

# THE ESSENTIAL QUALITIES OF THE INCARNATION

*A Progressive Scriptural and Metaphysical Architecture of the Redeeming Man*

**The paper argues that redemption requires a real human someone: a man who knows, trusts, obeys, suffers, and offers himself to God. This personhood does not require independence from God. The Son receives his existence, mission, authority, and power from God, yet he remains the human owner of the faith, obedience, suffering, and self-offering by which redemption is accomplished. Classical dyothelitism affirms the qualities that lead to this conclusion but refuses the conclusion itself. The issue is consistency.**

**By Chris Scalf | Counterpoint Apologetics**

SCRIPTURE QUOTATIONS ARE FROM THE KING JAMES VERSION UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED.

## Abstract

This study asks a question that is often skipped in Christological debate: What had to be true of Jesus for the saving work described in Scripture to be real? The paper starts with the saving event—bloodshed, death, reconciliation, and victory over death—and works backward. A redeeming death must be the death of a true representative man. That man must be holy and must live a positively righteous life. Such righteousness must be enacted in obedience. Real human obedience requires human knowledge, will, trust, submission, suffering, and personal ownership of the act.

The argument therefore does not stop with a human body, mind, and will. It asks who actually lives through them. Faith and obedience do not occur in an abstract nature; someone believes and obeys. Under human conditions, Jesus must receive God's word, judge God faithful, trust him, and submit. Without that human response, flesh, blood, hunger, exhaustion, pain, temptation, and death remain physically real, but they do not yet form a saving human life. The required qualities therefore culminate in a real human person—not someone independent from God, but a human someone whose life comes

from God and expresses God in flesh. God may will and sustain that life without doing the man's thinking, trusting, or choosing for him.

Only after establishing this positive case does the paper examine standard dyothelite Christology—the view that Christ has both a divine will and a human will. The test is internal. The question is whether the system follows its own stated commitments.

The councils already grant the needed human elements. Chalcedon affirms complete humanity like ours. The rejection of Apollinarius protects a rational human soul. Constantinople III affirms a natural human will and human operation. The tradition also affirms real temptation and positive obedience. The paper asks one question: If these concessions together describe a concrete human someone, which concession must be withdrawn to deny that someone?

Part IV examines the usual answers and the tradition's treatment of Christ's faith, knowledge, and human "I." The historical claims are stated carefully. Aquinas denies the theological virtue of faith and the corresponding hope of beatitude because Christ's soul possessed the vision of God, yet he also affirms acquired human knowledge that genuinely increases. The issue is not whether every human operation was erased. The issue is whether those operations belong to a bounded human first-person life or remain secondary functions inside a subject whose decisive knowledge is already complete.

## **Contents**

### **Part I — Method: From the Saving End Back to the Incarnation**

1. The Governing Question
2. Grades of Necessity
3. Properties, Capacities, Relations, and Acts

### **Part II — The Objective Requirements of Redemption**

4. Blood, Death, and Remission
5. Representative Human Kinship
6. The Qualified Man: Holiness and Positive Righteousness
7. The Divine Provision of the Redeemer: Why the Qualified Man Must Be God's Own Self-Expression
8. Origin Conditions and Enactment Conditions

### **Part III — The Interior Requirements of the Redeeming Life**

- 8A. The Governing Redemptive Quality: Human Faith Under Human Conditions
9. Obedience Is a Personal Act
10. Faith, Trust, and Dependence
11. Human Knowledge, Growth, and Revelation
12. Temptation, Suffering, and Tested Fidelity
13. Psychological Identity Is an Essential Human Quality

14. True Personhood Without Independence of Source or Intent

15. The First-Person Test: Who Does “I” Refer To?

16. The Concession Ledger and the Retraction Question

#### **Part IV — Why Dyothelite Christology Commonly Hand-Waves the Humanity**

17. What Dyothelitism Officially Affirms

18. Why Human Faculties Are Not Yet a Human Someone

19. Why the System Cannot Allow a Human Person: Two Subjects in Christ and a Fourth Personal Subject

20. Why “According to the Humanity” Does Not Solve the Psychological Problem (Reduplication)

21. Common Dyothelite Escape Formulas

22. Hostile Witnesses: The Human “I” and Epistemic Saturation

#### **Part V — The Oneness Incarnational Architecture**

23. God’s Self-Expression Realized as the Human Son

24. Divine Grounding Without Psychological Override

25. Derived Intent and Genuine Human Ownership

#### **Part VI — The Completed Saving Act**

26. The Sacrifice Must Be Personally Offered

27. Resurrection and Divine Vindication

28. Comparative Explanatory Tests

29. Final Synthesis

#### **Appendix A — Scripture Matrix**

#### **Appendix B — Questions a Dyothelite Account Must Answer**

#### **Appendix C — The Retraction Menu**

## **PART I — METHOD**

*From the saving end backward into the qualities of the Incarnation*

### **1. The Governing Question**

Christological discussions often begin with inherited formulas: one person, two natures, two wills, or a divine person assuming a human nature. Those formulas matter, but they begin too late for this study. We must first ask what the Incarnation had to accomplish. The saving goal tells us what act was needed. That act tells us what kind of redeemer was needed. Those requirements then tell us what had to be true of the incarnate life.

The method is therefore progressive and backward-looking. It begins with the effect Scripture says God intended—remission of sins, reconciliation, liberation from death,

covenant restoration, and a new representative humanity. It then asks, step by step, what conditions must be satisfied for those effects to be achieved. The inquiry does not treat the humanity of Christ as an ornamental attachment to a divine person. It asks what the humanity must actually contribute to the saving act.

**Governing principle: Start with the saving goal. That goal tells us what saving act was required. The act tells us what kind of redeemer was required. Those requirements tell us what the incarnate man had to be, possess, and personally do.**

The method also has an internal consistency test. At each stage the paper records two things: what Scripture requires and what classical dyothelite theology already affirms. The final charge is not that dyothelitism simply denies Christ's humanity. It is that the system affirms every quality redemption requires and then refuses the human conclusion those qualities produce. The reader should therefore watch two columns at once: the scriptural requirement and the classical concession.

The form of the argument is cumulative: You affirm A through F. A through F jointly require a concrete human someone who knows, wills, trusts, obeys, suffers, and offers himself. You nevertheless deny a human personal subject because the eternal Son is already the sole who. Which affirmation do you retract? An escape formula succeeds only if it preserves every conceded quality. If it saves the person-count by making one of the human qualities impersonal, figurative, merely instrumental, or only verbally human, it has paid for consistency by withdrawing its own concession.

**Internal burden rule: The paper does not need to disprove every dyothelite model from the outside. It must show that the qualities dyothelites already affirm lead to the human someone they refuse to name. The key question is not, "Can the formula be repeated?" It is, "Which human quality does the formula truly preserve, and which does it weaken?"**

This method blocks a familiar shortcut. It is not enough to say that Jesus' death has infinite value because its subject is divine. Scripture presents more than a divine subject who happens to possess flesh. It presents the obedient self-offering of the man Christ Jesus: born of a woman, placed under the law, made like his brothers, tested, heard in prayer, made obedient through suffering, and offered to God. Who the redeemer is matters. But his identity cannot replace the human life through which Scripture says redemption was accomplished.

**The first question is not merely, "Who is Jesus?" It is: "What had to be true of Jesus for his saving work to be real?"**

## 2. Grades of Necessity

The word necessary is easily abused. A claim may be necessary in one sense and not in another. To avoid equivocation, every major conclusion in this study is assigned a grade. This is not decorative terminology. It prevents the argument from sliding between what God could not possibly do, what God freely established within a covenant, what Scripture reveals that God chose and required, and what is merely fitting.

| Grade                            | Meaning                                                                                                                                                                                     |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| [AN] Absolute necessity          | A condition whose denial would be logically or metaphysically incoherent. Example: a real human act cannot occur without some subject of that act.                                          |
| [CN] Covenantal necessity        | A condition made necessary by the moral, legal, sacrificial, or representative order God established. Example: under the revealed covenantal order, remission is tied to sacrificial blood. |
| [RN] Revealed-economic necessity | A condition Scripture declares necessary in the economy God actually enacted, even when we cannot prove that no other conceivable economy was available to God.                             |
| [FN] Fittingness                 | A feature that is appropriate, illuminating, or harmonious with the saving purpose, but not demonstrated as strictly necessary.                                                             |

Most claims in this paper are covenantal and revealed-economic rather than claims about what an omnipotent God could never have done under any possible order. This makes the argument stronger, not weaker. The question is not whether human imagination can invent a different world. The question is what Scripture says was required within the world and covenant God actually established.

|      |                                                                                                                                                                |
|------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| [RN] | <b>The Incarnation must be evaluated according to the saving economy Scripture actually reveals, not according to unconstrained hypothetical alternatives.</b> |
|------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

## 3. Properties, Capacities, Relations, and Acts

The required qualities are not all the same kind. Some describe what the redeemer must be. Some describe what he must be able to do. Some describe the relations in which he must stand. Others are acts he must actually perform. Keeping these categories separate prevents the argument from treating the whole Incarnation as a list of static attributes.

| Category             | Examples                                                    |
|----------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|
| Necessary properties | Truly human, mortal, holy, righteous, undefiled, related to |

|                      |                                                                                                                     |
|----------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                      | those redeemed.                                                                                                     |
| Necessary capacities | Able to suffer, die, learn, deliberate, trust, obey, pray, and offer himself.                                       |
| Necessary relations  | Kinsman, representative, mediator, servant, priest, Son, image, and sent one.                                       |
| Necessary acts       | Living faithfully, resisting temptation, obeying, submitting, suffering, offering himself, dying, and being raised. |

This distinction matters because possessing a capacity is not the same as personally exercising it. A human will may exist as a faculty without yet explaining a human act of obedience. A human mind may exist as a power without yet explaining the man who learns, receives instruction, and trusts God. The paper therefore asks two questions: Does Christ possess the required human capacities? And does the man himself truly use and own them?

## PART II — OBJECTIVE REQUIREMENTS

*What the saving event requires before the interior psychology is considered*

### 4. Blood, Death, and Remission

*“Almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission” (Hebrews 9:22). See also Leviticus 17:11; Matthew 26:28; Romans 3:24–26; Hebrews 9:11–14; 1 Peter 1:18–19.*

The first objective requirement is sacrificial death. Hebrews 9:22 must be quoted carefully. It says that almost all things are purified with blood under the law and that without the shedding of blood there is no remission. The word almost prevents a careless claim about every ritual act. The second clause still states the governing sacrificial rule: atoning blood is life yielded under the order God established.

Yet the physical event of bleeding cannot by itself explain redemption. Blood is shed throughout human history. Animals die, martyrs die, criminals die, and innocent victims die. If the mere presence of blood were sufficient, every violent death would remit sin. Therefore the first requirement immediately forces a second question: what makes this blood and this death qualitatively different?

The answer must include more than blood. It must include the identity of the man, his relation to those he represents, his holiness, his obedience, his intention, and God’s appointment. The death must be the offering of the right man, not merely an event imposed on a body. Physical death is necessary, but it does not explain its own saving value.

|                |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
|----------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>[CN/RN]</b> | <b>[CN/RN] In the saving order Scripture reveals, real bloodshed and death are required for remission. Yet blood and death become redemptive only through the identity, righteousness, and willing self-offering of the man who dies.</b> |
|----------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

|                                    |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>DYOTHELITE CONCESSION</b>       | Dyothelitism confesses that Christ truly possessed passible human flesh and truly suffered and died according to the humanity; the whole conciliar tradition affirms the reality of his blood, death, and burial against docetism. |
| <b>NECESSARY ENTAILMENT</b>        | A real human death is not merely damage to human material; it is the death endured and personally owned by the human life that is offered.                                                                                         |
| <b>IF THE CONCLUSION IS DENIED</b> | The death becomes an event occurring in a possessed body while the sole personal owner remains the impassible eternal Son.                                                                                                         |
| <b>CONCESSION SOURCE</b>           | Chalcedon (451): “truly man”; standard dyothelite accounts of real human suffering and death.                                                                                                                                      |

## 5. Representative Human Kinship

*“Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same” (Hebrews 2:14). “Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren” (Hebrews 2:17). See also Genesis 3:15; Romans 5:12–21; Galatians 4:4–5; 1 Timothy 2:5; 1 Corinthians 15:21–22, 45–49.*

A redeeming death must be human in more than appearance. The redeemer must belong to the race whose condition he bears. Scripture describes him as seed, son, brother, mediator, last Adam, and the one made of a woman and under the law. These are not interchangeable metaphors. Together they establish real kinship: he enters the concrete human order, shares flesh and blood, assumes legal and covenantal location, and acts as the representative head of those he saves.

The kinsman-redeemer theme helps, but the argument is broader than a single Old Testament office. Representative action requires relevant sameness between the representative and the represented. A nonhuman proxy cannot repair the human vocation. An apparent body cannot reverse Adamic disobedience. A divine actor wearing human material does not yet constitute a human representative. The one who redeems must truly belong to the order in which obedience, mortality, suffering, and death occur.

This also shows why a human body alone is not enough. True kinship includes the whole human life: body, understanding, will, affection, dependence, and relation to God. If only

the body is human while a divine subject does all the thinking and willing, then the kinship is physical but not fully personal.

**A representative must not merely possess what humans possess; he must live and act as one of those whom he represents.**

|             |                                                                                                                                                         |
|-------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>[RN]</b> | <b>The redeemer must possess true human kinship in body, mind, will, relation, and lived agency—not merely human material available for divine use.</b> |
|-------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

|                                    |                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>DYOTHELITE CONCESSION</b>       | Chalcedon says Christ is fully human like us, with a rational soul and body, yet without sin. Gregory of Nazianzus gives the rule behind the claim: what Christ does not truly assume, he does not heal (Epistle 101). |
| <b>NECESSARY ENTAILMENT</b>        | Representative kinship must include the complete lived human order, not merely bodily material: human cognition, will, relation, and agency.                                                                           |
| <b>IF THE CONCLUSION IS DENIED</b> | “Consubstantial with us” is reduced to having human parts without a human owner. The tradition’s own rule then turns against the model: the human someone not assumed is the human someone not healed.                 |
| <b>CONCESSION SOURCE</b>           | Council of Chalcedon (451), Definition of Faith; Gregory of Nazianzus, Epistle 101.                                                                                                                                    |

## 6. The Qualified Man: Holiness and Positive Righteousness

*He was “holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners” (Hebrews 7:26), “tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin” (Hebrews 4:15), and “did no sin” (1 Peter 2:22). See also Isaiah 53:9–11; John 8:29, 46; Romans 5:18–19; 2 Corinthians 5:21; Hebrews 9:14.*

Human kinship is necessary, but ordinary kinship is not enough. Every other human death belongs to a life already implicated in sin and death. The redeemer must therefore be qualified not only by innocence but by positive righteousness. Scripture does not merely report that Jesus happened not to commit a recorded transgression. It describes an unblemished life ordered toward God, tested under suffering, and completed in obedience.

The distinction between negative innocence and positive righteousness is essential. A newborn child may be innocent of deliberate transgression, but has not fulfilled a covenantal vocation through obedience. The saving man must do more than avoid evil. He must love, trust, hear, submit, serve, and complete the work given to him. Romans 5

places the one man's obedience opposite the one man's disobedience. The contrast concerns performed faithfulness, not merely an uncorrupted substance.

The sacrifice is therefore qualified by the life that leads to it. The redeemer's holiness appears through real stages of human growth and real opposition. His righteousness is not a divine quality merely attached to a human body. It is the righteousness of the man who hears and does the will of God.

|                |                                                                                                                                                                           |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>[CN/RN]</b> | <b>The saving victim must be a positively righteous human representative whose obedience is enacted in history, not merely a physically human bearer of divine value.</b> |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

|                                    |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>DYOTHELITE CONCESSION</b>       | Dyothelites affirm that Christ's holiness, sinlessness, obedience, and moral perfection are real, not apparent. Romans 5:19 is widely read as the one man's performed obedience; Reformed theology states this most explicitly in its doctrine of active obedience. |
| <b>NECESSARY ENTAILMENT</b>        | Positive righteousness is the historically enacted faithfulness of a moral agent who hears, values, chooses, and completes the assigned vocation.                                                                                                                   |
| <b>IF THE CONCLUSION IS DENIED</b> | Righteousness becomes a divine person's use of a morally neutral human faculty-set rather than the righteousness of the human one obeying.                                                                                                                          |
| <b>CONCESSION SOURCE</b>           | Conciliar constant; anti-Apollinarian and anti-monothelite commitments; Romans 5:19 consensus; Hebrews 4:15; 5:8; 7:26.                                                                                                                                             |

## 7. The Divine Provision of the Redeemer: Why the Qualified Man Must Be God's Own Self-Expression

*"And he saw that there was no man, and wondered that there was no intercessor: therefore his arm brought salvation" (Isaiah 59:16). "None of them can by any means redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him" (Psalm 49:7). "God will provide himself a lamb" (Genesis 22:8). "That which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost" (Matthew 1:20). "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee... therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God" (Luke 1:35). See also Isaiah 63:5; John 1:14; Acts 20:28; Colossians 1:15; 2 Corinthians 4:4–6; Hebrews 1:3; John 14:9.*

The argument has now reached a problem that humanity cannot solve from within itself. The redeemer must truly belong to the human race (§5), stand as its qualified representative, and maintain positive righteousness through complete testing (§6). Psalm 49:7 says that no ordinary person can ransom another from within the shared human

debt. Every merely human candidate belongs to the same fallen order and has no standing to provide the required remedy from himself.

The paper does not claim that God could never appoint a created representative; Adam himself was one. The point is what Scripture says God actually did after Adam failed. Scripture does not present another merely external creature whom God later elevates. It assigns the provision to God himself. When no man or intercessor is found, God's own arm brings salvation (Isaiah 59:16; 63:5). God provides the lamb (Genesis 22:8). God is in Christ reconciling the world to himself (2 Corinthians 5:19). The Word—God's own self-expression—becomes flesh (John 1:14). The qualified man exists because God brings him forth through the Holy Spirit as the holy Son, the image of the invisible God, and the exact representation of God's reality.

Acts 20:28 may support the same point if the text is read as “the church of God” purchased “with his own blood.” On that reading, the blood is genuinely human and yet belongs to God through the saving manifestation. Because both the wording and the translation are disputed, this verse is supporting evidence, not the foundation of the argument. The main case rests on the broader pattern: God provides the redeemer, God reveals himself in him, and the result is a real human life.

This closes the Socinian or merely-created-redeemer option without turning the paper into a separate debate about Socinianism. Scripture does not present a private human individual, even a sinless one, as the final answer. It presents God's own arm, provision, and reconciling presence. The decisive qualification is therefore not innocence plus ability. In the economy Scripture reveals, the redeemer is God's own saving self-expression realized in flesh.

Dependence on God must not be confused with replacement by God. Jesus comes from the Holy Spirit and perfectly represents God, but that does not mean a divine consciousness lives the human life in his place. A real representation requires a real representative. If the human mind and will are bypassed, the humanity becomes only a visible surface instead of the true human life in which God is revealed.

*(A note on method: First Timothy 3:16, “God was manifest in the flesh,” is deliberately withheld from the load-bearing chain of this section pending the θεός/ός variant question. The argument above stands on uncontested texts.)*

**Divine source establishes the identity, holiness, vocation, and revelatory purpose of the man. It does not erase the human psychological identity through which that purpose is lived.**

[RN]

**[RN] In the economy Scripture reveals, God provides the redeemer as his own saving self-expression in flesh. This does not claim that God could never appoint a created representative in any possible world. It states what Scripture says God actually did.**

|                                    |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>DYOTHELITE CONCESSION</b>       | Classical theology grants this point in its own language. Nicaea calls Christ “true God.” Anselm argues that only God can provide what redemption requires. Dyothelites also affirm conception by the Holy Spirit, divine mission, image-language, and God’s real manifestation in Christ. |
| <b>NECESSARY ENTAILMENT</b>        | The human redeemer may be wholly dependent in source and revelatory identity without ceasing to be the concrete human owner of the saving acts. Dependence and personhood are different claims.                                                                                            |
| <b>IF THE CONCLUSION IS DENIED</b> | Dependence of source is treated as though it required the absence of a human personal subject, and the humanity becomes a visible interface rather than the lived form of the saving act.                                                                                                  |
| <b>CONCESSION SOURCE</b>           | Nicaea (325); Anselm, Cur Deus Homo; Matthew 1:20; Luke 1:35; Colossians 1:15; Hebrews 1:3. Both claims are now on the table: truly God and truly man. The remaining question is which model allows both claims to do their full work.                                                     |

## 8. Origin Conditions and Enactment Conditions

A simple distinction is now necessary. Some qualities explain how the redeemer comes to exist and receive his mission. Other qualities describe what he personally does throughout his life. These two levels must not be confused. Jesus can be holy by divine origin without his obedience being staged or mechanically produced.

| <b>Register</b>      | <b>What belongs to it</b>                                                                                                                |
|----------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Origin conditions    | Conceived from the Holy Spirit; holy from conception; constituted as Son, image, and representative; given vocation; anointed and sent.  |
| Enactment conditions | Growing, learning, trusting, praying, resisting temptation, submitting, obeying under suffering, offering himself, and dying faithfully. |

How Jesus comes to exist is not the same as what he later does. God may will the man into existence, make him holy, sustain his life, preserve his mission, reveal truth to him, and give him power. Those divine acts explain why the man exists and can act. They are not the man’s acts of understanding, judging, trusting, choosing, or submitting. Sustaining the agent is not using his faculties for him. Enabling is not controlling. Certainty is not force. The problem begins only when another subject supplies the

immediate judgment and choice so that the human mind and will no longer act as the man's own.

**CAUSAL-LEVEL RULE: Keep two questions separate. Why does the human agent exist and have power to act? Because God wills, constitutes, and sustains him. Who immediately understands, trusts, chooses, and obeys? The man. God may wholly ground the act without controlling or replacing the human agent.**

Certainty is not the same as control. Jesus' holy obedience may be certain because of his perfect character and God's faithful purpose without another subject performing it for him. The argument does not require independence from God, libertarian freedom, or a real possibility that Jesus would sin. It requires personal ownership: the obedience must proceed through the man's own understanding, values, affections, and will.

|                |                                                                                                                                                                                       |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>[AN/RN]</b> | <b>The divine grounding of the man's holy origin and the human enactment of his obedience are distinct explanatory levels. Grounding the agent is not performing the agent's act.</b> |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

|                                    |                                                                                                                                                       |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>DYOTHELITE CONCESSION</b>       | Constantinople III rejects the replacement of the human will and affirms a real human operation that follows and submits rather than being abolished. |
| <b>NECESSARY ENTAILMENT</b>        | If origin does not perform enactment, there must be a genuinely human agent whose intellect and will perform the obedience under testing.             |
| <b>IF THE CONCLUSION IS DENIED</b> | The human will is retained as a faculty while the eternal Son remains the only personal performer, collapsing enactment back into divine ownership.   |
| <b>CONCESSION SOURCE</b>           | Third Council of Constantinople (680–681), Definition of Faith.                                                                                       |

## PART III — INTERIOR REQUIREMENTS

*Why the saving qualities require a genuinely human psychological identity*

### 8A. The Governing Redemptive Quality: Human Faith Under Human Conditions

*“Whatsoever is not of faith is sin” (Romans 14:23). “Without faith it is impossible to please him” (Hebrews 11:6). “Looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of our faith” (Hebrews 12:2). See also Hebrews 2:13; 5:7–9; 10:38; Matthew 26:39.*

Hebrews 12:2 calls Jesus the pioneer and completer of faith. The word our is supplied by translators; the Greek says “the pioneer and completer of faith.” This verse alone need not carry the whole argument. Hebrews 2:13 directly places the words “I will put my trust in him” on the lips of the incarnate Son, and Hebrews 5:7–9 shows that trust lived out as obedience through suffering.

The physical features of humanity are necessary, but they do not explain themselves. Flesh can hunger, blood can be shed, muscles can fail, nerves can register pain, and a body can die without any of those events being righteous. Sinners, animals, criminals, martyrs, and accidental victims undergo the same physical conditions. What makes Christ’s life redemptive is that a human subject understands those conditions, receives God’s will within them, trusts God through them, and personally submits under their pressure.

The order is straightforward. Flesh and blood provide the embodied setting of obedience. Hunger, exhaustion, sorrow, pain, natural aversion, and mortality provide its cost. The human mind understands the command, the alternative, and the price of obedience. Faith judges God faithful. The human will makes that judgment its own and submits. Only then do suffering and death become the suffering and self-offering of a righteous man rather than events happening to human material.

**Governing redemptive principle: Human faith and submission give saving meaning to every other human quality. The flesh is where the man trusts. The blood is what he knowingly offers. Exhaustion is what he endures faithfully. Temptation is what he answers. Death is what he willingly accepts in obedience to God.**

The word originating must be used carefully when speaking of Christ’s faith. It does not mean that Jesus independently creates the truth, mission, power, or final purpose he trusts. All of these come from God. The word refers only to the immediate source of the human response: Jesus understands what is revealed, judges God faithful, makes the given purpose his own human intention, and entrusts himself to God.

A human act may depend entirely on God for the agent’s existence, continued life, opportunity, revelation, and power while still being the man’s own act. This is the locked formula §25 will state in full: the saving intent is derivative in order, personally appropriated in consciousness, and humanly enacted in obedience.

Put plainly: sustaining is not judging, empowering is not choosing, and preserving is not obeying. “God is faithful,” “I will obey,” and “I entrust myself to him” must be judgments and acts of the human knower and willer, not decisions supplied by another subject.

This exposes the deepest contrast between Adamic sin and Christ’s righteousness. Sin is more than an unlawful bodily act. It is the creature’s mistrust of God, preference for an apparent good apart from God, and self-direction against God’s command. Romans 14:23 states the same moral pattern within its discussion of conscience: “whatsoever is not of faith is sin.” The redemptive opposite of sin is therefore not bare non-sinny. It is a true

man's understood, intended, and faithful submission to God. Christ repairs the human condition at its moral center only if that trust and submission are genuinely his.

| Human condition                    | Redemptive meaning only when human faith owns it                                                                                   |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Flesh and blood                    | The embodied life in which the man receives the vocation and knowingly offers himself; otherwise bloodshed is only physical loss.  |
| Hunger and exhaustion              | The cost through which trust perseveres; otherwise fatigue is merely a biological state.                                           |
| Sorrow, fear, and natural aversion | Human desires consciously brought into submission to God; otherwise the passions are experiences endured by a possessed nature.    |
| Temptation                         | An alternative apprehended and faithfully rejected by the human subject; otherwise pressure occurs without a human moral center.   |
| Pain and suffering                 | The arena in which dependence, prayer, and obedience are personally sustained; otherwise suffering has no covenantal ownership.    |
| Death                              | The personally embraced culmination of trustful obedience and self-offering; otherwise it is an event imposed upon human material. |

The conclusion should be plain. If Christ does not trust and submit within his own human mind and will, the other human qualities remain physically real but lose their saving meaning. The body is human, but no human someone understands the test, judges God faithful, trusts, submits, and endures. Humanity is then present at the level of what suffers, but absent at the very point where the human condition must be healed.

|                |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>[AN/RN]</b> | <b>[AN/RN] Every real moral act requires a subject. In the saving economy Scripture reveals, Christ's bodily conditions become redemptive only when the man himself understands them, trusts God through them, and submits.</b> |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

|                              |                                                                                                                                                                                             |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>DYOTHELITE CONCESSION</b> | Dyothelites affirm Christ's real flesh, blood, hunger, exhaustion, sorrow, temptation, suffering, prayer, obedience, and human will. They also affirm that his human obedience truly saves. |
| <b>NECESSARY ENTAILMENT</b>  | These conditions form one redemptive life only if a human subject understands the command and its cost, trusts God, and                                                                     |

|                                    |                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                    | submits his own will.                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| <b>IF THE CONCLUSION IS DENIED</b> | If the eternal divine subject supplies the personal center, the body and faculties remain human in type, but the lived faith, suffering, and obedience belong to another personal agent rather than to the man. |
| <b>CONCESSION SOURCE</b>           | Romans 5:18–19; Matthew 4:1–11; 26:36–46; Hebrews 2:10–18; 4:15; 5:7–9; 9:14; 10:5–10; Constantinople III’s affirmation of natural human willing and operation.                                                 |

## 9. Obedience Is a Personal Act

*“Though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered” (Hebrews 5:8). He “became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross” (Philippians 2:8). See also Romans 5:19; John 4:34; 5:30; 6:38; 8:28–29; 10:17–18; 14:31; Hebrews 10:5–10.*

As §8A established, the body and its passions gain redemptive meaning only when the man trusts and obeys through them. Obedience is not a movement inside a faculty. Someone hears a command, recognizes another’s authority, and aligns his own will with it. A human will is necessary, but its mere existence is not enough. It must be the lived will of the human one who obeys.

This is why the phrase “the divine person acts through the human will” does not yet answer the question. It tells us which faculty is used, but not who personally owns the willing. If the eternal divine Son remains the only actual “who,” the human will can become an instrument used to produce a human-looking act. The act is called human because the faculty is human, while its true personal owner remains divine.

The word through can mean two very different things. It may mean that God creates, sustains, teaches, empowers, and preserves the human agent. None of that removes human action. Or it may mean that the eternal divine subject is the immediate thinker and chooser—what scholastic theology calls the proximate operator—while the human mind and will serve only as channels. That second meaning displaces the human act. The criticism is not against God’s causality or providence. It is against using those truths to make another subject do the human thinking and choosing.

Scripture’s language is stronger. Jesus does not merely display an obedient human operation. He lives as the commanded and sent man. He distinguishes his will from the will of the one who sent him, delights to do that will, and completes it through suffering. The obedience belongs to his human self-relation: he knows himself as the one commissioned, tested, and required to submit.

**Who is the concrete someone who knows, “I am commanded,” and then says, “I will do the will of him who sent me”?**

|                |                                                                    |
|----------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>[AN/RN]</b> | <b>Because obedience is an intentionally owned act, the saving</b> |
|----------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|

|  |                                                                                                         |
|--|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|  | <b>obedience requires a concrete human first-person subject, not merely a human volitional faculty.</b> |
|--|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

|                                    |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>DYOTHELITE CONCESSION</b>       | Constantinople III affirms both a divine will and a human will and rejects any removal of Christ's human willing. Its own definition adds that the human will follows "not as resisting or reluctant, but as subject to his divine and omnipotent will." The question is simple: Is this the submission of a real human willer, or only a human faculty directed from the divine subject's side? |
| <b>NECESSARY ENTAILMENT</b>        | Submission requires a commanded human someone for whom the human will is personally "my will."                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| <b>IF THE CONCLUSION IS DENIED</b> | Submission is moved from the man to a faculty through which the divine subject produces a human-mode act.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| <b>CONCESSION SOURCE</b>           | Third Council of Constantinople (680–681), Definition of Faith; Catechism of the Catholic Church §475 summarizes the same concession.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |

## 10. Faith, Trust, and Dependence

*"I will put my trust in him" (Hebrews 2:13). He "committed himself to him that judgeth righteously" (1 Peter 2:23), and at death said, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit" (Luke 23:46). See also Psalm 22; Isaiah 8:17–18; Hebrews 5:7; Hebrews 12:2.*

Faith is one of the clearest tests of psychological identity because faith is intrinsically relational. The believer knows himself as dependent upon another. He receives a word or promise, judges the speaker faithful, and entrusts himself to what he does not autonomously secure. Trust therefore cannot be reduced to correct behavior. It includes a first-person relation: I rely upon God.

A divine person, considered in divine existence, does not exercise faith in God. God does not need revelation, depend on preservation, or hope for a future he lacks power to secure. Therefore adding the words "according to humanity" does not by itself explain Jesus' faith. The question is simpler: Is there a real human field of awareness in which dependence on God is actually experienced and personally owned?

Jesus' trust is source-dependent without being impersonal. He receives his mission from God, words from God, power through the Spirit, and vindication from God. His faithfulness is not independent invention. Yet the reception and response are his own human acts. He commits himself; he cries; he prays; he endures; he entrusts his life to the Father. Derivation of content does not negate ownership of response.

Aquinas provides an important internal test, but his position must be stated accurately. He denies the theological virtue of faith in Christ because faith concerns what is not seen, whereas Christ's human soul possessed the vision of God. He likewise denies theological hope for the soul's beatitude because that beatitude was already possessed. At the same time, he allows hope for what Christ had not yet received, such as the glorification of the body (Summa Theologiae III, q. 7, aa. 3–4).

This does not mean Aquinas denies every possible sense of trust, confidence, commitment, or obedient dependence. It does mean that the biblical language of trust must be fitted into a system that does not allow Christ's human standpoint to be ordinarily dependent in knowledge.

Hebrews 2:13 places trust on the lips of the incarnate Son. The exact question is therefore not whether Aquinas "deleted all trust." It is what is lost when complete vision is placed before the human life of faith. When the ordinary human standpoint conflicts with the prior structure, the standpoint is reclassified.

|                |                                                                                                                                                                |
|----------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>[AN/RN]</b> | <b>Faith requires a humanly grounded first-person relation of dependence. A divine subject using human faculties is not yet an explanation of human trust.</b> |
|----------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

|                                    |                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>DYOTHELITE CONCESSION</b>       | Dyothelites affirm Christ's real prayer, obedience, dependence, and entrusting of himself to the Father in Gethsemane, at the cross, and in Hebrews 5:7–9, even when they deny the technical category of theological faith. |
| <b>NECESSARY ENTAILMENT</b>        | Prayer and trust are self-involving acts: the human subject knows that he depends on God and personally entrusts himself to God.                                                                                            |
| <b>IF THE CONCLUSION IS DENIED</b> | If antecedent vision removes theological faith, the account must still identify the genuinely human believer expressed in the biblical language of trust.                                                                   |
| <b>CONCESSION SOURCE</b>           | Aquinas, ST III, q. 7, aa. 3–4; Hebrews 2:13; Hebrews 5:7–9; Luke 23:46.                                                                                                                                                    |

|                        |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>[Reclassified ]</b> | <b>The scholastic mainstream denies theological faith and the hope of a beatitude Christ already possessed (ST III.7.3–4). It still allows other forms of trust and hope, including hope for bodily glorification. The pressure remains: How does the biblical language of trust retain a genuinely dependent human believer?</b> |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

## 11. Human Knowledge, Growth, and Revelation

*“Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and man” (Luke 2:52). He said, “My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me” (John 7:16), and “as my Father hath taught me, I speak these things” (John 8:28). See also Isaiah 50:4–5; Luke 2:40, 46–52; Mark 13:32; John 5:19–20, 30; 12:49–50.*

Human cognition develops through embodiment, experience, memory, language, instruction, revelation, and reflection. Scripture applies this developmental structure to Jesus. He grows in wisdom, asks and answers questions, receives teaching, speaks what has been given, and distinguishes what he knows from what the Father knows. These are not incidental limitations surrounding the real work of a hidden omniscient subject. They belong to the human way in which the saving vocation is understood and enacted.

Standard dyothelitism can formally say that one person knows through the divine intellect and lacks knowledge through the human intellect. That does not settle the deeper issue. What does Jesus actually know and experience as man? When he says that he does not know, is his lived human awareness genuinely limited, or is an omniscient subject merely reporting that one of his human faculties lacks the information?

A complete human mind requires more than a storage location for limited information. It requires a human knower whose self-understanding is formed in relation to that information. Jesus must know himself as the man receiving revelation, discovering the shape of his mission, interpreting Scripture, and acting on what God has made known. Otherwise human knowledge exists, but no genuinely human someone inhabits it.

The same requirement extends across time. The child who grows, the man who receives revelation, the servant who makes judgments under testing, and the sufferer who finally offers himself must be the same human subject. Memory, developing self-understanding, stable purpose, and formed character bind these acts into one life. Otherwise the final sacrifice does not complete a history of human faithfulness; it merely follows a series of states located in human faculties.

The historical record again shows the pressure. The Agnoetae appealed to Mark 13:32 in support of real ignorance in Christ, but their position was condemned. Gregory the Great read the saying as non-disclosure and distinguished what Christ knew in his humanity from what he knew from his humanity.

Later scholastic theology gave Christ’s human soul beatific and infused knowledge from conception while also preserving acquired knowledge that could genuinely increase (ST III, qq. 9–12). The human intellect still operates, but the decisive knowledge is already complete.

The question is therefore not whether Christ has a human intellect. It is whether growth, reception, and limitation shape what he actually knows and experiences as man, or whether they remain a lower track beneath knowledge already complete from above.

[RN]

**The scriptural growth and reception of knowledge require a genuinely human epistemic standpoint, not merely limited**

|  |                                                                             |
|--|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|  | <b>information housed in a nature owned by an omniscient divine person.</b> |
|--|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|

|                                    |                                                                                                                                                                              |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>DYOTHELITE CONCESSION</b>       | Chalcedonian theology affirms a rational human soul; many dyothelites additionally affirm real acquired knowledge and genuine growth in wisdom on the strength of Luke 2:52. |
| <b>NECESSARY ENTAILMENT</b>        | A real process of learning requires a human knower whose first-person horizon is genuinely formed through time, experience, and revelation.                                  |
| <b>IF THE CONCLUSION IS DENIED</b> | Growth becomes only the acquisition of information by one faculty of an already omniscient personal subject, rather than development in a human knower.                      |
| <b>CONCESSION SOURCE</b>           | Chalcedon (451); modern dyothelite affirmation of Luke 2:52; Aquinas separately posits acquired knowledge in ST III, q. 12.                                                  |

|                        |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
|------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>[Reclassified ]</b> | <b>The Agnoetae’s claim of real ignorance was rejected, and Mark 13:32 was read as non-disclosure. Later scholastic theology kept genuine acquired growth but placed it beneath beatific and infused knowledge already present from conception. The question is whether human limitation is Jesus’ lived standpoint or only a lower track inside a mind already complete from above.</b> |
|------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

## 12. Temptation, Suffering, and Tested Fidelity

*He “was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin” (Hebrews 4:15), and “in that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted” (Hebrews 2:18). See also Matthew 4:1–11; Matthew 26:37–44; Luke 22:41–44; Hebrews 5:7–9.*

Temptation tests more than bodily sensation. It presents a perceived good or relief in tension with faithful obedience. The tempted person understands the alternative, experiences the pressure, and remains aligned with God. Suffering intensifies this test by making obedience costly. If the result is produced by a consciousness incapable of uncertainty, dependence, or spiritual struggle, the human testing becomes externally dramatic but internally hollow.

The argument does not require a sinful inclination in Jesus. Nor does a real test require that failure be likely or even metaphysically possible. The pressure must still be felt within his human life, and his faithfulness must proceed through human judgment and

will. The hunger must be his hunger, the sorrow his sorrow, the natural desire to avoid death his human desire, and the submission his human act.

Gethsemane is therefore not solved by counting wills. The existence of a human natural will and a divine will does not yet identify the one who personally experiences “my will” and submits it to “thy will.” The saving significance lies in the personal ownership of the human desire and its voluntary alignment with God under suffering.

|             |                                                                                                                                                             |
|-------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>[RN]</b> | <b>Real temptation and suffering require that the incarnate man personally undergo and faithfully answer the test within a human psychological horizon.</b> |
|-------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

|                                    |                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>DYOTHELITE CONCESSION</b>       | Dyothelites affirm real temptation, suffering, sorrow, and obedience under testing—not a merely theatrical appearance of struggle. Hebrews 4:15 is affirmed across the tradition.                        |
| <b>NECESSARY ENTAILMENT</b>        | Testing must be registered and answered within the first-person life of the human one being tested; certainty of fidelity does not by itself negate this.                                                |
| <b>IF THE CONCLUSION IS DENIED</b> | If Christ’s human mind is said to possess comprehensive knowledge from conception, the account must explain how dependence and tested fidelity are still genuinely lived rather than merely represented. |
| <b>CONCESSION SOURCE</b>           | Hebrews 2:18; 4:15; 5:7–9; Matthew 4:1–11; the Gethsemane traditions.                                                                                                                                    |

### 13. Psychological Identity Is an Essential Human Quality

At this point the progressive argument reaches its central conclusion. A body, intellect, will, emotions, and operations are necessary components of human life. But a list of components does not yet provide the unity of a lived human existence. Human psychology has a center of reference: the one to whom memories, perceptions, desires, intentions, sufferings, and decisions belong. This is what the present study means by psychological identity.

Psychological identity is not an extra substance added to body and soul. It is the human “I” that unites the whole life. It is the one who remembers, understands, desires, suffers, decides, and trusts. The man does not merely contain thoughts; he thinks. He does not merely possess a will; he wills. He does not merely contain pain or faith; he suffers and trusts. The ordinary word person names this real “someone,” although later theology often uses person in the narrower sense of an independently subsisting hypostasis.

**OPERATIVE-OWNERSHIP RULE: Every human quality that matters for redemption must belong to the human subject who experiences and enacts it. God may create and sustain the faculty. But if another subject personally owns its knowing, trusting, willing, or suffering, the act is not yet the saving act of the man.**

That narrower definition must not decide the biblical question in advance. If Scripture presents a human someone who knows, wills, trusts, obeys, and offers himself, the conclusion cannot be avoided by defining person so that the humanity is forbidden to be one. Independent subsistence may be distinguished from human psychological personhood. But the lived human subject cannot be removed while keeping acts that only such a subject can perform.

**Humanity is not complete merely because every human faculty is listed. It is complete when those faculties belong to a real human “I” who knows, trusts, and acts as himself.**

[AN/RN]

**The essential qualities of redemption culminate in true human psychological personhood: a concrete human someone who owns the saving acts.**

## 14. True Personhood Without Independence of Source or Intent

The word personhood is often treated as though it implied independence. This is false. Human persons do not originate their own existence, language, nature, capacities, world, or ultimate purpose. They remain persons while being radically dependent upon God and others. Dependence concerns where existence and purpose come from; personhood concerns whether there is a concrete someone who receives, understands, responds, and acts. Continuous dependence upon God for existence does not imply that God operates, controls, manipulates, or forces the dependent person’s psychology; otherwise no created person could be a genuine agent.

The incarnate Son’s dependence is unique and total. His origin is from the Holy Spirit. His identity is the human realization of God’s Word and intent. His mission is given. His doctrine is received. His works are supplied. His authority is bestowed. His power is mediated through the Spirit. His resurrection is God’s vindication. Nothing about this requires an independently originating center of intent alongside God.

A purpose received from God can still become the man’s own purpose. Jesus can say that he came to do the will of the one who sent him and still embrace that mission as the governing intention of his life. The Father gives the saving purpose; the man understands it, accepts it, and carries it out.

This is the summit of the argument: real human personhood without independence from God. The Son is not an autonomous human hypostasis standing beside God. Neither is he

a human nature with no lived subject of its own. He is the real human person brought forth when God's own self-expression is realized in flesh.

|         |                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
|---------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| [AN/RN] | <b>Personhood requires owned consciousness and action, not independence of source. The incarnate Son is genuinely personal precisely as the source-dependent human realization of God's saving intent.</b> |
|---------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

## 15. The First-Person Test: Who Does "I" Refer To?

Faith, obedience, and self-offering are acts in which the subject knows himself as the one acting. Philosophers call these de se acts—acts "about oneself." "I trust God" is not the same as saying that trust occurs somewhere in a nature. "Not my will" requires a speaker for whom the human will is truly his. "I thirst" requires the human sufferer to be the one meant by "I."

**The First-Person Test: For every saving act, ask three questions. Who does "I" refer to? From whose lived standpoint is the act experienced? Who owns the human knowledge, will, dependence, suffering, and choice involved?**

1. Who is the referent of "I" when Jesus speaks of his knowledge, will, dependence, suffering, or mission?
2. Can that referent literally learn, trust, be taught, submit, hope, be tested, and receive power?
3. Is the concrete human existence the immediate psychological owner of the act?
4. Or is the human existence an operational medium through which an eternal divine subject acts?
5. Does the model explain the first-person life, or merely reclassify predicates by saying "according to humanity"?

This test does not assume that each nature must exist as an independent person. It asks something more basic: Does the concrete human life get to be the "I" of its own experience? If not, the man never speaks as himself. An eternal divine subject speaks through human equipment, and the saving acts lack a genuinely human owner.

|      |                                                                                                                                                   |
|------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| [AN] | <b>A mode of operation is not a referent, a faculty is not a first-person standpoint, and a nature is not by itself the someone who says "I."</b> |
|------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

## 16. The Concession Ledger and the Retraction Question

The progressive argument is now complete. Before examining the classical system, the paper gathers its own official concessions in one place. None of the following claims is foreign to dyothelite theology. Each is affirmed in a council, a standard doctrinal source, or the tradition's standing consensus.

| Conceded quality                                     | Classical source of the concession                                                                                                              |
|------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| True body, blood, death, and burial                  | The entire conciliar tradition against docetism; Chalcedon: "truly man."                                                                        |
| Rational human soul and mind                         | Condemnation of Apollinarius (Constantinople, 381); Gregory of Nazianzus, Epistle 101: the unassumed is the unhealed.                           |
| Complete humanity consubstantial with us             | Chalcedon (451): "consubstantial with us according to the manhood; in all things like unto us, without sin."                                    |
| Natural human will and natural human operation       | Constantinople III (680–681), against monothelitism and monenergism.                                                                            |
| Sinlessness with positive, saving obedience          | Conciliar constant; Romans 5:19 consensus; Reformed doctrine of active obedience.                                                               |
| Real temptation and suffering                        | Hebrews 2:18; 4:15; 5:7–9, affirmed across all traditions.                                                                                      |
| Divine identity and divine provision of the redeemer | Nicaea (325): "true God of true God"; Anselm, Cur Deus Homo; the scriptural economy of God's own saving action.                                 |
| Human prayer, dependence, and received mission       | The Gospel and Hebrews traditions, affirmed even where the technical category of faith is reclassified (§10).                                   |
| Humanly lived faith and trustful submission          | Romans 5:19; Hebrews 2:13; 5:7–9; the Gethsemane traditions; the standing affirmation of genuine human obedience, prayer, and dependence (§8A). |

These concessions do not stand alone. Section 8A showed that flesh, blood, hunger, exhaustion, temptation, suffering, and death gain saving meaning only when a human subject trusts and obeys through them. Obedience must be personally owned (§9). Faith requires a human believer who knows himself to depend on God (§10). Received knowledge requires a human knower who grows through it (§11). Temptation must be felt and answered within a human life (§12). A list of faculties owns nothing; a concrete human "I" does (§§13, 15). The concessions therefore lead to one conclusion.

[AN]

**The conceded qualities jointly entail a concrete human someone: a genuinely human first-person subject who owns the saving acts.**

The charge can now be stated plainly. Dyothelitism does not simply deny Christ's humanity; it affirms every component of it in conciliar language. The problem is that the system refuses the human someone those components jointly describe. The paper adds no foreign premise. It asks the system to follow its own concessions to their conclusion.

**THE RETRACTION QUESTION: You affirm a complete human mind and body, a human will, human action, dependence, obedience, suffering, and self-offering. Together these describe a real human someone. You deny that someone. Which affirmation do you withdraw?**

The burden now changes. A dyothelite cannot answer merely by repeating that one person acts through two natures, because that is the claim under examination. The account must say which conceded quality is not personally human. Is the knowledge not the knowledge of a human knower? Is the will not the will of a human willer? Is the obedience not owned by the man who is commanded? Does the faith not arise within the human one who faces exhaustion, temptation, and suffering? Is the self-offering not the act of the man who gives himself? If an answer protects the person-count by making one of these qualities impersonal, figurative, or merely instrumental, it has withdrawn its own concession.

Part IV examines the available answers. The standard formulas rarely retract a concession openly. Instead, they keep the human words while weakening what those words must mean. The historical record also shows that, when the pressure becomes clear, the system has often qualified Christ's human faith, knowledge, ignorance, or growth rather than reconsider the person-count fixed in advance.

## **PART IV — THE DYOTHELITE HAND-WAVE**

*Why official affirmation of two wills often fails to explain the human person who uses them*

### **17. What Dyothelitism Officially Affirms**

A careful dyothelite will agree with much of the positive case. Classical dyothelitism affirms a complete human nature, a rational human mind, a natural human will, human action, human suffering, and real obedience. Many contemporary dyothelites also affirm genuinely limited human knowledge. Major scholastic accounts instead deny straightforward ignorance by appealing to beatific and infused knowledge (§§11, 22). Constantinople III was meant to reject the replacement of the human will by the divine will. The present argument therefore goes beyond merely proving that Jesus had a human will or human operations.

The question lies one level deeper. Dyothelitism usually says that natures do not act; persons act through natures. The eternal Son is the one hypostasis, or personal subject. Every human act is therefore finally the act of that eternal Son, performed through the human nature. The formula preserves one person in Christ, but it does not yet explain where the human “I” required by the acts is located.

A system can affirm a human faculty while denying it a human owner. A puppeteer may move a figure with fully formed limbs, but the limbs do not make the figure an agent. The analogy is intentionally limited; dyothelites reject mechanical control. The point is simply that a human mind and will must be more than equipment possessed by an eternal divine subject. They must be the lived mind and will of the man.

**The question is not, “Are there two wills?” It is, “Who is the human someone whose will the human will is?”**

## **18. Why Human Faculties Are Not Yet a Human Someone**

A nature tells us what something is. A person tells us who acts. Dyothelite theology often places every human capacity in the nature while reserving the “who” entirely for the eternal Son. The list of parts may be complete, but the central question remains: Who unites and owns those parts as one human life?

If the human intellect knows but no human knower exists, the language says more than the model explains. If the human will submits but there is no human someone for whom it is “my will,” submission has been assigned to a faculty. If human consciousness exists but the only conscious “who” is the eternal Son, the human consciousness becomes a secondary stream owned by a divine subject.

The usual reply—“the person owns the nature”—repeats the theory without solving the problem. It does not explain how a nonpersonal nature has first-person consciousness. Either the human consciousness has an immediate human subject, and a real human person has appeared, or it is directly the consciousness of the eternal Son, and the human life lacks an “I” of its own.

**[AN]**

**Complete faculties do not by themselves yield human personhood. The dyothelite must explain personal ownership, not merely ontological possession.**

## **19. Why the System Cannot Allow a Human Person: Two Subjects in Christ and a Fourth Personal Subject**

The denial of a second person in Christ did not begin as an attempt to weaken Christ’s humanity. The technical terms anhypostasia and enhypostasia were developed against Nestorian division. In plain language, they deny that Christ’s humanity exists as a separate personal subject and affirm that it exists in the Logos. The purpose was to

preserve one Christ, not two independently acting Christs. That purpose should be acknowledged. The present criticism is narrower: a rule meant to deny independent human subsistence is often used to deny the real human subject required by Christ's human acts.

### **Enhypostasia Names the Placement but Does Not Explain the Economy**

The anhypostasia–enhypostasia formula answers a limited ontological question. It says that Christ's humanity does not possess an independently subsisting human hypostasis and instead subsists in the hypostasis of the Logos. In other words, it identifies where the humanity is placed within the model and to whom it ultimately belongs. It does not yet explain how that humanity exists and operates as a concrete human life.

The word “in” must not be treated spatially or materially, as though a body and rational soul were contained inside the Logos. It normally indicates ontological dependence, personal possession, termination, assumption, or sustentation in another. But exchanging the word “in” for one of these technical terms does not complete the explanation. Each still requires an account of what the relation positively does and how this body, soul, intellect, will, memory, consciousness, and developing self-understanding are united as one genuinely human first-person life.

Three explanatory levels must therefore be distinguished. Individuation asks what makes this humanity a concrete human particular rather than humanity in general. Operation asks who immediately knows, learns, trusts, deliberates, submits, suffers, and offers himself. Attribution asks why those human acts finally belong to the Logos rather than to an independently subsisting human hypostasis. Enhypostasia chiefly answers the third question. It normally assumes the first and leaves the second underexplained.

If the Logos is the immediate thinker and chooser of the human acts, then the created intellect and will risk becoming instruments through which a divine personal subject lives in a human mode. The operations may be human in faculty and form while their proximate personal source remains divine. If, however, the created human intellect and will possess a unified first-person standpoint from which the man understands, judges, trusts, and chooses, then the account has admitted the concrete human someone it refuses to call a person.

The remaining answer—“the one person acts through the human nature”—only repeats the theory unless the word through is explained. It may name divine grounding and personal attribution, but it does not identify the proximate human knower, believer, and obeyer. Ownership is not the same thing as operation, and locating the humanity in the Logos is not yet an account of how the human life is internally lived.

This is the unpaid explanatory debt of enhypostasia. The formula may successfully prohibit an independently existing second Christ and identify the ultimate bearer of the human predicates. But it does not, merely by naming that bearer, explain the internal economy of Christ's human consciousness and agency. It tells us whose humanity it is; it does not yet tell us who immediately lives that humanity from within.

**PLACEMENT–OPERATION RULE: Enhypostasia identifies the humanity’s ontological placement and ultimate attribution. It does not by itself explain its individuation, its proximate human operation, or its first-person psychological ownership.**

The system is nevertheless under a structural constraint. Standard Trinitarian Christology already has three personal subjects before the Incarnation: Father, eternal Son, and Holy Spirit. The eternal Son already possesses a complete personal identity. If the assumed humanity is also allowed to be a true human personal subject, the system appears to have two subjects in Christ and one more personal subject than the Trinity permits.

The feared result is not a fourth divine person. It is a fourth personal or hypostatic subject in the total account: Father, eternal Son, Spirit, and the human Jesus. Within Christ there would be two “whos”—the eternal Son and the man. The tradition identifies that result with Nestorian division and therefore rules it out in advance. The fixed person-count then becomes the reason the concessions gathered in §16 cannot reach their natural conclusion.

This explains the recurring pattern. Everything associated with human personhood—mind, will, emotion, action, and consciousness—is placed in the human nature, but the conclusion “human person” is denied. The humanity is allowed to have all the features of a someone without being permitted to be one. The eternal Son must remain the only “who” because the person-count has already been settled.

The result is a structural hand-wave. The humanity is said to be complete, but when the account is asked who believes, learns, submits, and offers himself, the answer returns to the eternal Son. Human words remain, while their human personal owner disappears.

**[Structural diagnosis]**

**The problem is built into the system: accepting the human someone required by the saving acts would appear to create two subjects in Christ and another personal subject beyond the Trinity.**

## **20. Why “According to the Humanity” Does Not Solve the Psychological Problem (Reduplication)**

Reduplication is the technical practice of qualifying a claim by saying “according to the divine nature” or “according to the human nature.” It can prevent a flat contradiction: the Son knows according to divinity and does not know according to humanity; he is impassible according to divinity and suffers according to humanity. But sorting the predicates does not yet explain the lived experience.

The issue is the lived “I.” Can the same sole subject sincerely say “I do not know” while also possessing the knowledge essentially and eternally? Is the ignorance part of what Jesus actually knows and experiences as man, or is it merely information absent from one human faculty owned by a subject who already knows? Can that same sole subject trust God for vindication while already possessing divine power and complete knowledge of the outcome?

Reduplication tells us where a statement is classified. It does not create a human knower, believer, or sufferer. Saying that the Son suffers “as man” still leaves the central question: Who personally undergoes the human suffering? A grammatical qualifier cannot supply the human first-person life that the act requires.

|             |                                                                                                                                                                 |
|-------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>[AN]</b> | <b>Reduplication can distinguish predicates and faculties; it cannot by itself supply distinct lived horizons or explain the human ownership of de se acts.</b> |
|-------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

## 21. Common Dyothelite Escape Formulas

Each formula below keeps the language of a conceded human quality while leaving its personal owner unclear. The third column shows what the formula quietly gives up. In that sense, each row supplies an unstated answer to the Retraction Question in §16.

| <b>Formula</b>                                   | <b>Unanswered question</b>                                                                                                 | <b>Concession quietly surrendered</b>                                                                                            |
|--------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| “The person acts through the nature.”            | It names who owns the nature in the theory, but not who personally lives the human act.                                    | §9: obedience as a personally owned human act.                                                                                   |
| “The Son wills humanly.”                         | Changes the adverb; it does not identify who experiences the human will as “my will.”                                      | The council’s claim that the human willing is genuinely lived as human, not merely produced in a human form by a divine subject. |
| “The human nature is enhypostatic in the Logos.” | It says the humanity depends on the Logos for personal subsistence, but it does not explain the human “I.”                 | The human first-person life is withheld while the language of complete humanity remains.                                         |
| “There are two consciousnesses in one person.”   | It names two streams of awareness, but still leaves the eternal Son as the only “who.” Who is the “I” of the human stream? | Either the human “I” is real, which grants §13, or it is only a mode of the divine “I,” which denies a human owner.              |

|                                                  |                                                                                                                                         |                                                                                                                                  |
|--------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| “The one person does not know qua man.”          | It classifies the ignorance as human but does not explain how the sole omniscient subject genuinely lives with limited human knowledge. | §11: the reality of the ignorance itself.                                                                                        |
| “The human ego is the Word’s ego in human mode.” | Is the human ego a real human someone, or only another name for the eternal divine ego?                                                 | If the ego is truly human, the human someone is granted. If not, divine self-awareness is merely being expressed in a human way. |
| “This is mystery.”                               | Mystery can mark the limit of explanation, but it cannot replace the basic distinction between who acts and what faculty is used.       | All the human qualities remain in the wording but lose a clear human owner.                                                      |

These formulas are not automatically false. Each may name part of a real account. The problem is treating the phrase as though it finished the explanation. The paper asks for one thing: show how the human life itself owns the saving acts without creating two independent Christs. Until that is shown, “full humanity” has been stated but not explained.

The neutral technical names for this failure are psychological displacement and agency substitution. In plain language, the human faculties are present, but another subject is doing the personal believing and choosing. The sharper phrase volitional ventriloquism may be used only after that failure has been shown; it should not replace the argument.

## 22. Hostile Witnesses: The Human “I” and Epistemic Saturation

If §19 is correct, two patterns should appear when the system is pressed. First, careful theologians should describe a real human “I” in everything but name. Second, historical accounts should weaken some part of the human life rather than revise the fixed person-count. Both patterns appear in the record.

Exhibit A: the psychological “I.” Modern Catholic Christology has often responded to these questions by affirming a genuinely human psychological subject in Christ. Galot distinguishes the human psychological ego—the lived human “I”—from the ontological person, meaning the one metaphysical subject. Weinandy speaks of a genuinely human “I” of the divine Son. Other two-consciousness accounts also affirm human self-awareness with its own lived standpoint. These proposals concede the main point of Part III: there is a real human first-person life in Christ.

Only the word person is withheld, and the reason is the person-count fixed in advance. The proposal then faces a simple fork. If the human “I” really refers to a human psychological subject, §16’s conclusion has been granted. If that “I” is simply identical

with the eternal omniscient Son, the problem returns: the same subject must be both essentially omniscient and genuinely limited, dependent, and hopeful.

A third answer fares no better. If the human words are directly the words of the divine person, the saving acts have no immediate human owner. The two-level “I” proposal therefore does not escape the Retraction Question. It comes close to conceding the human person while refusing the name.

Exhibit B: epistemic saturation. The term means that Christ’s human mind is said to possess such complete knowledge from above that ordinary human learning and dependence risk becoming secondary. Aquinas attributes beatific, infused, and acquired knowledge to Christ’s human soul (ST III, qq. 9–12). He does not abolish human intellectual activity. He includes acquired knowledge so the natural human intellect truly operates, and he allows real increase in that knowledge.

The pressure comes from the order of the account. Acquired growth occurs in a soul that already possesses beatific and infused knowledge from conception. Aquinas therefore denies theological faith and theological hope for a beatitude already possessed, although he allows hope for what Christ had not yet received, such as bodily glorification (ST III, q. 7, aa. 3–4).

The earlier anti-Agnoetae tradition shows a similar pressure. Gregory the Great resists a straightforward reading of Christ’s ignorance in Mark 13:32. He reads the saying as non-disclosure and distinguishes what Christ knew in the humanity from what he knew from the humanity—that is, knowledge present in the human soul through divine power rather than arising through ordinary human knowing.

The criticism must remain exact. Aquinas does not turn Luke 2:52 into mere appearance, and certainty does not by itself cancel testing. The question is who owns the human life of growth and dependence. Are these features the actual lived standpoint of a human knower, or secondary operations within a mind whose decisive knowledge is already complete?

Not every dyothelite adopts the Thomistic scheme. Many contemporary accounts allow genuinely limited human knowledge, and much modern Catholic theology has moved away from the older comprehensive-knowledge model. That movement itself shows how serious the pressure has become, even while the one-person structure remains unchanged.

This is the argument documented from within the tradition. The problem described in §21 is not limited to careless popular explanations. At the scholastic level the same pattern appears: full humanity is affirmed in the definition, then qualified in the explanation when it threatens the one-person structure.

|                     |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
|---------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>[Documented]</b> | <b>When pressure arises, the classical system has often qualified Christ’s human faith, hope, ignorance, or growth rather than reconsider the person-count fixed in advance. The historical record therefore supports the structural diagnosis in §19.</b> |
|---------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

## PART V — THE ONENESS INCARNATIONAL ARCHITECTURE

*How divine source and genuine human personhood are preserved without an eternal second Son-person*

Part V has a limited purpose. It is not a second full treatise. It simply shows that the qualities already established can fit together in a coherent Oneness account. This matters because the dyothelite refusal cannot then be excused as a problem every Christological model must share.

### 23. God's Self-Expression Realized as the Human Son

The Oneness account begins with one divine personal subject: God. God's Word is his own wisdom, purpose, and self-expression, not a second eternal mind standing beside him. The Word becomes flesh when God's self-expression is realized as a true human life.

The Son is therefore not an eternal divine person who later acquires human faculties. Sonship is the incarnate identity brought forth through the Holy Spirit. The man is truly Son because his whole life comes from God, is directed toward God, reveals God, and fulfills God's saving purpose. The Father is the source; the Son is the true human realization and revelation of that source.

This does not reduce Jesus to an ordinary creature-agent outside God's saving self-manifestation. The man is God's image, exact representation, embodied Word, and manifestation. His divine identity comes from God's own source and self-expression. His human identity belongs to the actual man who lives in history. God is truly present and known in him without a second eternal Son-consciousness replacing the man's human consciousness.

**God is truly present in the human Son, but the Son is not another eternal divine person. God's own self-expression is realized as the real human person who reveals and obeys him.**

### 24. Divine Grounding Without Psychological Override

Two questions must be kept separate. What does God provide? God gives the man existence, sustains his life and capacities, establishes his holy origin, gives his mission, reveals the saving purpose, anoints him, and supplies power. What does the man do? He understands, values, intends, trusts, obeys, and offers himself through his own human mind, affections, and will.

God can enable without replacing. Revelation can teach the man without placing an omniscient mind inside him. The Spirit can empower without becoming the one who thinks and chooses. God can preserve Jesus in holiness without manipulating his deliberation. God can guarantee his saving purpose without turning the human acts into controlled outputs. None of these divine actions is the same act as the man's understanding, trust, consent, obedience, or self-offering.

**SUSTAINING IS NOT OPERATING: God is the continuous and indispensable source of the man's existence and power. The man is still the immediate—the proximate—thinker and chooser. Dependence tells us where the agent and his power come from. Ownership tells us who understands, intends, trusts, and acts.**

The main contrast is not certainty against freedom, God's causality against human agency, or dependence against personhood. It is human action against bypass. An act can be certain, enabled by God, continually sustained, and providentially ordered while still being the man's act. Human agency is lost only if another subject does the immediate knowing, judging, and willing while the human faculties serve merely as instruments.

This paper does not settle every theory of providence, created freedom, or divine concurrence—the various accounts of how God works with created causes. Its minimum claim is narrower. God's willing and sustaining of Jesus cannot be treated as the same thing as another subject doing Jesus' human thinking and choosing. The grounding-versus-performing distinction helps only if there is a real human subject whose acts God sustains. It cannot rescue a model that denies the human owner from the start.

[AN/RN]

**The source and constitution of the saving man are divine; the lived enactment of saving obedience is genuinely human. Divine grounding does not entail psychological override.**

## 25. Derived Intent and Genuine Human Ownership

A purpose can come from God and still become the man's own purpose. The Father gives Jesus his mission, doctrine, works, and authority. Jesus then receives that mission as the governing purpose of his human life: he desires to do the will of the one who sent him, lays down his life, sets his face toward the appointed end, and finishes the work.

This is what the paper means by derived intent. God supplies the content, authority, and final purpose. The man receives that purpose through revelation, vocation, and the Spirit. He understands it, judges God faithful, makes it his own intention, and acts through his human body. Two questions must remain separate. Who gives and authorizes the saving purpose? God. Who understands it under human conditions, embraces it, and consents to obey? The man. The purpose depends on God for its source but truly belongs to the man in his human action.

The point is familiar. A servant may receive a command and make obedience his own intention. A son may receive a family calling and freely embrace it. God may sustain the

person's existence and power to act without becoming the person's immediate chooser. Dependence does not make someone an instrument. Instrumentalization begins when the person's own understanding, judgment, and consent are bypassed, controlled, or replaced.

**The Father originates the saving intent; the human Son receives, understands, embraces, and performs it. The intent is derivative in order and genuinely his in enactment.**

[AN/RN]

**True personhood requires personal appropriation of intent, not independent origination of intent.**

## PART VI — THE COMPLETED SAVING ACT

*Why the sacrifice and resurrection require the entire architecture*

### 26. The Sacrifice Must Be Personally Offered

*Christ “through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God” (Hebrews 9:14). “Lo, I come... to do thy will, O God” (Hebrews 10:7). See also John 10:17–18; Ephesians 5:2; Hebrews 5:7–9; 10:5–14.*

The argument now returns to the blood with which it began. The saving death is not redemptive merely because blood is present, the victim is innocent, or a divine subject stands behind the event. It is redemptive because it completes the life of the qualified man: the true representative who knowingly, willingly, faithfully, and as priest offers himself to God.

Self-offering is a first-person act. Another subject can offer me, but not in the same sense that I offer myself. If the eternal divine Son is the only true personal subject, then the human life is offered as something he possesses. Hebrews instead presents the tested and obedient Christ as the one who offers himself. The same concrete man must be both the human one offered and the human one who gives himself.

Self-offering also requires human covenantal answerability—the standing of one who can answer for a promise, command, and act. The offerer must know himself as the one commissioned, obligated, tested, and responsible before God. This standing truly belongs to the man, although God wholly constitutes, authorizes, and sustains it. Without that human self-awareness, the humanity supplies blood and mortality but not the answerable man who knowingly gives himself.

The sacrifice gathers every earlier requirement, including §8A. Blood has no saving power as an isolated substance. It is saving as the blood knowingly offered by the human believer and obeyer whose trust gives the suffering its covenantal meaning. The blood is human. The man represents humanity. His life is holy. His obedience is tested. His faith

is real. He embraces the mission. His death is voluntary. His identity comes from God and reveals God. Remove the human owner, and the account becomes divine agency using a human victim.

|                |                                                                                                                                                                                          |
|----------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>[CN/RN]</b> | <b>The redemptive sacrifice is the personally owned self-offering of the divinely sourced, righteous human Son—not merely the death of human material possessed by a divine subject.</b> |
|----------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

## 27. Resurrection and Divine Vindication

*God “raised him up, having loosed the pains of death” (Acts 2:24). He was “raised again for our justification” (Romans 4:25). See also Acts 2:32–36; 13:30–39; Romans 1:3–4; 1 Corinthians 15:12–23; Hebrews 5:7; 7:16, 24–25.*

Death alone does not complete the saving work. Resurrection is God’s vindication of the righteous man, the defeat of death within representative humanity, and the beginning of the new human order. The one who trusted God through suffering is answered. The one who offered himself is received. The one who entered death is raised to incorruptible life.

The same order of dependence remains. Jesus does not vindicate himself as an independent human agent. Nor is resurrection merely an eternal Son resuming visible activity after leaving a body. God raises the man and declares him Lord and Christ within the completed saving economy. God remains the source, and the man is truly vindicated.

Resurrection also shows that the humanity is not a temporary tool. The same human person who learns, obeys, suffers, and dies is vindicated and exalted. Redemption gives us a living human mediator and representative head, not merely a finished episode in the history of a divine person.

|             |                                                                                                                                         |
|-------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>[RN]</b> | <b>Resurrection vindicates and perpetuates the same genuinely human personal identity that enacted the obedience and self-offering.</b> |
|-------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

## 28. Comparative Explanatory Tests

| <b>Test</b>     | <b>Question</b>                                                                                                                                    |
|-----------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Human origin    | Is Jesus’ humanity genuinely from the Holy Spirit and constituted as Son, image, and representation—or merely assumed by a preexistent Son-person? |
| Human knowledge | Who grows, learns, receives revelation, and says “I do not                                                                                         |

|                                              |                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
|----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                              | know”?                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| Human faith                                  | Who personally trusts God and commits himself to God’s judgment?                                                                                                                                    |
| Human will                                   | For whom is the human will literally “my will”?                                                                                                                                                     |
| Human obedience                              | Who knows himself as commanded and personally aligns his will with God?                                                                                                                             |
| Temptation                                   | Who experiences the pressure and owns the faithful response?                                                                                                                                        |
| Self-offering                                | Who is the human self in “offered himself”?                                                                                                                                                         |
| Person count                                 | Does the model preserve human someonehood without introducing a preexistent divine Son plus a separate human Jesus?                                                                                 |
| Divine manifestation                         | Is God’s own self-expression truly realized in the man, or is the man a nature possessed by another divine person?                                                                                  |
| Source dependence                            | Can the model distinguish dependence of origin and intent from absence of personhood?                                                                                                               |
| <b>Divine sustenance and human operation</b> | Does the model distinguish God’s willing, constituting, sustaining, revealing, empowering, and preserving from operating, controlling, manipulating, or forcing the man’s human intellect and will? |

A model should not be judged merely by whether it can repeat every biblical statement. Almost any system can add the phrase “according to humanity.” A better model explains why the statements are literally true, identifies who owns the acts, preserves God as the source of the man, and avoids multiplying independent subjects.

The Oneness account has an advantage at the point where standard dyothelitism is most constrained. It does not begin with an eternal Son-person whose personal identity is complete before the Incarnation. It therefore does not need to deny the man’s personhood in order to keep one Christ. The Son is the incarnate human person—the true image and self-expression of the one God.

## 29. Final Synthesis

The argument began with remission and worked backward. Remission requires the sacrifice God ordained. Sacrifice requires real blood and death. Redemptive death requires a true human representative. That representative must be holy and positively righteous. Scripture presents God himself as providing the man through his own self-expression. Righteousness requires enacted obedience. The body’s hunger, exhaustion, temptation, suffering, and death receive saving meaning only through faith and submission lived within the human life. Obedience requires a human mind and will.

Faith requires a human believer who knows he depends on God. Self-offering requires the man to own the life he gives.

These requirements culminate in real human personhood. This person is not independent in origin, existence, mission, authority, knowledge, power, or final purpose. Jesus comes from the Holy Spirit. He is the image of the invisible God and the exact representation of God's reality. God sends him, teaches him, empowers him, and raises him. His whole identity depends on the divine source.

Dependence, however, is not displacement. The man receives the mission and truly intends it. He receives revelation and truly knows it. He receives power and truly acts. God continually sustains him, but sustaining is not understanding, trusting, choosing, or obeying. The man performs those human acts. He is God's own self-expression and truly lives as man. This is personhood without independence from God and agency without control by another subject.

Standard dyothelite Christology affirms the required human parts, but its prior commitment to an eternal Son-person prevents it from acknowledging the human person those parts describe. A human person would appear to create two subjects in Christ and another personal subject beyond the Trinity. The system therefore reserves personhood for the eternal Son and places the whole human life inside a nonpersonal nature. When pressed, it changes the qualifier—"humanly," "according to the humanity," or "through the human will"—without identifying the human someone whose life is being described.

The final demand is simple. Dyothelitism has already signed every premise through its councils and standard doctrines, but it refuses the conclusion. The only barrier is a person-count fixed before the Incarnation is examined. The Retraction Question in §16 therefore remains: Either withdraw one of the human concessions and state the cost, or accept the human someone those concessions describe.

**Final thesis: The Incarnation brings forth a real human person who is wholly dependent on God. God wills and sustains the Son's existence and mission, while the Son personally knows, trusts, obeys, suffers, offers himself, and is raised. Classical dyothelitism affirms every human quality that leads to this conclusion but refuses the conclusion itself. A Christology that keeps the human faculties while denying the man his own first-person identity preserves the parts of humanity while losing the human someone redemption requires.**

**Final prosecutorial question: Which affirmed quality of Christ's humanity must be made less than personally real in order to keep the eternal Son as the only who?**

## **Appendix A — Scripture Matrix**

*Key passages arranged by the quality they establish*

| Necessary quality                          | Principal texts                                                                                           |
|--------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Blood and remission                        | Leviticus 17:11; Matthew 26:28; Hebrews 9:11–14, 22; 10:4–14; 1 Peter 1:18–19                             |
| True human kinship                         | Genesis 3:15; Romans 1:3; 5:12–21; Galatians 4:4–5; Hebrews 2:10–18; 1 Timothy 2:5                        |
| Holiness and righteousness                 | Isaiah 53:9–11; John 8:29, 46; Hebrews 4:15; 7:26; 9:14; 1 Peter 2:22                                     |
| Divine provision of the redeemer           | Genesis 22:8; Psalm 49:7; Isaiah 59:16; 63:5; John 1:14; Acts 20:28                                       |
| Divine source of the man                   | Matthew 1:18, 20; Luke 1:35; Galatians 4:4; John 1:14                                                     |
| Image and exact representation             | Colossians 1:15; 2 Corinthians 4:4–6; Hebrews 1:3; John 14:9                                              |
| Human growth and learning                  | Isaiah 7:15–16; 50:4–5; Luke 2:40, 46–52; Hebrews 5:8                                                     |
| Received knowledge and words               | John 5:19–20, 30; 7:16; 8:28; 12:49–50; 17:7–8                                                            |
| Human ignorance                            | Mark 13:32; Matthew 24:36                                                                                 |
| Prayer and dependence                      | Matthew 26:36–44; Luke 22:41–44; Hebrews 5:7                                                              |
| Faith and trust                            | Psalm 22; Isaiah 8:17–18; Hebrews 2:13; 1 Peter 2:23; Luke 23:46                                          |
| Faithful submission under human conditions | Romans 5:18–19; 14:23; Matthew 4:1–11; 26:36–46; Hebrews 2:13, 18; 4:15; 5:7–9; 9:14; 10:5–10; 11:6; 12:2 |
| Human will and submission                  | John 4:34; 5:30; 6:38; Matthew 26:39; Hebrews 10:5–10                                                     |
| Temptation and suffering                   | Matthew 4:1–11; Hebrews 2:18; 4:15; 5:7–9                                                                 |
| Voluntary self-offering                    | John 10:17–18; Ephesians 5:2; Hebrews 9:14; 10:5–14                                                       |
| Resurrection and vindication               | Acts 2:24, 32–36; 13:30–39; Romans 1:3–4; 4:25; 1 Corinthians 15:12–23                                    |

## Appendix B — Questions a Dyothelite Account Must Answer

1. When Jesus says “I,” what concrete reality is the referent: the eternal divine Son, the human existence, or both without distinction?

2. If the eternal Son is the sole referent, how can that subject literally have faith in God, receive divine knowledge, or depend upon divine power?
3. If the human life is the immediate “I” of the limited knowledge and dependent will, what prevents it from being a real human person in the psychological sense?
4. What does it mean for a nonpersonal nature to possess consciousness when the only conscious who is the eternal Son?
5. How does saying “the Son acts through the human nature” differ from assigning human faculties to a divine operator?
6. For whom is the will in Gethsemane personally “my will”?
7. Who learned obedience in Hebrews 5:8: an eternal divine person, a human nature, or the human Son?
8. Can a nature trust, pray, and offer itself, or do those predicates require a someone?
9. Does saying “according to the humanity” explain who lives the limited human experience, or does it merely sort the statements into two categories?
10. How can Jesus’ human ignorance be personally real if the only subject of that ignorance eternally knows the answer?
11. Why does the model refuse to call the complete human first-person life a person? Is the refusal scripturally derived or required by the prior count of Trinitarian persons?
12. Would acknowledging a human personal subject create a fourth personal subject in the total ontology? If so, does that structural concern control the interpretation of the human texts?
13. How is the humanity more than metaphysical equipment added to an already complete eternal Son-person?
14. In what sense did the man offer himself if the eternal Son is the only personal owner of both the offering act and the human victim?
15. If the faith and trust do not arise within Christ’s human first-person life under hunger, exhaustion, temptation, sorrow, and mortality, what gives those physical conditions any redemptive meaning?
16. If no concession recorded in §16 is retracted, what—other than the antecedent count of persons—blocks the conclusion that the human life of Christ is a genuinely human someone?
17. Does the model distinguish God’s willing and sustaining of Jesus from doing Jesus’ human thinking and choosing? If so, who is the proximate human knower, believer, and obeyer?
18. Why is a Oneness account—God’s own self-expression realized as the human Son—not a better explanation of divine manifestation together with genuine human personhood?

## Appendix C — The Retraction Menu

*Appendix C restates the Retraction Question from §16 in table form. Each row names a quality dyothelitism affirms, shows how that quality may be weakened without openly denying it, and states what is lost. The final column gives the historical label where one applies. It distinguishes formally condemned doctrines from costs the tradition has accepted or reclassified.*

| Conceded quality             | Disguised retraction                                                                                            | What collapses                                                                                  | Historical name                                                  |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| True blood and death         | The death occurs in a human body, but the only personal owner remains the impassible eternal Son.               | No actual sacrifice; remission fails (Hebrews 9:22).                                            | Docetism.                                                        |
| Human kinship                | “Consubstantial with us” is reduced to having human components without a human owner.                           | No representative; the unassumed is unhealed.                                                   | Docetism.                                                        |
| Rational human soul and mind | Knowledge housed in a faculty while the eternal Son is the only knower.                                         | No human knower; the human mind is personal only because a divine subject owns it.              | Apollinarianism (condemned 381).                                 |
| Natural human will           | The human will is operated by the eternal Son as the sole subject—human in type, but not in personal ownership. | No human submission; Gethsemane is staged.                                                      | Monothelitism (condemned 681).                                   |
| Sinlessness                  | —                                                                                                               | The victim himself requires redemption.                                                         | —                                                                |
| Positive righteousness       | Righteousness credited to a body rather than enacted by the man.                                                | Romans 5:19 loses the obedience performed by the one man; covenant fulfillment becomes unclear. | —                                                                |
| Real ignorance and growth    | The omniscient subject lacks information only in one human faculty; acquired growth remains a lower track       | Luke 2:52 and Mark 13:32 no longer describe Jesus’ actual lived human standpoint.               | Anti-Agnoetae ruling; scholastic “epistemic saturation,” meaning |

|                                      |                                                                                                                               |                                                                                                                                                 |                                                                                               |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                      | beneath already complete knowledge.                                                                                           |                                                                                                                                                 | knowledge already complete from above (ST III.9–12).                                          |
| Faith and trust                      | Dependence is assigned to the human nature while the sole person remains self-sufficient; theological faith is denied.        | Hebrews 2:13 loses a genuinely dependent human believer.                                                                                        | Aquinas, ST III.7.3–4 (faith and hope denied).                                                |
| Human faith and submission           | Trust is assigned to the human nature, but the eternal divine subject remains the personal source of the judgment and choice. | Flesh, blood, hunger, exhaustion, temptation, suffering, and death remain passive conditions without a human believer and obeyer to unite them. | Agency displacement; the human life is real in its parts but lacks its own personal center.   |
| Real temptation                      | The pressure occurs in human nature while the sole personal subject stands above the condition.                               | Hebrews 4:15 becomes staged rather than a genuinely tested human fidelity.                                                                      | Psychological docetism.                                                                       |
| Human consciousness or ego           | The human ego is treated only as the eternal Son's human mode of awareness.                                                   | The human someone is conceded in reality and denied only in name.                                                                               | The two-level "I" (§22).                                                                      |
| The human someone                    | Every human claim is qualified—"humanly," "as man," or "through the nature"—without naming the human owner.                   | All the human qualities become statements without a clear human someone who lives them.                                                         | The standing dyothelite refusal.                                                              |
| Human agency under divine dependence | God's willing and sustaining of the man is treated as though it were the same thing as doing the man's thinking and choosing. | Dependence becomes control; faith, obedience, and self-offering cease to be the man's acts even though the faculties remain human.              | Category error: confusing God's grounding of the agent with the agent's own immediate action. |

**Reading rule: An answer may keep the human word while weakening the human reality. If the quality becomes only an impersonal faculty or a divine subject's human-mode act, it has been affirmed verbally but withdrawn in the explanation.**

**Some rows in this menu name positions the classical tradition formally**

**condemned. Others name costs it has accepted or reclassified. The consistent choices are simple: openly withdraw a human concession and accept the cost, or accept the human someone those concessions describe.**

## **Closing Formulation**

**The issue is not whether dyothelitism can place a human mind and will in Christ. It can. The issue is whether those realities belong to a real human someone. God may will, create, and sustain the man without doing the man's thinking and choosing for him. Redemption requires a human Son who receives God's purpose, trusts, obeys, suffers, and offers himself. He is wholly dependent on God, yet the saving acts are truly his. This is the Son Scripture presents and the conclusion the classical concessions already imply.**