted with the topic and further analyze it. The reader is advised to thoroughly study this topic in the following manner:

Word analysis in comparing certain phrasing that reoccurs in the new testament, and also the Septuagint Greek original texts. The student shall analyze and evaluate the translations and determine, if the ideas conveyed in the church dogmas resemble the actual meaning of the text, or if translations made by the dogmatic church authorities were deliberately weighed in support of the hypostatic union doctrine. Most notably the King James Version uses italicized words in order to impose a pro-chalcedonian rendering upon the text. Note how Hebrews 2:16 adds 4 words in a row in order to support a "taking on of a nature": "For verily he took not on *him the nature of* angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham." - note also that these words are not marked or italicized in the online bible on biblegateway.com, a clear misleading of the reader towards an interpretation, similarly as that of the adding of vowel points to the Hebrew text by the masorettes, blurring messianic prophecies.

The true bible student has no need of changing the Word of God to support and uphold a dogma. It is always an indicator of satanic forces at work when this happens. Compare this to the New King James Version: "For indeed He does not give aid to angels, but He does give aid to the seed of Abraham. In deed, the Greek language clearly defines this taking on as an act of help, not as a "taking on of a new nature". The reader will himself find the tools necessary to show this to be true. One other example shall be shown. Romans 1:3 was translated in strong favor of a marian flesh dogma in the King James Bible: " Concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, **which was made of the seed of David** according to the flesh." - compared to the New King James Version: "Concerning His Son Jesus Christ our Lord, **who was born of the seed of David** according to the flesh." The true sense of the verse though, by the expression of "ginomai ek" is not a transitioning as it is when 2 nouns are connected without prepositions, but rather an emerging out of a thing. Compare this to Luke 3:22, where a voice "ginomai ek" heaven, it came out of heaven, it emerged out of heaven. The voice was not physically made up of the substance "Heaven", but rather appeared out of this source, as God resides in heaven. In the same fashion now, a true and meaningful explanation of Romans 1:3 would be that Jesus "came out of the seed of David", meaning he came out of this very lineage. The promise was fulfilled because Jesus was born into Joseph's line and Joseph legally counted as his father, thus passing on the promise given to Abraham through David and Salomon to Jesus Christ. It is far fetched to assume that these texts can be used to prove a marian flesh wrapping of a mere spiritual God essence that never truly incarnated in the most literal sense. Here are more examples of verses that can easily be harmonized with the erroneously termed "celestial flesh" doctrine. The clear scriptures that teach a flesh-becoming of the Word cannot be harmonized with a marian flesh dogma, this being the very reason it being labeled a mystery and further observation not encouraged in churches, debates or general discussion. The term "celestial flesh" in reality is a misleading stigmatization of a wonderful truth. Jesus did not bring flesh from heaven, but he was conceived as a unique man "in the likeness of sinful flesh" into the womb of Mary, out of the depth of the Holy Spirit, as the Spirit always carries the Word of God, God's self-reflection and inner contemplation, which as the deep things of God sought out by that self-same Spirit is not wisdom itself, but rather its source as the old and new testament mention in several instances. Equating Logos with Wisdom is misleading, paving the path to the Gnostic preincarnate female aeon Sophia that fell in a kenotic sense and was the source for the spiritual world to be entrapped in the material world. This is the source of the harsh distinction of spiritual and material world: Gnosticism. God can in no sense become flesh in Gnosticism. And as such, the Word of God that proceeds from God's heart through his mouth can neither. We shall prove that it in deed did in the most literal sense: The Word BECAME flesh ! As Jesus did not bring the wine from anywhere that became from the water, the flesh was not brought from heaven or out of Mary. The flesh was neither created, nor merely seemingly flesh, but it was real flesh filled with real blood, "the likeness of sinful flesh", but not of the flesh of Adam's flesh that was subject to death. The second Adam was **not earthly, created from dust** (1 Corinthians 15:47) and the **Son of Man did not come from earth, but from heaven.** (John 3:13)

Following are the verses subject to scrutiny, that marian flesh advocates and deniers of the true flesh-becoming of our great God and Word of God Jesus Christ misapply. Analyze the wording clearly and see where else the wording is used, also in adopted family members according to the levitical law or elsewhere. You will see that they do not convey the meaning of "flesh-inheriting", but rather of association by birth or adoption to a certain tribe, a "genos", a kind. Notice also that Jesus is referred to as the "branch", the actual branch that came out of the **root** of Jesse and was born into the davidic lineage. Jesus Christ branched forth from "on high" (Luke 1:78, compare to the Septuagint "branch" in Zechariah 3:8 and 6:12). The birth from the virgin into the line of Joseph was the actual necessity for Jesus to fulfill the promises. Otherwise he could have merely appeared anywhere as a fully grown man. However, Jesus was subject to growth in wisdom and also to temptation, which is why he became likened to us. (Hebrews 2:17) Likened to us ! So that he could be a merciful high priest and understand when we are tempted. Jesus Christ did not have 2 minds or 2 natures, but he is the Son of God, who was indwelt by the source of himself: the Father, that did the works and gave the words, see John 14:10. Seeing Jesus was seeing the Father's heart unwrapped and manifest as real genuine flesh.

[The Israelites]...of whom are the fathers and from whom, according to the flesh, Christ came, who is over all, the eternally blessed God. Amen. (Romans 9:5)

Now to Abraham and his Seed were the promises made. He does not say, "And to seeds," as of many, but as of one, "And to your Seed," (sperma) who is Christ. (Galatians 3:16)

For it is evident that our Lord arose from Judah, of which tribe Moses spoke nothing concerning priesthood. (Hebrews 7:14)

But when the fullness of the time had come, God sent forth His Son, born of a woman, born under the law. (Galatians 4:4)

"Remember that Jesus Christ, of the seed (sperma) of David, was raised from the dead according to my gospel." (2 Timothy 2:8)

From (Apo) this man's seed (spermatos), according to the promise, God raised up for Israel a Savior—Jesus. (Acts 13:23)

Has not the Scripture said that the Christ comes from the seed (sperma) of David and from the town of Bethlehem, where David was?"
(John 7:42) (**note: was Jesus' body comprised of material of the town of Bethlehem, or did he merely come forth from Bethlehem? If the latter, why does he need marian flesh to come forth from the Davidic lineage, rather than merely be born into it? - see further below comments regarding the "sperma", the seed*)

But one of the elders said to me, "Do not weep. Behold, the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David, has prevailed to open the scroll and to loose its seven seals."
(Revelation 5:5)

I, Jesus, have sent My angel to testify to you these things in the churches. I am the Root and the Offspring of David, the Bright and Morning Star."
(Revelation 22:16)

The Lord has sworn in truth to David; He will not turn from it: "I will set upon your throne the fruit of your body."
(Psalms 132:11)

Therefore, being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him that of the fruit of his body, according to the flesh, He would raise up the Christ to sit on his throne.
(Acts 2:30)

The mentioned "genos" of David in Revelation 22:16, can be compared to people who were "genos" of cities, denoting their point of emerging, according to the flesh, meaning their forth-coming. Jesus came forth from the tribe of Judah and the house of David.

And he found a certain Jew named Aquila, **born in Pontus**. (genos)
(Acts 18:2)

Now a certain Jew named Apollos, **born at Alexandria**.
(Acts 18:24)

The argument based on the mentioning of the "seed" of David/Abraham/woman, which in Greek is "sperma" (as above in 2. Timothy 2:8, Galatians 3:16, Romans 1:3 and John 7:42), as providing a need for Mary and thus Jesus to be "made up of davidic flesh" falls short since we can learn from the Septuagint that the "sperma" of a childless passed away husband can be raised up after him by his brother. This "levirate marriage" also is the reason for the 2 different genealogies from Joseph in Matthew and Luke. Consider these scriptures:

If brethren dwell together, and one of them die, and have no child, the wife of the dead shall not marry without unto a stranger: her husband's brother shall go in unto her, and take her to him to wife, and perform the duty of an husband's brother unto her.
(Deuteronomy 25:5)

And Judah said unto Onan, Go in unto thy brother's wife, and marry her, and raise up seed to thy brother. **And Onan knew that the seed (sperma) should not be his;** and it came to pass, when he went in unto his brother's wife, that he spilled it on the ground, lest that he should give seed to his brother.
(Genesis 38:8-9)

The reader ought to know, that the doctrine of immediate literal flesh-becoming in a transitioning from condition to condition was not represented in debates leading up to the council of Chalcedon. Many concepts were battling, failing to mention the biblical doctrine. As additional information, next to the self analysis of the genealogy texts, consider these scriptures:

And again, Isaiah says: "There shall be a **root of Jesse**; And He who shall rise to reign over the Gentiles, In Him the Gentiles shall hope."
(Romans 15:12)

MENTION DANIEL 11:7a LXX here !!!

There shall come forth a **Rod from the stem of Jesse**, And a **Branch shall grow out of his roots**.
(Isaiah 11:1)

Is the branch not of the root? The rod not from the stem?

'Hear, O Joshua, the high priest, You and your companions who sit before you, For they are a wondrous sign; For behold, **I am bringing forth** My Servant the BRANCH.

(Zechariah 3:8)

Then speak to him, saying, 'Thus says the Lord of hosts, saying: "Behold, the Man whose name is the BRANCH! **From His place He shall branch out,** And He shall build the temple of the Lord.

(Zechariah 6:12)

Through the tender mercy of our God, With which the Rising (**same word as used in the Septuagint for branch*) from on high has visited us.

(Luke 1:78)

And has raised up a horn of salvation for us **in the house of His servant David.**

(Luke 1:69)

Now indeed, **Elizabeth your relative** has also conceived a son in her old age; and this is now the sixth month for her who was called barren.

(Luke 1:36)

There was in the days of Herod, the king of Judea, a certain priest named Zacharias, of the division of Abijah. **His wife was of the daughters of Aaron, and her name was Elizabeth.**

(Luke 1:5)

Did the promise to Abraham and David continue through Salomo?

Behold, a son shall be born to you, who shall be a man of rest; and I will give him rest from all his enemies all around. His name shall be Solomon, for I will give peace and quietness to Israel in his days. **He shall build a house for My name, and he shall be My son,** and I will be his Father; and **I will establish the throne of his kingdom over Israel forever.**

(1 Chronicles 22:9-10)

"When your days are fulfilled and you rest with your fathers, **I will set up your seed after you, who will come from your body,** and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build a house for My name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever. I will be his Father, and he shall be My son. If he commits iniquity, **I will chasten him with the rod of men** and with the blows of the sons of men. But My mercy shall not depart from him, as I took it from Saul, whom I removed from before you.

(2 Samuel 7:12-15)

For to which of the angels did He ever say: "You are My Son, Today I have begotten You"? And again: "I will be to Him a Father, And He shall be to Me a Son"?

(Hebrews 1:5)

For Salomo... They shall fear You as long as the sun and moon endure, throughout all generations. He shall come down like rain upon the grass before mowing, like showers that water the earth. In His days the righteous shall flourish, and **abundance of peace, until the moon is no more.** He shall have **dominion also from sea to sea, and from the River to the ends of the earth.**

(Psalms 72:0.5-7)

The genealogy of Luke 3 is not that of Mary, but clearly of Joseph. In case the reader does not believe this, let him note also the fact that this line goes through Nathan, not Salomo, and terminates with God, thus not being a flesh and blood decadency, but rather one of generational inheritance and lacking Salomo.

Now Jesus Himself began His ministry at about thirty years of age, being as was supposed **the son of Joseph, the son of Heli,** the son of Matthat... the son of Seth, **the son of Adam, the son of God.**

(Luke 3:23.24a.28b)

Jesus Christ in fact was the engraving of the **one hypostasis** of God, not a union of 2 hypostases as the dogma says, hypostatic union.

...who being the brightness of His glory and the engraving of His hypostasis.

(Hebrews 1:3)

The body of Jesus Christ is the factual engraving of God's hypostasis. Not any part of his body came from Mary.

Now I want to compile a list of scriptures that the reader should analyze for wording in Greek original texts and mark out differences, find other verses with the same word sequences and come up with a conclusion. The Greek Septuagint on blueletterbible.com is very helpful for this and is the translation named LXX.

Now the birth of Jesus Christ was as follows: After His mother Mary was betrothed to Joseph, before they came together, **she was found with child of the Holy Spirit**. Then Joseph her husband, being a just man, and not wanting to make her a public example, was minded to put her away secretly. But while he thought about these things, behold, an angel of the Lord appeared to him in a dream, saying, "Joseph, son of David, do not be afraid to take to you Mary your wife, for that which is **conceived** in her is of the Holy Spirit."
(Matthew 1:18-20)

compare to

And behold, you will **conceive** in your womb and bring forth a Son, and shall call His name Jesus.
(Luke 1:31)

Are both words translated conception the same? What could be the difference (use bible tools such as Strong's concordance.)

Why was Jesus called "Son of God" ? Where did the Son of God come from, where did the Son of Man come from?

And the angel answered and said to her, "The Holy Spirit will come upon you, and the power of the Highest will overshadow you; **therefore, also, that Holy One who is to be born will be called the Son of God**."
(Luke 1:35)

No one has ascended to heaven but He **who came down from heaven, that is, the Son of Man** who is in heaven.
(John 3:13)

How can we literally eat the flesh of the Son of God and drink his blood, other than the bread of heaven having transitioned into flesh upon conception? Following back the transition from flesh to Word tells us that the consumption of the bible and extracting the words of eternal life is literally "eating his flesh and drinking his blood".

I am the living bread which came down from heaven. If anyone eats of this bread, he will live forever; and the bread that I shall give is My flesh, which I shall give for the life of the world."
(John 6:51)

The Jews therefore quarreled among themselves, saying, "How can this Man give us His flesh to eat?"

Then Jesus said to them, "Most assuredly, I say to you, unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood, you have no life in you. Whoever eats My flesh and drinks My blood has eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day. For My flesh is food indeed, and My blood is drink indeed. He who eats My flesh and drinks My blood abides in Me, and I in him. As the living Father sent Me, and I live because of the Father, so he who feeds on Me will live because of Me. This is the bread which came down from heaven—not as your fathers ate the manna, and are dead. He who eats this bread will live forever."
(John 6:53-58)

But He answered and said, "It is written, 'Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceeds from the mouth of God.'"
(Matthew 4:4)

Now I want to focus on John 1:14 and the exact wording. Use a Strong's concordance to find the word G1096 ginomai and analyze carefully every use of the word (start with the new testament) and find all instances where it directly connects 2 nouns or a noun and an adjective, meaning a condition or state. Make sure there is no additional preposition such as ek used in the noun connection. As you will find, it exclusively means "becoming" as a transition from condition to condition. This proves that the body of Jesus Christ preexisted in a different condition and also that this self-same Word of God became that very flesh and blood of Jesus Christ. The Word became flesh !

And the Word became flesh and dwelt among us, and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth.
(John 1:14)

Some examples are: stones becoming bread, water becoming wine, a seed becoming a tree, the sea becoming blood. You will find more, also Jesus having become dead or his garments having become white.

Analyze next 2 passages in the new testament and ask yourself how they were fulfilled literally, if not the Word of God himself became flesh. Ask yourself what spiritual significance this has in regards to salvation, atonement and reconciliation. Analyze what the enmity was and how it was abolished. Analyze the words "slain", "abolished" and also "nailed". How did God triumph over principalities and powers? What did the Father nail to the cross?

Therefore remember that you, once Gentiles in the flesh—who are called Uncircumcision by what is called the Circumcision made in the flesh by hands—that at that time you were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope and without God in the world. But now in Christ Jesus you who once were far off have been brought near by the blood of Christ. For He Himself is our peace, who has made both one, and has broken down the middle wall of separation, having **abolished in His flesh the enmity, that is, the law of commandments contained in ordinances**, so as to create in Himself one new man from the two, thus making peace, and that He might reconcile them both to God in one body through the cross, thereby **putting to death the enmity**. (Ephesians 2:11-16)

And you, being dead in your trespasses and the uncircumcision of your flesh, He has made alive together with Him, having forgiven you all trespasses, having wiped **out the handwriting of requirements that was against us, which was contrary to us**. And He has taken it out of the way, having **nailed it to the cross**. Having disarmed principalities and powers, He made a public spectacle of them, triumphing over them in it. (Colossians 2:13-15)

Where was sin? What was death's sting? What does this mean as a requirement for the body of Jesus Christ?

Therefore, just as through one man sin entered the world, and death through sin, and thus death spread to all men, because all sinned— For until the law sin was in the world, but sin is not imputed when there is no law. Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over those who had not sinned according to the likeness of the transgression of Adam, who is a type of Him who was to come. (Romans 5:12-14)

Consider these scriptures out of the book of Job:

"Man who is born of woman is of few days and full of trouble. He comes forth like a flower and fades away; He flees like a shadow and does not continue. And do You open Your eyes on such a one, and bring me to judgment with Yourself? **Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? No one!** Since his days are determined, the number of his months is with You." (Job 14:1-5)

Behold, I was brought forth in iniquity, and in **sin my mother conceived me**. (Psalms 51:5)

Now I say this, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; nor does the perishable inherit the imperishable. Behold, I tell you a mystery; we will not all sleep, but we will all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trumpet; for the trumpet will sound, and the dead will be raised imperishable, and we will be changed. For **this perishable** must put on the imperishable, and this **mortal** must put on immortality. But when this perishable will have put on the imperishable, and this mortal will have put on immortality, then will come about the saying that is written, "**Death is swallowed up in victory**. O death, where is your victory? O death, where is your sting?" The **sting of death is sin, and the power of sin is the law**; but thanks be to God, who gives us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ. (1 Corinthians 15:50-57)

All flesh is not the same flesh, but there is one kind of flesh of men, another flesh of animals, another of fish, and another of birds.

There are also celestial bodies and terrestrial bodies; but the glory of the celestial is one, and the glory of the terrestrial is another. There is one glory of the sun, another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars; for one star differs from another star in glory. So also is the resurrection of the dead. **The body is sown in corruption**, it is raised in incorruption. It is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory. It is sown in weakness, it is raised in power. It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body. And so it is written, "The first man Adam became a living being." The last Adam **became a life-giving spirit**. However, the spiritual is not first, but the natural, and afterward the spiritual. The first man was of the earth, made of dust; the second Man is the Lord from heaven. As was the man of dust, so also are those who are made of dust; and as is the heavenly Man, so also are those who are heavenly. And as we have borne the image of the man of dust, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly Man. (1 Corinthians 15:39-49)

And you know that He was manifested to take away our sins, **and in Him there is no sin.**
(1 John 3:5)

From the above scriptures, we learn that the mortal and thus corruptible flesh was passed down from Adam through the generations. King David acknowledges the fact that his mother held him in her womb in sin. This is the factual reason why the roman catholic church came up with the dogma of the immaculate conception. They saw the problem that "marian flesh" posed, and simply made up a fictitious claim that Mary was somehow cleansed at her own conception in "Anna", a name they give to Mary's mother. Luther on the other hand also believed in the hypostatic union, but was not willing to cleave on to the immaculate conception dogma, though it had only been formulated in the 1800s, the belief was thoroughly held since late antiquity. So Luther had Mary's cleansing postponed, to just prior to Jesus being conceived in the womb.

In the end, all this just seeks to divert from the real factual problem: the incarnation did not really happen in the hypostatic union dogma because the Word did not become flesh in a literal sense, thus it was not the Word of God that became man, but it was a created fleshly shell out of Mary's womb that got filled and somewhat united (not mixed, not converted, but subsisting they argue !) with a "God the Son" essence. And that not until "Christmas eve". This would be Gnosticism in its purest form. We learn from 1 John 4:2-3

By this you know the Spirit of God: Every spirit that confesses that **Jesus Christ has come in flesh** is of God, and every spirit that does not confess that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh is not of God. And this is the spirit of the Antichrist, which you have heard was coming, and is now already in the world.

Notice how the article "the" was added to the verse. Literally it reads "has come in flesh". Something similar is going on in 1. Timothy 3:16, where bibles translate "God was manifest in the flesh", whereas a much clearer reading is: "God appeared/became visible in flesh." Analyze it !

If Jesus Christ came in flesh, then he came so upon the very moment he came, which is the conception. As the Word is born out of the depth of the Spirit, and as we learn this to be the case at the conception of Jesus Christ in the womb (conceived out of the Holy Ghost), we can conclude that the coming of Jesus Christ was an imminent proceeding forth as a transitioning into flesh upon the conception. There was no precreation of flesh, neither was there a "pulling of the flesh" out of Mary's womb as Tertullian wants to make us believe. Rather, God imminently "appeared in flesh" and "came in flesh". The "hypostatic union Jesus" came in Spirit and adopted/took on flesh. That is of an antichrist spirit and it is the very pillar of the antichrist church system. God has left us these scriptures so that we can see that the antichrist will deny Jesus to be the messiah (Judaism) and also him to have come in flesh (church system). We see how both join and fuse in our last days. Peter warned of damnable heresies that would be brought in "secretly". That is it !

We also know that the flesh of Jesus Christ saw no decay (Acts 2:31), but that the flesh we have is of corruptible nature, **Jesus Christ did come in real flesh and blood, but it came from becoming, not from adopting.** It was his, not a strangers' flesh. He was the Son of God, and as the Son of Man, he was from heaven.

For what the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh, God did by sending His own Son **in the likeness of sinful flesh,** on account of sin: He condemned sin in the flesh.
(Romans 8:3)

But emptied Himself, the form of a servant having taken, **in the likeness of men having become.**
(Philippians 2:7)

Since life is in the blood and the life was manifest (1 John 1:1.2), it needs to be concluded that the life itself became that flesh and blood. That Word of Life was seen and handled. It was a tabernacle made without hands, not of this creation.

That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our **hands have handled, concerning the Word of life.**
(1 John 1:1)

For the **life of the flesh is in the blood,** and I have given it to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls; for it is the blood that makes atonement for the soul.'
(Leviticus 17:11)

But Christ came as High Priest of the good things to come, with the **greater and more perfect tabernacle not made with hands, that is, not of this creation. Not with the blood of goats and calves, but with His own blood He entered the Most Holy Place once for all,** having obtained eternal redemption. For if the blood of bulls and goats and the ashes of a heifer, sprinkling the unclean, sanctifies for the purifying of the flesh,

how much more shall **the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered Himself without spot to God**, cleanse your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?
(Hebrews 9:11-14)

Therefore take heed to yourselves and to all the flock, among which the Holy Spirit has made you overseers, to shepherd the church of **God which He purchased with His own blood.**
(Acts 20:28)

Let us turn our attention back to the book of Hebrews, chapter 2, a text commonly taken in order to justify a "marian flesh" theology:

Inasmuch then as the children have partaken of flesh and blood, He Himself likewise shared in the same, that through death He might destroy him who had the power of death, that is, the devil, and release those who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage. For indeed He does not give aid to angels, but He does give aid to the seed of Abraham. Therefore, in all things He had to be made like His brethren, that He might be a merciful and faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God, to make propitiation for the sins of the people. For in that He Himself has suffered, being tempted, He is able to aid those who are tempted.
(Hebrews 2:14-18)

As mentioned prior, the King James Bible saw the necessity to add 4 words into verse 16 "him the nature of", in order to provide proof for a "taking on" of a nature by Jesus, when in fact the verse clearly explains for whose help Jesus came. The "had to be made like" is a similarly misleading translation, since the "likening" does not bear the idea of "making like" in a sense of an act of creation. The body of Jesus was not created by anyone, it became, as is also evident from John 1:3 "without him, nothing was made that was made", showing that if the body of Jesus had been pre-created, it had to have been pre-created by himself. A very obvious contradiction in the thought patterns of hypostatic unionists such as James White, John MacArthur or Charles Spurgeon.

We already learned from Philippians 2:7 and Romans 8:3 that Jesus came "in the likeness of sinful flesh" and the reason for this is explained in Hebrews 2:18. He had to be likened to us in every way so that he could experience temptation. Irenaeus gets off track and claims that this means Jesus had to become a zygote like us, an embryo like us and so forth. While I do not argue that Jesus did not become an embryo, I want to make very clear that this is not the meaning behind verse 17. Rather, the likening took place in the temptations, in order to become a merciful high priest. This also refutes the manichaeian idea that Jesus Christ's flesh was mere "spiritual flesh" or the slanderous terminology that it was some "celestial flesh". It was real flesh and blood, and this flesh and blood did not derive from any other source than from the Word of God itself, by becoming, not by taking or creating.

An interesting research can be made into the valentinian Gnostic sect of the eastern school, namely Theodotus and his associates. Hippolyt and Clement wrote about him and his eastern valentinian school. It becomes evident, that the eastern valentinians had a very similar idea of the nature of Jesus as the proponents of the hypostatic union. They believed that Jesus had 2 bodies, one spiritual which he brought from heaven (one essence) and one material body that the demiurge (the craftsman) prepared, which was actual real material. While Ptolemy of the western school says that both essences went through Mary like through a tube, the eastern school poses a different thought. Since the valentinian Gnostics were the most important Gnostic sect, they outweigh by far the Manichaeian association with Gnosticism as our first point of comparison with church dogmas. We find striking similarities between Valentinians and hypostatic Unionists, as well as Trinitarians in general (Marcus of Ancreya in his defense claimed that it was Valentinus who first came up with the idea of 3 hypostases). Valentinus almost became pope and the question needs to be asked, how much subtle influence the Valentinians had in further proceedings and the establishment of dogmas.

I want to again motivate the reader to research the word "ginomai" to see that the plain teaching of the bible is that the Word of God literally transitioned from Spiritual to Flesh and Blood and Soul condition. Bearing this in mind, let us look at John 6 again:

For the **bread of God is He who comes down from heaven** and gives life to the world.
(John 6:33)

The bread of God in its entirety came down from heaven. It did not have 2 points of origin.

And they said, "Is not this Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? How is it then that He says, 'I have come down from heaven?'"
(John 6:42)

I am the bread of life. Your fathers ate the manna in the wilderness, and are dead. **This is the bread which comes down from heaven, that one may eat of it and not die. I am the living bread which came down from heaven. If anyone eats of this bread, he will live forever; and the bread that I shall give is My flesh, which I shall give for the life of the world.**" The Jews therefore quarreled among themselves, saying, "How can this Man give us His flesh to eat?" Then Jesus said to them, "Most assuredly, I say to you, **unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood, you have no life in you. Whoever eats My flesh and drinks My blood has eternal life,** and I will raise him up at the last day. For My flesh is food indeed, and My blood is drink indeed. He who eats My flesh and drinks My blood abides in Me, and I in him. As the living Father sent Me, and **I live because of the Father, so he who feeds on Me will live because of Me.**" (John 6:48-57)

The Word of God is our daily bread. If we eat thereof and drink its blood, we have eternal life. The Jews and many others might merely eat thereof, but they fail to drink its blood, not believing the promises of eternal life by faith contained in it. This meaning of John 6 is completely lost in the marian flesh theology and is a main proof against it.

Many have attempted to throw this truth into a "heresy bucket" such as Eutychianism, Apollinarianism, Nestorianism, Monophysitism or other teachings that the opponents held that Irenaeus, Clement and others debated. None of these buckets fit though, since the question is not how "2 essences" fused or were united or coexisted, the question at hand is if the Word of God ever became a man or not. And this question is clearly blurred. Having this divide and conquer battle leading up to Chalcedon allowed the obviously Gnostic hypostatic union to be fastened as the pillar of all the western churches. The Alexandrian and other eastern churches never adopted the "flesh-becoming" truth of the bible either. It remained veiled and merely popped up in the early reformation by people like Menno Simons.

The bible states in Revelation 21:22 that the new Jerusalem will not have any temple in it, but that "God and the Lamb" ARE the temple. Jesus mentioned the temple in association with his body in John 2:19-21, that he would rebuild after 3 days. This is further proof that the temple, thus the body of Jesus actually IS God himself. It is God's flesh and it is God's blood and as such is worshipped. God IS the Lamb ! Edward Dalcour in his speech at Knox Presbyterian Church in march 2019 makes a remarkable statement: "He is the God-Christ, this is how he could be all over the place. We do not worship the flesh." Dalcour, a foremost trinitarian apologist shows his gnostic convictions in a very obvious way. He speaks of a divided "God-Christ" where he merely worships the spiritual essence out of God.

The bible does not know this kind of division in Jesus Christ. It is one Jesus Christ, one Lamb, which is the Word that became flesh and is worshipped in deed. That Jesus is indwelled by the invisible Father.

Now when He had taken the scroll, the four living creatures and the twenty-four elders **fell down before the Lamb**, each having a harp, and golden bowls full of incense, which are the prayers of the saints. And they sang a new song, saying:

"You are worthy to take the scroll,
And to open its seals;
**For You were slain,
And have redeemed us to God by Your blood**
Out of every tribe and tongue and people and nation,
And have made us kings and priests to our God;
And we shall reign on the earth."
(Revelation 5:8-10)

Jesus Christ continually refused any association with Mary. At his first miracle, he says to her: "What to me and to you, woman?", which is a literal translation from "Woman, what do I have to do with you?". (John 2:5). Similarly, a woman out of the crowd sought to make a statement "Blessed is the body that carried you." (Luke 11:27) Jesus however counters the statement and tells us that "blessed is much more he who hears God's word and does it". Jesus never confirmed such statements, which is remarkable. Also his denial to be the Son of David in a literal sense in more than a side note. If there be anything outside the statements about the incarnation from others, then they are clearly diverting from a marian flesh idea. A point that no one can honestly deny or debate. Jesus Christ outright refused any connection with Mary. The bible makes remarkably clear statements such as:

[Melchizedek, who is...] without father, without mother, without genealogy, having neither beginning of days nor end of life, but likened to the Son of God, remains a priest continually.
(Hebrews 7:3)

Jesus Christ is the Son of God, conceived out of the depth of the Holy Spirit, the Logos that the Holy Ghost carried, becoming flesh, being indwelled by the Father that brought him forth, preexisting as God's self-contemplation "towards God" (John 1:1), sought out as the depth of

God by his Holy Spirit (1 Corinthians 2:10), glorified as an all-filling, life-giving Spirit (Ephesians 4:10, 1 Corinthians 15:45), eternally and ever present with us as the One and Only manifestation of our Heavenly Father that will remain with us eternally.

"I came out of the Father." (John 16:28)

"And the Word became flesh and tabernacled in us." (John 1:14)

"For unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulder. And they call his name Wonderful, Counselor, The Mighty God, The Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace."
(Isaiah 9:6)

"He who has seen me has seen the Father." (John 14:9)

"What do I have to do with you, woman?"
(John 2:5)