

## Editorial

The theme topic of this issue of *Historicism* is presented by Dr. A. L. Moore in his paper entitled, "The Humanity of Christ."

The early Christian church formulated its position on the nature of Christ primarily at the councils of Nicea (A.D. 325) and Chalcedon (A.D. 451). The Nicene creed says in part: "[We believe] in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, . . . who for us men and for our salvation came down from the heavens, . . . and became man, . . ." (Henry Bettenson, *Documents of the Christian Church*, 2nd ed. [London: Oxford University Press, 1963], p. 58). At Chalcedon the same positions were maintained and clarified: ". . . we all with one accord teach men to acknowledge one and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, at once complete in Godhead and complete in manhood, truly God and truly man, . . . of one substance [*homoousios*] with the Father as regards his Godhead, and at the same time of one substance with us as regards his manhood; like us in all respects, apart from sin; . . ." (ibid., p. 73).

The more intently one studies the two aspects of Christ's one divine-human nature the more they are seen to defy intuition. It is difficult, for example, to imagine the Son of the infinite God as an infant asleep at His mother's breast. But when we accept that Mary's baby really was just that, it becomes equally difficult to imagine how He could lower Himself so completely as to become one with those He has created. It seems somehow discourteous not to protect Him from full union with the fallen race. But until the issues are joined this directly, this paradoxically, their true force remains obscured.

It would be much easier to imagine a demigod who approximates humanity and approximates divinity. But this is not the claim. Christ was at once fully God and fully man. As Ellen G. White has stated, "Christ did not make believe take human nature; he did verily take it" (*Review and Herald*, April 5, 1906). He was the Son of David as well as the Son of God, the Son of Abraham as well as the Son of Adam. And "like every child of Adam He accepted the working of the great law of heredity" (*Desire of Ages*, p. 49). Christ was not almost God and almost man. He was both, completely, in a plenary sense.

Moore's paper is a strong defense of Christ's complete manhood. As such, what he says must be considered a defense of the best of the classic christological positions taken by the early church at such councils as Nicea and Chalcedon.

Next time our theme topic will be Dan 10.

Frank W. Hardy  
Editor