The Integrated Hypostatic Union Model:

Addressing Christological Coherence

A Proposal for a Unified Framework in Understanding &

Navigating the   Dual Natures of Christ through Kenosis and Selective Communication

D. Gene Williams Jr., PhD

Defend the Word Ministries

NorthPointe Church

ABSTRACT

This paper introduces the Integrated Hypostatic Union Model (IHUM), a framework for understanding the dual natures of Christ as fully divine and fully human—what the early Church Fathers referred to as theanthropos (God-man)—grounded in the Chalcedonian Definition. The IHUM offers a fresh approach to resolving challenges related to the Hypostatic Union by integrating two key concepts: Kenosis (self-emptying) and Selective Communication. Kenosis in the IHUM refers to Christ's voluntary limitation of certain divine attributes during the Incarnation, while Selective Communication emphasizes Christ's strategic choice in revealing or concealing knowledge according to His divine mission.

This model engages with historical Christological heresies, contemporary models, and scriptural exegesis to present a solution to the issue of how Christ's two natures coexist in one person. Additionally, the IHUM provides a more precise distinction between Christ's divine and human natures, avoiding potential pitfalls such as over-integration seen in other models like the Perichoretic Model. Through this framework, the IHUM seeks to maintain the full integrity of Christ's divinity and humanity without falling into dualism or diminishing either nature. The IHUM offers significant implications for theological education, pastoral care, and interfaith dialogue, providing a robust Christological model that upholds orthodox doctrine while addressing contemporary challenges.

I. INTRODUCTION

The doctrine of the Hypostatic Union, formalized at the Council of Chalcedon in AD 451, asserts that Jesus Christ exists as one person with two complete and distinct natures—fully divine and fully human. The Chalcedonian Definition clarified that these natures coexist without confusion, change, division, or separation, preserving the integrity of both natures while maintaining Christ's singular personhood. However, despite the importance of this doctrine, the question of how two distinct natures interact within one person has continued to generate theological challenges. How can Christ possess both the infinite attributes of divinity and the finite attributes of humanity without one nature overpowering or diminishing the other?[1]

The IHUM seeks to clarify and expand on traditional Christological formulations by emphasizing two key concepts: Kenosis and Selective Communication. In this model, Kenosis refers to Christ's voluntary self-limitation during the Incarnation, where He refrained from fully exercising certain divine attributes, such as omniscience and omnipotence, while still retaining them.[2] This is not a loss of divinity but a purposeful concealment for the sake of His human experience and mission. Selective Communication further explains how Christ, though fully omniscient and omnipotent in His divine nature, chose to reveal divine knowledge and power in a manner consistent

---

[1] Council of Chalcedon, *Definition of Faith*, in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, ed. Philip Schaff, Vol. 14, trans. Henry Wace and William Bright (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1994), 258-59.

[2] Philippians 2:7. All biblical references are taken from the *English Standard Version* (ESV), unless otherwise noted.

with His human limitations, thereby fully participating in the human condition while remaining the eternal Logos.[3]

The IHUM addresses the challenges posed by earlier Christological models, such as Nestorianism (which divided Christ's person into two), Monophysitism (which merged the two natures into one), and Apollinarianism (which denied the completeness of Christ's humanity by asserting that the Logos replaced His rational soul). By contrast, the IHUM offers a coherent explanation of how Christ's divine and human natures coexist in a single person, avoiding the extremes of either dualism or reductionism.[4]

Additionally, the IHUM emphasizes that the Divine Logos, existing outside of time in the *'Eternal Now,'*[5] has always possessed the full experience of both divine and human natures. This understanding eliminates the notion that Christ, in His divine nature, gained anything new through the Incarnation. The Incarnation is therefore not an event where the Logos experiences something unfamiliar, but one undertaken solely for the purpose of humanity's salvation. The Logos, having eternally comprehended human nature, entered into time to manifest the redemption already known within His divine consciousness. IHUM frames this in such a way that Christ's unified consciousness does not imply any development or change in the Logos but rather manifests a timeless reality within the created world.

---

[3] For a detailed discussion of Selective Communication within the framework of Christ's omniscience, see J.P. Moreland and William Lane Craig, *Philosophical Foundations for a Christian Worldview* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2003), 606-609.

[4] J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, 5th ed. (London: Continuum, 2006), 324-26; Richard A. Norris, Jr., *The Christological Controversy* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980), 102-107.

[5] D. Gene Williams Jr., *B-Theory of Time: A Defense of God's Eternal Now in Christian Theology*, accessed March 2025, https://triinitysem.academia.edu/GeneWilliamsJr; https://defendtheword.com/insights-and-studies.html.

Unified Divine-Human Consciousness and Non-Propositional Knowledge:

The IHUM asserts that the Logos's consciousness is not merely divine but divine-human, having eternally possessed non-propositional knowledge of humanity due to the Eternal Now. This means that the Logos has always comprehended the full reality of human experiences—not merely in a propositional or abstract sense, but directly and experientially. By affirming that the Logos's consciousness is that of the Theanthropos, IHUM clarifies that Jesus was never merely human but always the God-man.

Furthermore, the distinction between the persons of the Trinity is rooted in non-propositional knowledge unique to each person. This form of knowledge transcends mere propositional facts and reflects the relational depth and distinct self-awareness within the Trinity. By affirming this, IHUM preserves the unity of the divine essence while explaining how the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit relate distinctly yet inseparably.[6]

This paper will demonstrate the coherence of the IHUM through rigorous scriptural exegesis, historical theology, and philosophical reasoning, aligning with Chalcedonian orthodoxy while addressing contemporary theological concerns. Additionally, the IHUM's implications for pastoral care and ecclesial unity will be explored, highlighting its relevance for modern Christological discussions.

---

[6] D. Gene Williams Jr., *A Defense of the Trinity: The Foundation Without Which There Is No Christianity,* accessed March 2025, https://triinitysem.academia.edu/GeneWilliamsJr; https://defendtheword.com/insights-and-studies.html.

II. SCRIPTURAL FOUNDATIONS FOR THE INTEGRATED HYPOSTATIC UNION MODEL

The Integrated Hypostatic Union Model (IHUM) is firmly grounded in key scriptural passages that affirm both the full divinity and full humanity of Christ. Central to the biblical witness is John 1:1-14, where the Logos is described as both with God and being God, and yet later *"became flesh and dwelt among us."* This passage is essential to understanding the Incarnation, as it asserts that the divine Word did not lose His divinity but took on human nature without confusion or change. The term *"became flesh"* (ἐγένετο σὰρξ) expresses the full reality of Christ's human experience without compromising His divinity.[7]

Another foundational passage is Philippians 2:5-11, which describes Christ's Kenosis—His self-emptying. Here, Paul explains that Christ, though in the form of God, did not count equality with God as something to be exploited, but *"emptied Himself"* by taking the form of a servant and being born in the likeness of men. The concept of Kenosis is critical to the IHUM, as it underscores the voluntary self-limitation Christ undertook during the Incarnation. This passage does not imply a subtraction of divinity, but rather a strategic self-restraint, where Christ chose not to exercise certain divine attributes fully during His earthly ministry.[8]

The full humanity of Christ is further emphasized in Hebrews 2:14-18, where the author stresses that Christ *"had to be made like his brothers in every respect"* to become

---

[7] C.F.D. Moule, *The Birth of the New Testament*, 3rd ed. (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1981), 89-91.

[8] Gerald F. Hawthorne, *The Presence and the Power: The Significance of the Holy Spirit in the Life and Ministry of Jesus* (Dallas: Word Publishing, 1991), 182-85.

a merciful and faithful high priest. This text highlights that Christ's humanity was complete, and that His experience of human suffering and temptation was genuine. By engaging with human limitations in time, Christ manifested His eternal knowledge of the human condition without gaining any new experiential knowledge, as the Divine Logos already possesses this knowledge in the Eternal Now. The *"Eternal Now"* refers to the understanding that God exists outside of time, perceiving all of history—past, present, and future—in a single, eternal act. Thus, while Christ, in His human nature, experienced time sequentially, His divine nature remained fully omniscient, existing beyond time.

Each of these passages underscores different dimensions of Christ's dual nature and supports the key components of the IHUM—Kenosis and Selective Communication. Together, they provide a coherent scriptural basis for the understanding that Christ's divine and human natures coexist without compromising the completeness of either.

III. THE CHALCEDONIAN DEFINITION AND THE INTEGRATED HYPOSTATIC UNION MODEL (IHUM)

The Council of Chalcedon, convened in AD 451, provided one of the most definitive statements on Christology, known as the Chalcedonian Definition. It affirms that Jesus Christ is one person (hypostasis) with two distinct and complete natures—divine and human—without confusion, change, division, or separation.[9] The Integrated Hypostatic Union Model (IHUM) is directly aligned with this orthodox Christological foundation but introduces key elements that address unaddressed issues inherent in traditional formulations. These tensions, particularly concerning how Christ's two natures

---

[9] Chalcedonian Definition, *Acts of the Council of Chalcedon*, 451 AD..

coexist without leading to duality or diminishing the fullness of either nature, are central to the discussion.

The IHUM goes beyond the Chalcedonian framework by incorporating the concepts of Kenosis and Selective Communication. Kenosis, as discussed earlier, involves Christ's voluntary limitation of the exercise of certain divine attributes. The IHUM posits that this self-limitation was not an ontological reduction of His divine nature, but a functional restriction designed to facilitate genuine human experiences. Christ's divinity was never diminished; rather, His human experiences were allowed to operate without the full expression of certain divine prerogatives.[10]

Moreover, Selective Communication serves as a crucial component of IHUM, wherein Christ's divine and human knowledge are harmonized without violating the unity of His person. This concept helps explain passages such as Mark 13:32, where Christ declares that He does not know the day or hour of His return. The IHUM posits that Christ's human nature operated within the constraints of human knowledge, while His divine nature, from the perspective of the Eternal Now, always retained full omniscience. Thus, Christ did not gain any new experiential knowledge but manifested it within the limitations of time. This selective withholding of divine knowledge in certain contexts serves as a pedagogical tool for communicating with humanity, with the Divine Logos manifesting His eternal knowledge in ways that would be comprehensible and relatable.[11]

---

[10] Thomas G. Weinandy, *Does God Suffer?* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000), 137-39.

[11] John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, ed. John T. McNeill (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960), 2.12.1.

The IHUM, therefore, builds on the Chalcedonian Definition by integrating these nuanced concepts to resolve lingering theological tensions. Specifically, it upholds the unity of Christ's person while safeguarding the distinctiveness of His two natures. This model directly counters historical heresies such as Nestorianism, which falsely divides Christ's natures into two persons, and Apollinarianism, which undermines the completeness of Christ's human nature by positing that the Logos replaced the rational human soul.[12]

By affirming both the fullness of Christ's humanity and the integrity of His divinity, the IHUM presents a more cohesive and comprehensive understanding of the Hypostatic Union, providing clarity where traditional models left persistent difficulties.

The Chalcedonian Definition and Its Gaps in Addressing Consciousness

As established earlier, the Chalcedonian Definition provides a foundational framework for understanding the two natures of Christ. However, this section will now address the philosophical and psychological gaps left by Chalcedon, particularly concerning the interaction between Christ's divine and human consciousness. While Chalcedon affirms the unity of personhood and the distinction of natures, it does not explicitly address how these two natures coexist cognitively within one person.[13] Gregory of Nyssa addressed the complexity of these theological issues in his defense of Nicene orthodoxy, but even he did not fully resolve the question of how these two natures engage cognitively within Christ[14]

---

[12] J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, 293-97.

[13] J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, 289-290.

[14] Gregory of Nyssa, *Against Eunomius*, in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers: Second Series*, Vol. 5, ed. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1893), 35-89.

Chalcedon asserts the integrity of both natures without specifying how they interact cognitively or consciously within the one person of Christ. This leaves open the question of how the human consciousness of Jesus—His growth in wisdom, understanding, and experience—relates to His divine omniscience. The Chalcedonian model does not provide a framework for understanding how Christ's divine mind and human mind coexist within a single person, which modern philosophical Christology has sought to address.

The Integrated Hypostatic Union Model's Contribution

The Integrated Hypostatic Union Model (IHUM), while affirming the Chalcedonian distinction of two natures in one person, addresses this gap by introducing the concept of Selective Communication and the Unified Consciousness model. Unlike models that propose a subliminal influence, such as William Lane Craig's Reformulated Apollinarianism, IHUM posits that Christ's divine and human minds are fully integrated within a single, unified consciousness. This unified consciousness ensures that Christ experiences genuine human limitations and development while maintaining divine omniscience, without compartmentalizing or separating the two minds.

IHUM does not merge or confuse the divine and human natures but provides a more detailed explanation of how Christ's divine mind operates in harmony with His human consciousness. Rather than proposing that the divine mind functions as a subliminal guide—hidden from the human mind—IHUM holds that Christ's unified consciousness allows for full access to both minds simultaneously. This preserves the integrity of Christ's human experience while affirming His divinity, without reducing one nature to a passive or unconscious influence.

Avoiding the Pitfalls of Merging Unexplained Elements

By addressing these unexplored areas of consciousness, IHUM avoids the risk of merging or blending the two natures in ways not intended by Chalcedon. Instead, it expands the theological and philosophical understanding of the Hypostatic Union without violating the principles of Chalcedonian orthodoxy. The Unified Consciousness model ensures that while Christ's two natures remain distinct, His divine and human minds operate within one coherent personal experience, where both are fully present and accessible in a harmonious manner.

IV.   **THE INTEGRATED HYPOSTATIC UNION MODEL (IHUM)**

A   **Unified Personhood**

The Integrated Hypostatic Union Model (IHUM) begins by affirming the unified personhood of Jesus Christ, in line with the Chalcedonian Definition's declaration that Christ is one person (*hypostasis*) with two distinct natures—divine and human—fully integrated without confusion or separation.[15] This unity safeguards against dividing Christ into two separate entities or diminishing the completeness of either nature. In IHUM, the divine nature remains fully omniscient, omnipotent, and eternal, while the human nature is complete with all the inherent limitations that characterize human beings—such as hunger, weariness, and suffering.2[16]

IHUM clarifies that these human limitations do not imply any deficiency in Christ's divine nature. Rather, they represent the full integrity of His human experience.

---

[15] J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, 297.

[16] Thomas F. Torrance, *Incarnation: The Person and Life of Christ* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2008), 132–34.

From the perspective of the Eternal Now, the Logos exists outside of time, perceiving all moments of history—past, present, and future—simultaneously.[17] Thus, Christ's divine nature has always possessed full omniscience, even while His human nature experienced time sequentially.[18] This ensures that the divine mind never *"learns"* or *"gains"* new knowledge, preserving God's immutability while fully engaging with the temporal realm through Christ's human nature.[19]

Additionally, middle knowledge provides a nuanced understanding of Christ's omniscience. In the Eternal Now, the Logos not only knows the actual sequence of events within the timeline but also comprehends all potential outcomes across possible worlds.[20] This includes the counterfactual knowledge of what could have occurred under different circumstances, preserving divine omniscience even in the context of human free will. For example, in 1 Samuel 23:10-13, God reveals to David what would happen if he remained in the city of Keilah, even though this scenario never materialized.[21] Such knowledge of potential outcomes demonstrates how Christ's divine nature, through middle knowledge, retained awareness of every possibility without compromising His experience of human limitations.[22]

---

[17] Ibid., 132.

[18] William Lane Craig, *Philosophical Foundations for a Christian Worldview* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2003), 595.

[19] J.P. Moreland and William Lane Craig, *Philosophical Foundations for a Christian Worldview* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2003), 591.

[20] William Lane Craig, *"Middle Knowledge and Divine Foreknowledge,"* in *Philosophical Foundations for a Christian Worldview*, 337–39.

[21] 1 Samuel 23:10-13 (ESV).

[22] William Lane Craig, *The Only Wise God: The Compatibility of Divine Foreknowledge and Human Freedom* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1987), 140.

IHUM ensures that both natures—divine and human—are united in a single, coherent personhood. The human nature experiences the world within the constraints of time and finitude, while the divine nature, existing outside of time, possesses omniscience and eternally comprehends all realities, both actual and potential. This unified approach avoids the error of dividing Christ into two persons while maintaining the integrity of both His natures.[23]

The IHUM asserts that the divine Logos, existing in the Eternal Now, has always possessed the unified consciousness of both the divine and human experiences. The Incarnation did not introduce anything new to the Logos's consciousness, for God does not change or learn.[24] Instead, the full assumption of human nature by the Logos represents the manifestation in time of the eternal knowledge already present in His divine consciousness.[25]

This understanding counters the historical heresy of Nestorianism, which argued for two distinct persons in Christ, one divine and one human.[26] Instead, the IHUM presents Christ's two natures as integrated within a single consciousness, wherein both divine and human experiences are united without diminishing the integrity of either.[27] This provides a coherent framework for how Christ could experience hunger or sorrow (in His human nature) while still upholding the fullness of His divine attributes.[28]

---

[23] Thomas F. Torrance, *Incarnation: The Person and Life of Christ*, 133.

[24] Ibid., 132.

[25] Rowan Williams, *Arius: Heresy and Tradition*, 153.

[26] J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, 297.

[27] Ibid.

[28] Thomas F. Torrance, *Incarnation: The Person and Life of Christ*, 133.

Furthermore, the IHUM addresses the challenge posed by Adoptionism—the heretical view that Jesus was a mere human later *"adopted"* as the Son of God. The IHUM firmly holds that Christ was eternally the Son of God and that His Incarnation did not alter His divine identity but added a fully human nature to His person.[29]

B   Kenosis: A Theological Expansion

The IHUM presents a deeper understanding of Kenosis, as outlined in Philippians 2:5–11, where Christ *"emptied Himself"* (ἐκένωσεν) by assuming the form of a servant without forfeiting His divine nature. Rather than interpreting Kenosis as a relinquishment of divine attributes, the IHUM views it as a deliberate concealment of certain divine powers. This voluntary self-limitation enabled Christ to fully participate in the human experience, embracing the constraints of human existence while preserving the entirety of His divinity.[30][31]

In this model, Kenosis does not imply that Christ ceased to be omniscient or omnipotent but rather that He chose to experience human life from within its natural constraints. This view aligns with classical theism, where God can engage with creation in a relational manner without compromising His immutable and transcendent nature.[32]

Some theologians, such as Hans Urs von Balthasar, have expanded Kenosis to include the Trinitarian life, arguing that the Son's self-emptying reflects an eternal act of

---

[29] Thomas F. Torrance, *Incarnation: The Person and Life of Christ*, 133.

[30] Philippians 2:5–11.

[31] For a deeper discussion of Kenosis in Christology, see Hans Urs von Balthasar, *Mysterium Paschale: The Mystery of Easter*, trans. Aidan Nichols (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1990), 112–14.

[32] Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, I, q.13, a.5, trans. Fathers of the English Dominican Province (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1947).

self-giving within the Godhead.[33] The IHUM, however, confines Kenosis to the Incarnation, suggesting that it was a specific act related to Christ's mission to redeem humanity, rather than a reflection of the internal workings of the Trinity.

C   **Selective Communication and Divine Accommodation**

Building on the previously discussed concept of Selective Communication, this section will explore its alignment with the theological principle of Divine Accommodation. Divine Accommodation, as emphasized by John Calvin, refers to how God communicates His divine truths in ways that align with human understanding. In the context of Christ's earthly ministry, Selective Communication explains how Christ's divine knowledge was adapted to human limitations without compromising His divine nature. This concept helps reconcile passages like Mark 13:32, where Christ, in His human nature, expresses a lack of knowledge about the day or hour of His return, while still retaining omniscience in His divine nature. Selective Communication allows for a harmonious coexistence of Christ's divine and human natures, ensuring that while His human nature experienced limitations, His divine nature remained fully intact and omniscient.

Divine Accommodation, a theological principle emphasized by John Calvin, complements Selective Communication by positing that God adjusts His revelation to the capacities of human understanding. In this case, Christ's human limitations allowed Him to communicate with humanity in a way that was fully relatable, without overwhelming them with divine omniscience.[34] By integrating Selective Communication with Kenosis,

---

[33] Hans Urs von Balthasar, *Theo-Drama: The Person in Christ* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1992), 215-18.

[34] John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, 2.12.1.

the IHUM provides a coherent explanation for how Christ's two natures could coexist without compromising the unity of His personhood or the fullness of either nature.

The Transfiguration as Selective Communication in Action

The Transfiguration (Matthew 17:1–8) vividly illustrates Jesus' selective use of His divine power. In this event, Jesus is transfigured before Peter, James, and John, revealing His divine glory while engaging with Moses and Elijah.[35] From the disciples' perspective, this moment showcased Jesus' fulfillment of the Law and the Prophets.[36] However, when understood through the lens of Selective Communication, the Transfiguration also highlights Jesus' control over temporal boundaries.[37]

By collapsing time, Jesus interacts with Moses and Elijah in their own historical moments, bringing them into the present.[38] This act demonstrates His divine omnitemporality while simultaneously accommodating the disciples' human limitations. They witness a profound moment of divine interaction yet are only shown what they can comprehend. This dual operation of divine omniscience and human accommodation aligns with the IHUM's framework, emphasizing that Christ's divine and human natures function in harmony without confusion or division.

The Transfiguration: A Case Study in Divine Omnitemporality and Kenosis

The Transfiguration (Matthew 17:1–8) exemplifies how Jesus' divine omnitemporality operates within the framework of Kenosis, showcasing the IHUM

---

[35] Matthew 17:1–8 (ESV).

[36] On the Transfiguration as fulfilling the Law and the Prophets, see D.A. Carson, *The Expositor's Bible Commentary: Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984), 385–87.

[37] John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, 1.13.3.

[38] Ibid., 1.14.4.

principle of divine and human natures functioning in harmony.[39] In this event, Jesus

reveals His divine glory to Peter, James, and John while engaging with Moses and Elijah,

figures from distinct historical periods.[40] From a divine perspective, He transcends

temporal boundaries, collapsing time to bring these Old Testament figures into the

present. From a human perspective, Jesus limits the revelation to a form the disciples can

perceive and comprehend, tailoring the experience to their finite capacities.[41]

This dual dynamic is a profound expression of Kenosis, as described in

Philippians 2:6–7: *"Christ did not count equality with God a thing to be grasped, but*

emptied himself, by taking the form of a servant."[42] The Transfiguration demonstrates

this self-emptying in action:

- **Selective Revelation:** Jesus does not fully unveil His divine glory but allows the
  disciples to see only what they can bear (cf. Matthew 17:9).[43] This restraint reflects His
  human limitations while affirming the IHUM's emphasis on the cooperation of His two
  natures.

- **Omnitemporal Engagement:** By bringing Moses and Elijah into the present, Jesus
  exercises His divine attribute of omnitemporality. This act connects the law and the
  prophets (represented by Moses and Elijah, respectively) to the fulfillment of God's
  redemptive plan in Christ.[44]

---

[39] Philippians 2:6–7 (ESV).

[40] Craig S. Keener, *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 456.

[41] Ibid., 457.

[42] Philippians 2:6–7 (ESV).

[43] Matthew 17:9 (ESV).

[44] Keener, *Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*, 457–58.

Theological Implications

- **Kenosis and Divine Sovereignty:** The Transfiguration illustrates that kenosis does not imply a loss of divine attributes but a voluntary, purposeful limitation in their exercise. Jesus remains omnipotent and omnitemporal but exercises these attributes selectively, ensuring that His divine actions are compatible with His human experience.[45]

- **Omnitemporality and the Unity of Scripture:** By interacting with Moses and Elijah, Jesus transcends time to reveal the unity of God's redemptive plan across history. This event underscores the continuity of the Old and New Testaments, with Christ as the unifying center.[46]

- **Accommodation of Human Understanding:** In limiting the scope of His revelation, Jesus demonstrates His commitment to meeting humanity where they are. The disciples witness the event through their human faculties, yet the divine reality extends beyond their comprehension.[47]

Integration into the IHUM Framework

The Transfiguration highlights the IHUM's central tenet: that Christ's divine and human natures operate in perfect harmony without confusion or division. His human limitations do not constrain His divine nature but provide the context through which His

---

[45] Gerald O'Collins, *Christology: A Biblical, Historical, and Systematic Study of Jesus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 120–23.

[46] John Calvin, *Institutes*, 1.10.3.

[47] Carson, *Expositor's Bible Commentary: Matthew*, 389.

divine attributes are expressed.[48] This seamless integration is particularly evident in the interplay between divine omnitemporality and human perceptibility.

By incorporating the Transfiguration into the discussion of kenosis, the IHUM underscores the coherence of Christ's actions with His dual natures. Divine omnitemporality, as demonstrated in this event, becomes an essential feature of Christ's identity and mission, harmonized with His human experience for the purpose of redemption.[49]

V.   ADDRESSING KEY CHRISTOLOGICAL ISSUES

A   Non-Duality of Minds

A key issue the Integrated Hypostatic Union Model (IHUM) seeks to address is the concept of non-duality of minds in Christ. Historically, theologians have debated how Christ's divine and human natures interact within His person. Some, such as proponents of Two-Minds Christology, have suggested that Christ possesses both a divine and a human mind, functioning in parallel.[50] However, this approach risks implying a Nestorian division between the divine and human natures, thereby creating two distinct persons within Christ.

The IHUM, by contrast, posits that while Christ has two distinct natures, each with its own mind, they are unified within a single conscious experience. This means that Christ's divine omniscience and human limitations coexist within one person, without

---

[48] Ibid., 390.

[49] O'Collins, *Christology*, 124–26.

[50] Oliver Crisp, *Divinity and Humanity: The Incarnation Reconsidered* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 112-15.

creating a duality of consciousness. In this framework, the divine mind of Christ did not

override or negate the limitations of His human mind, but neither were they functioning

as entirely independent centers of consciousness.[51]

This approach prevents the duality of persons found in Nestorianism while

maintaining the distinctiveness of Christ's human experience. For example, Christ could

experience hunger, fatigue, and sorrow (Matthew 4:2; John 11:35) without compromising

His divine attributes. At the same time, His divine nature remained fully intact, capable

of performing miracles, such as raising Lazarus from the dead (John 11:43-44). This

single consciousness model provides a robust theological response to the tension between

Christ's divine and human experiences, ensuring that both are preserved without falling

into dualism or confusion.

B   Mark 13:32 and the Integration of Knowledge

One of the most debated passages in discussions of Christology is Mark 13:32,

where Jesus states, *"But concerning that day or that hour, no one knows, not even the*

angels in heaven, nor the Son, but only the Father." This statement seems to imply that

Christ, in His human nature, lacked knowledge of the day of His return, raising questions

about how this aligns with His divine omniscience.

The Integrated Hypostatic Union Model (IHUM) addresses the issue of Christ's

knowledge by appealing to Selective Communication and Kenosis. According to IHUM,

Christ's divine nature always remained fully omniscient. However, His unified

consciousness regulated the expression of His divine knowledge in alignment with His

---

[51] J.P. Moreland and William Lane Craig, *Philosophical Foundations for a Christian Worldview*, 610-13.

mission. This self-limitation was not a loss or deficiency but a functional decision to fully experience human limitations, while retaining His complete divinity. As Crisp notes, Christ's divine nature was always accessible but selectively expressed, allowing Him to fulfill His mission while maintaining both the fullness of His divinity and humanity.[52]

This concept of selective communication is also seen in the writings of the Church Fathers. Basil the Great suggests that the knowledge of the day and hour is inherently shared between the Father and the Son. He interprets Mark 13:32 not as evidence of ignorance but as the Son's alignment with the Father's will in choosing not to express certain knowledge during His earthly ministry. According to Basil, *"the Son would not have known unless the Father had known: that is, the cause of the Son's knowing comes from the Father."* This underscores the relational dynamic within the Trinity, where knowledge flows from the Father to the Son, not in limitation but in perfect unity.[53]

Basil's interpretation is further supported by the Greek syntax of Mark 13:32. The verb οἶδεν (oiden), translated as *"knows,"* is in the perfect tense, which suggests a completed state of knowing. This tense indicates that the subject—whether human, angelic, or divine—either already possesses the knowledge or has chosen not to communicate it.[54] Thus, the text allows for the possibility that Christ, though omniscient as the divine Logos, chose not to express this knowledge during His earthly ministry.

---

[52] Crisp, *Divinity and Humanity*, 120.

[53] Basil the Great, *"Letter 236,"* in *Church Fathers: Letters*, accessed November 2018, https://www.original-sinner.com/resources/church-fathers/basil-the-great/letter-236/.

[54] *"Mark 13:32 – Περὶ δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας..." Interlinear Study Bible*, StudyLight.org. Accessed January 2019. https://www.studylight.org/interlinear-study-bible/greek/mark/13-32.html.

This reading aligns with the IHUM framework, which emphasizes selective communication to reconcile Christ's full divinity with His human experience.

The Greek construction of the verse also tolerates this interpretation. As Basil the Great explains, the relational flow of knowledge from the Father to the Son reflects divine order, not a limitation. Similarly, the phrase *"but only the Father"* serves to highlight the divine economy rather than signal ignorance on the Son's part. Therefore, Mark 13:32 reflects not a lack of knowledge in Christ but a deliberate decision not to disclose that knowledge, maintaining unity within the Trinity and supporting the IHUM model of selective communication.[55]

Similarly, Gregory of Nazianzus maintains that Christ's ignorance pertains only to His human nature, not His divine nature, emphasizing that divine knowledge was intentionally concealed during the Incarnation for redemptive purposes. Francis Gumerlock reinforces this view, explaining that several Church Fathers, including Basil, saw Mark 13:32 as reflective of selective communication, not a deficiency in knowledge.[56]

We can see a similar use of the perfect tense in Joshua 10:2 (LXX), where Adoni-Zedek, king of Jerusalem, *"knew"* (οἶδεν) that Gibeon was a powerful city. The perfect tense indicates that the king's knowledge, once gained, continued to shape his actions. In the same way, Jesus' divine knowledge remained intact during His earthly ministry, though He chose not to express certain aspects of it at specific moments.

---

[55] Basil the Great, *"Letter 236,"* in *Church Fathers: Letters*, accessed November 2018

[56] Francis Gumerlock, *Mark 13:32 and Christ's Supposed Ignorance*, accessed December 2018, https://francisgumerlock.com/wp-content/uploads/2009/01/Mark%2013.32%20and%20Christ's%20Supposed%20Ignorance.pdf.

"But when Adoni-bezek, king of Jerusalem, heard that Joshua had captured Ai and destroyed them, the way they did to Jericho and its king so they did to Ai and its king, and that the inhabitants of Gibeon had deserted to Joshua and Israel, they became very afraid of them. For they knew that Gibeon was a great city like one of the mother states, and all its men were strong." [57]

This example from Joshua 10:2 shows how the perfect tense conveys ongoing knowledge that continues to influence decisions and actions. Similarly, Jesus possessed divine knowledge throughout His mission but chose not to act on or express it at all times, in accordance with His purpose.

Moreover, this strategy of selective communication is not unique to Christ. Paul's teaching in 1 Corinthians 2:2 reflects a similar principle: *"For I decided to know nothing among you except Jesus Christ and Him crucified."* Although Paul had broader theological knowledge, he chose to limit his teaching to what was most essential for his audience.[58][59] This mirrors how Christ communicated only what was appropriate for His mission, while His divine knowledge remained fully intact.

By placing the IHUM in continuity with these patristic insights, it becomes clear that the model does not introduce a novel concept but builds on historical theology. The idea of selective communication strengthens the IHUM's claim that Christ's human limitations and divine omniscience coexisted in harmony, without contradiction or

---

[57] Rick Brannan, Ken M. Penner et al., *The Lexham English Septuagint*, Second Edition (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2020), Jos 10:1–2.

[58] John Sanidopoulos, *"Was Jesus Ignorant of the Time of His Second Coming?" Orthodox Christianity Then and Now*, May 5, 2011, accessed December 2108, https://www.johnsanidopoulos.com/2011/05/was-jesus-ignorant-of-time-of-his.html?m=1.

[59] Francis Gumerlock, *Mark 13:32 and Christ's Supposed Ignorance*, accessed December 2018

division. It offers a coherent understanding of how Mark 13:32 can reflect the fullness of both Christ's human and divine natures, preserving the mystery of the Hypostatic Union.

In practical terms, the IHUM asserts that Christ's human nature experienced time and knowledge as any human would, yet His divine nature remained outside of time and omniscient. This allows for a coherent understanding of Mark 13:32, where Christ's human limitations are acknowledged, while His divine omniscience remains intact. It preserves the mystery of the Hypostatic Union while providing a theological framework for understanding how Christ's divine and human knowledge coexisted.

C   Paul's Example of Selective Communication in 1 Corinthians 2:2

The concept of Selective Communication, as articulated in the IHUM, finds a parallel in the ministry of the Apostle Paul. In 1 Corinthians 2:2, Paul states, *"For I decided to know nothing among you except Jesus Christ and Him crucified."* Here, Paul deliberately limited the scope of his communication to what was essential for his audience—Christ crucified—despite possessing greater theological knowledge.

This selective approach mirrors the way Christ, in His earthly ministry, chose to limit the expression of His divine attributes to fulfill His mission. Just as Paul focused on what was necessary for his audience, Christ strategically communicated divine truths in a manner that human beings could comprehend, while reserving the full exercise of His omniscience for specific moments in His divine mission.[60]

Paul's example illustrates that Selective Communication is not merely a theological abstraction but a practical reality in Christian ministry. By limiting the revelation of certain knowledge or attributes, both Paul and Christ modeled a strategy that

---

[60] Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, 2.12.1.

serves to engage with human limitations without diminishing the truth they sought to convey. This analogy helps clarify how Christ's divine and human natures functioned in harmony during His earthly life, without creating confusion or division between the two.

VI. EMERGENT PROPERTIES AND THE TRANSCENDENT DIVINE SPARK: A CRITICAL DISTINCTION

A. Defining Emergent Properties and the Divine Spark

i. Emergent Properties (Naturalistic and Immanent)

Emergent properties arise naturally from the complex interaction of simpler parts within a system but are not reducible to those parts alone.[61] In humans and animals, desires, instincts, and basic emotions can be understood as emergent properties of the biological complexity of the brain and nervous system.

- **Example:** Consciousness as an emergent property of neural interactions in the brain without implying anything beyond the material world.[62]

ii. The Transcendent Divine Spark (Supernatural and Participatory)

In contrast, the divine spark is a transcendent aspect of human consciousness that enables self-awareness, moral reasoning, and communion with

---

[61] Philip Clayton, *Mind and Emergence: From Quantum to Consciousness* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 45.

[62] Terrence Deacon, *Incomplete Nature: How Mind Emerged from Matter* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2011), 212.

God. It cannot be reduced to natural processes or emergent properties of the animal soul.[63]

- **In Relation to the Human Rational Animal:** The divine spark enables humans to transcend the limitations of the animal soul, making them capable of spiritual understanding and moral accountability.

- **Analogy of 1-Infinity:** The divine spark can be seen as a finite participation in God's infinite nature—1 representing the divine spark and infinity representing God—preserving divine simplicity while explaining human capacity for spiritual communion.[64]

B   Addressing the Heresy of Gnosticism

i   Rejection of Gnostic Dualism

Gnosticism claimed that the material world is evil, and that salvation comes through secret knowledge (*gnosis*) of the divine spark trapped within the material body.[65] This dualism contradicts the Christian doctrine of creation, which affirms the goodness of both the material and spiritual realms.

- **Orthodox Position:** The divine spark is not secret knowledge but a universal capacity for communion with God, accessible through

---

[63] C.S. Lewis, *The Problem of Pain* (New York: HarperOne, 2001), 78.

[64] Gregory of Nyssa, *On the Soul and the Resurrection*, in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series, Vol. 5*, ed. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1893), 320.

[65] Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, in *Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. 1*, ed. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson (Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1885), 326.

faith in Christ.[66] It is a participatory link to God, not a fragment of His essence.

ii   Divine Spark vs. Gnostic Spark

- **Gnostic Spark:** Described as a trapped fragment of a higher divine essence needing to escape the material world.[67]

- **Divine Spark (Orthodox View):** A reflection of God's image that enables communion with God without rejecting the material world.[68]

- **Salvation:** Through Christ, not through secret knowledge reserved for an elite group.[69]

C   The Role of Christ's Incarnation

i   Against Gnostic Docetism

Gnostics denied the real humanity of Christ, proposing that He only appeared to be human (*Docetism*).[70]

- **IHUM's Position:** Affirms that Christ's humanity was real and complete, with both a human will and mind, unified with the

---

[66] Athanasius, *On the Incarnation*, trans. John Behr (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2011), 87.

[67] Kurt Rudolph, *Gnosis: The Nature and History of Gnosticism* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1983), 102.

[68] John of Damascus, *An Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith*, in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series, Vol. 9*, ed. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1899), 15.

[69] Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, 332.

[70] Ignatius of Antioch, *Letter to the Smyrnaeans*, in *Apostolic Fathers*, trans. Bart D. Ehrman (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003), 113

divine Logos. This directly opposes Gnostic dualism by affirming the full reality of both Christ's humanity and divinity.[71]

ii   Christ as the Bridge Between Creation and Creator

- **Affirmation of the Material World:** By becoming fully human, Christ affirmed the goodness of creation, countering the Gnostic disdain for the material.[72]

- **Divine-Human Consciousness:** The Logos's consciousness has eternally possessed non-propositional knowledge of humanity, making it divine-human rather than purely divine.[73] This allows the Logos to fully assume human nature without division or confusion.

D   The Necessity of Two Wills in Christ: Emergent and Transcendent Aspects

i   The Animal Will as an Emergent Property

The will can be seen as an emergent property of the animal soul, which both humans and animals possess. This natural will seeks self-preservation, satisfaction of desires, and basic decision-making capacities.[74]

ii   The Rational Will as Directed by the Divine Spark

In humans, the rational will is directed by the divine spark, allowing for

---

[71] Leo the Great, "*Tome to Flavian*, in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series", Vol. 14*, ed. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1893), 205.

[72] Athanasius, *On the Incarnation*, 94.

[73] Maximus the Confessor, *On the Cosmic Mystery of Jesus Christ*, trans. Paul M. Blowers and Robert Louis Wilken (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2003), 95.

[74] Thomas Nagel, "*What Is It Like to Be a Bat?"* (Philosophical Review 83, no. 4, 1974), 435-450.

moral reasoning and the capacity to act contrary to instinct. This rational

will involves a transcendent participation in the divine nature.[75]

iii   Christ's Two Wills

- **Human Will:** As part of the assumed human nature, Christ's

  human will possessed natural instincts, desires, and decision-

  making capacities.[76]

- **Divine Will:** Directed by the divine-human consciousness, the

  divine will harmonized with but did not override the human will.[77]

- **Against Craig's Neo-Apollinarianism:** Craig's reluctance to

  affirm two wills risks denying the fullness of Christ's humanity.

  By maintaining the two wills, the IHUM model preserves the

  integrity of both Christ's human and divine natures without

  confusion or division.[78]

E   Addressing William Lane Craig's Objection: Are Wills Associated with

Persons or Natures?

i   **Craig's Argument Summarized**

Craig argues that wills are associated with persons, not natures, implying

---

[75] C.S. Lewis, *Mere Christianity* (New York: HarperOne, 2001), 136.

[76] Maximus the Confessor, *On the Cosmic Mystery of Jesus Christ*, 102.

[77] William Lane Craig, *Dyothelitism vs Monothelitism* [YouTube Video], (accessed March 2025), https://youtu.be/OzUczFrtLgU.

[78] Thomas Nagel, "*What Is It Like to Be a Bat?*," 435-450.

that if Christ had two wills, it would suggest two persons—a human person and a divine person—falling into Nestorianism.[79]

    ii   **Response: The Emergent Will and the Animal Soul**

The will is an emergent property of the animal soul, not a separate person. Therefore, Christ's human will is a natural property of His assumed human nature, not a distinct person.[80]

    iii   **The Divine Spark and Rational Will**

The divine spark in humans directs the rational will, enabling them to transcend animal instincts and pursue moral and spiritual ends. In Christ, the divine-human consciousness harmonized His human will with His divine will, preserving both without confusion or separation.[81]

Summary

- **Emergent Properties:** Natural and immanent, explaining the mind and will of the human animal.

- **Divine Spark:** Transcendent, participatory, and enabling communion with God.

- **Divine-Human Consciousness:** The Logos's consciousness has eternally possessed non-propositional knowledge of humanity, making it divine-human rather than purely divine.

- **Two Wills in Christ:** Necessary to affirm the fullness of both His human and divine natures, avoiding the errors of Monothelitism and Nestorianism.

---

[79] Leo the Great, "*Tome to Flavian*, in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series",* 205.

[80] Maximus the Confessor, *On the Cosmic Mystery of Jesus Christ,* 106.

[81] Augustine, *City of God*, trans. Henry Bettenson (London: Penguin Books, 2003), 598.

- **Rejection of Gnosticism:** Affirms the goodness of the material world and the universality of salvation through Christ, not secret knowledge.

VII.   THE PATRISTIC FOUNDATIONS OF THE INTEGRATED HYPOSTATIC UNION MODEL

The Integrated Hypostatic Union Model (IHUM) is deeply rooted in the patristic tradition, drawing on the works of early Church Fathers who wrestled with the complexities of Christ's divine and human natures. Among the most influential of these theologians are Athanasius, Cyril of Alexandria, and Maximus the Confessor, each contributing foundational insights to the development of Christology.

A   Athanasius: Defending the Full Divinity of Christ

Athanasius of Alexandria was a central figure in defending the full divinity of Christ during the Arian controversy. In his seminal work, On the Incarnation, Athanasius argued that Christ must be fully divine in order to accomplish the redemption of humanity. He famously stated, *"What has not been assumed has not been healed,"* emphasizing that only by assuming full human nature could Christ redeem humanity.[82]

Athanasius' defense of Christ's divinity laid the groundwork for the Nicene Creed, which firmly established the Son as consubstantial with the Father. This concept of consubstantiality—that Christ shares the same divine essence as the Father—serves as a critical foundation for the IHUM's affirmation of the full divinity and humanity of

---

[82] Athanasius, *On the Incarnation*, 93.

Christ.[83] By aligning with Athanasius*'* theology, the IHUM preserves the integrity of Christ*'s* divine nature while integrating the reality of His human experiences.

B   Cyril of Alexandria: Unity of Person in Christ

Another key figure in the development of the IHUM is Cyril of Alexandria, who was instrumental in combating the Nestorian heresy. Nestorianism suggested a division between Christ*'s* divine and human natures, effectively creating two persons in Christ. Cyril, however, fiercely defended the unity of Christ*'s* person, insisting that the divine and human natures were inseparably united in the one person of Christ.

In his Third Letter to Nestorius, Cyril wrote: *"We must understand that the Word, having been made flesh, remained what He was, that is, God; but while He assumed flesh and blood, He also possessed them as His own."*[84] Cyril*'s* formulation of the Hypostatic Union—the union of Christ*'s* two natures in one person—serves as a crucial antecedent to the IHUM, which also emphasizes the full and unified personhood of Christ without division or confusion between His divine and human natures.[85]

C   Maximus the Confessor: The Doctrine of the Two Wills

Maximus the Confessor played a significant role in articulating the doctrine of Dyothelitism, the belief that Christ has two wills—one divine and one human. Similarly, Monoenergism—another heresy condemned by the Church—claimed that Christ had only one energy rather than two distinct energies proper to each nature. Maximus argued

---

[83] Nicene Creed, *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers: Second Series*, Vol. 7, ed. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1894), 20.

[84] Cyril of Alexandria, *Third Letter to Nestorius*, in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers: Second Series*, Vol. 7, ed. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1894), 20.

[85] Ibid.

that Christ's two energies must remain distinct and work together in harmony. This teaching forms the theological foundation for theandric actions, which describe how Christ's divine and human energies cooperate visibly in His earthly ministry.

Maximus argued that for Christ to be fully human, He must possess a human will in addition to His divine will.[86] He emphasized that Christ's human will was always in perfect submission to His divine will, preserving the integrity of both natures—divine and human—within the single person of Christ. This is essential for maintaining the Chalcedonian Definition of the two natures without confusing or collapsing them into one.

Maximus's rejection of the notion of a single theandric operation was essential in defending the integrity of both divine and human energies in Christ.[87] He insisted that each nature must express its own energy, ensuring that Christ's actions reflect the distinct operations of both his divinity and humanity working in harmony. This teaching became pivotal during his debates, such as in the Dialogue with Pyrrhus, and was influential in the Third Council of Constantinople (680–681 AD). Maximus affirmed that divine and human actions cooperate without being fused, thus aligning with the concept of theandric actions but in a manner consistent with orthodox teaching on Dyoenergism.

The IHUM adopts Maximus's understanding, asserting that Christ's human experiences, including His will, are fully real and distinct, yet they are harmoniously united with His divine nature. The distinction between two wills and two energies ensures

---

[86] Maximus the Confessor, *On the Cosmic Mystery of Jesus Christ*, 95.

[87] Maximus the Confessor, *Ambigua*, trans. Nicholas Constas, vol. 2 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014), 107–109; Maximus the Confessor, *The Trial of Pyrrhus*, in Maximus the Confessor, *On the Cosmic Mystery of Jesus Christ*, 95; Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine*, vol. 1 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971), 262.

the fullness of both Christ's divinity and humanity, preserving the mystery of the hypostatic union without compromising either nature.

By drawing from the teachings of Athanasius, Cyril, and Maximus, the IHUM is firmly grounded in patristic Christology. These early theologians established the theological framework upon which the IHUM builds, ensuring that the model aligns with orthodox tradition while addressing contemporary Christological concerns.

Theandric Actions: Unified Divine-Human Activity

The Integrated Hypostatic Union Model (IHUM) aligns closely with patristic Christology, incorporating the concept of *theandric actions*—the harmonious cooperation of divine and human energies in the person of Christ.[88] A theandric action refers to an act that involves both divine power and human participation, where supernatural effects are manifested through Christ's human body and faculties.

Examples of Theandric Actions include:

A   **Healing the Sick (Mark 1:41):**

In Mark 1:41, Jesus encounters a man with leprosy, a disease that rendered individuals ritually unclean and isolated from the community under Mosaic Law (Leviticus 13:45–46). The leper approaches Jesus, kneels before Him, and pleads, *"If you will, you can make me clean."* Jesus, moved with compassion, reaches out His hand and touches the leper (human action), declaring, *"I will; be clean."* Immediately, the leprosy leaves him, and he is made clean (divine power).

---

[88] Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100–600)*, vol. 1 of *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971), 262.

This act is profoundly theandric, as it intertwines Christ's divine power with His human compassion. The physical touch, which would have rendered anyone else ritually unclean, becomes the conduit for divine healing. Instead of being defiled by the leper's uncleanness, Jesus' divine energy cleanses the leper. This moment exemplifies the IHUM principle that Christ's divine power operates through His humanity in perfect harmony.

The healing also fulfills Old Testament prophecies about the Messiah bringing physical and spiritual restoration. Isaiah 53:4 prophesies that the Suffering Servant would *"bear our griefs and carry our sorrows,"* which the New Testament interprets as including physical healing (Matthew 8:17). Furthermore, Psalm 103:3 describes Yahweh as the one "who forgives all your iniquity, who heals all your diseases," aligning Christ's actions with the divine prerogatives of Yahweh.

The theological implications of this theandric action are significant:

- **Compassion and Sovereignty:** Jesus' willingness to touch the untouchable reflects His deep compassion for humanity while simultaneously showcasing His sovereign power to cleanse and restore.

- **Fulfillment of the Law:** By healing the leper, Jesus not only restores his health but also enables him to return to the community and participate fully in religious life, fulfilling the requirements of the Law (Leviticus 14:1–32). This act illustrates how Christ fulfills the Law, not by abolishing it, but by bringing wholeness and restoration.

- **Divine Authority:** Unlike Old Testament prophets who acted as intermediaries, Jesus directly exercises divine authority to heal and cleanse, underscoring His identity as God incarnate.

In addition, this theandric action has eschatological significance. Leprosy, often viewed as a symbol of sin and human frailty, is eradicated by Christ's touch, pointing to the ultimate restoration He will bring in the new creation. As Revelation 21:4 promises, there will be no more sickness, suffering, or death in the fullness of God's kingdom.

By uniting human action and divine power, the healing of the leper exemplifies the heart of the IHUM: Christ's two natures working together in seamless unity. It is both a demonstration of divine compassion and a foreshadowing of His ultimate mission to heal humanity, both physically and spiritually, through His incarnation, death, and resurrection.

B   Calming the Storm (Mark 4:39):

In Mark 4:39, Jesus calms a violent storm by simply speaking: *"Peace! Be still!"* (human action). Instantly, the wind ceases, and there is great calm (divine energy). This act echoes Psalm 107:28–29, where it is said of Yahweh, *"Then they cried to the Lord in their trouble, and he delivered them from their distress. He made the storm be still, and the waves of the sea were hushed."* By calming the storm, Jesus demonstrates His authority over creation—a hallmark of divine sovereignty.

This connection highlights the theandric nature of Christ's actions. His human voice becomes the vessel through which divine power operates, affirming the IHUM's emphasis on the perfect unity of Christ's natures. Furthermore, by evoking the language and imagery of Psalm 107, the narrative subtly proclaims Christ's identity as Yahweh incarnate. This theandric act not only reveals His divine authority but also reassures the disciples of His ability to save, both physically and spiritually.

C   Walking on Water (Matthew 14:25 and Mark 6:47-52):

In Matthew 14:25 and Mark 6:47–52, Jesus walks on water, a feat that transcends natural law. His human body moves upon the waves (human action), sustained by His divine power. This miracle resonates with Job 9:8 (LXX), where it is said of God, *"He alone stretches out the heavens and walks on the sea as on dry ground."* By performing an act attributed solely to God, Jesus once again reveals His divine nature through a theandric action.

Notably, this event serves a dual purpose: it demonstrates His divine power while engaging with the disciples on a deeply human level. In Matthew's account, Peter is invited to step out of the boat and walk toward Jesus, but when Peter falters, Christ saves him. This interaction underscores the IHUM principle that Christ's divine power is always expressed through His humanity, allowing Him to meet human needs personally and compassionately.

These examples illustrate the profound theological significance of theandric actions. They affirm the unity of Christ's two natures and His identity as both fully human and fully divine. Additionally, the references to Psalm 107 and Job 9 provide a rich biblical context, emphasizing how these actions align with the characteristics and actions of Yahweh as revealed in the Old Testament.

D   The Transfiguration as a Theandric Action (Matthew 17:1–8):

i   The Transfiguration provides a profound example of a theandric action, illustrating how Christ's divine and human natures operate in perfect harmony. In this event, Jesus reveals His divine glory to Peter, James, and John while engaging in a supernatural interaction with Moses and Elijah.

From a human perspective, the disciples witness an extraordinary moment of divine revelation. From a divine perspective, Jesus transcends temporal boundaries, bringing Moses and Elijah—figures from distinct historical periods—into the present.

ii   This event demonstrates the seamless cooperation of Christ's human faculties and divine energy. His physical presence on the mountain allows the disciples to witness the transfiguration (a human-visible event), while His divine power bridges time to engage with Moses and Elijah.

iii   By including the Transfiguration as a theandric action, the IHUM emphasizes how Christ's divine power operates through His humanity to reveal His glory and fulfill God's redemptive plan, all while accommodating the disciples' human understanding.

The Significance of Theandric Actions

Theandric actions showcase how divine energy operates through Christ's human nature without diminishing either nature. The human act—such as speaking or touching—becomes the visible vessel for the divine power at work. These actions reflect the IHUM's foundational assertion that Christ's divine and human natures are fully united in one person, without confusion or division.

The IHUM also underscores the importance of the two distinct energies in Christ—divine and human—working in harmony without merging. This distinction preserves the integrity of both natures, ensuring that Christ's human actions are never independent of His divine energy. His divine power is always expressed through His humanity, maintaining the unity of His person.

By recognizing the theandric nature of Christ's actions, the IHUM reinforces the doctrine that Christ's divine and human natures, though distinct, are united in one person. This understanding is essential for articulating how the divine and human dimensions of Christ work together to achieve God's redemptive purposes while remaining fully consistent with historic Christian theology.

The Relationship Between Theandric Actions and Communicatio Idiomatum

Communicatio Idiomatum (Communication of Properties)

> A   **Definition**: The communication of idioms refers to the theological principle that attributes or properties belonging to one nature of Christ (either divine or human) are ascribed to the person of Christ.

> B   **Example:**

>> i   Acts 20:28: *"The church of God, which He purchased with His own blood."*

>> ii   Although God (the divine nature) cannot bleed, the person of Christ—who is both God and man—can be described as shedding God's blood, because the human and divine natures are united in the person of Christ.

This principle ensures that, while the natures remain distinct, the actions or properties of either nature can be attributed to the whole person.

Theandric Actions: Expressing the Communication of Idioms in Action

> A   Theandric actions describe the visible, active expression of the unity between Christ's divine and human natures. These actions are supernatural

acts, where both divine energy and human faculties work together in the one person of Christ.

B   In the communication of idioms, divine properties (like omnipotence) are attributed to Christ's person, and human properties (like hunger) are likewise ascribed to Him.

C   In theandric actions, these properties are expressed together through action.

D   Example: When Christ touches a leper (human action) and heals him (divine power), both natures cooperate harmoniously, without confusion.

Thus, theandric actions are a practical outworking of the communication of idioms, as both divine and human elements participate in these acts, demonstrating how Christ's one person operates through two natures.

Key Distinction and Complementarity

Concept	Communicatio Idiomatum	Theandric Actions
Focus	Ascribing properties of one nature to the person of Christ.	Describes how Christ's two natures cooperate in action.
Theological Framework	Ensures that the two natures remain distinct but united in one person.	Expresses the unity of the two natures through divine-human actions.
Example	*"God's blood"* (Acts 20:28) – Human suffering ascribed to God in the person of Christ.	Christ healing by touch – Divine energy working through human faculties.
Outcome	Ensures the integrity of the hypostatic union.	Demonstrates the harmonious operation of both natures in action.

Conclusion

Theandric actions are an expression of the communication of idioms in action. While the communication of idioms deals with how properties of both natures can be attributed to Christ's person, theandric actions show how those properties are actively expressed through specific acts in His earthly ministry.

Therefore, theandric actions are not a separate concept but a practical manifestation of the communication of idioms, where divine and human properties are visibly displayed in Christ's actions. This addition to your IHUM paper would further highlight the importance of how Christ's two natures cooperate seamlessly in both being and doing.

VII.   COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF CHRISTOLOGICAL MODELS

The Integrated Hypostatic Union Model (IHUM) provides a unique framework for understanding the dual natures of Christ, building upon the Chalcedonian Definition but addressing unresolved tensions in classical and contemporary Christological models. In this section, IHUM is compared with Two-Minds Christology, William Lane Craig's Reformulated Apollinarianism, Kenotic Christology, and the Perichoretic Model to demonstrate how IHUM advances theological discourse and resolves issues that other models encounter.

A   Two-Minds Christology

Two-Minds Christology, advanced by theologians such as Thomas Morris and Oliver Crisp, asserts that Christ has both a divine mind and a human mind, which operate distinctly within the one person of Jesus Christ. The human mind experiences limitations, such as the need for learning and growth, while the divine mind remains fully omniscient. However, these minds are not disconnected; instead, Christ's divine mind has full access to His human mind, but the human mind does not have reciprocal access to the divine

mind. This concept is referred to as asymmetric accessing or asymmetric consciousness.[89][90]

Strengths of Two-Minds Christology:

Affirmation of Full Humanity and Divinity: Two-Minds Christology affirms both the full humanity and divinity of Christ by maintaining that He possesses a genuinely human mind that is subject to limitations. Simultaneously, the divine mind retains its omniscience and omnipotence, ensuring that Christ is fully divine.[91][92]

Criticisms and Challenges:

Nestorian Tendency: A primary criticism of Two-Minds Christology is its tendency toward Nestorianism, the heresy that divides Christ into two persons—one human and one divine. While the model affirms that there is only one person in Christ, the sharp distinction between the two minds can create the perception of dualism, where Christ appears to have two centers of consciousness, thus risking a fragmented view of Christ's personhood.[93]

Asymmetric Accessing: The concept that the divine mind can fully access the human mind, but not vice versa, introduces concerns that Christ's human experiences might seem less genuine, as the divine mind remains omniscient. Critics argue that this

---

[89] Crisp, *Divinity and Humanity*, 88-92.

[90] Thomas V. Morris, *The Logic of God Incarnate* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1986), 102-106.

[91] Morris, *The Logic of God Incarnate*, 110-112.

[92] Crisp, *Divinity and Humanity*, 88-89.

[93] Morris, *The Logic of God Incarnate*, 110-112.

model risks making Christ's human experiences appear theoretical rather than fully lived.[94]

IHUM's Alternative: Unified Consciousness

The Integrated Hypostatic Union Model (IHUM) addresses these concerns by proposing a unified consciousness. While Christ possesses both a divine mind and a human mind, these two minds are fully integrated into a single center of self-awareness. This unified consciousness allows Christ to experience human limitations genuinely while maintaining the fullness of His divine mind.

In IHUM, the human mind remains fully human, and the divine mind remains fully divine, but they are integrated into one unified consciousness that allows Christ to act as one person, not two separate individuals. This unified approach avoids the risk of dualism by ensuring that the divine and human experiences are fully integrated, preserving the oneness of Christ's person while maintaining the distinctness of His natures.

B   William Lane Craig's Reformulated Apollinarianism

William Lane Craig's Reformulated Apollinarian Model posits that the Logos fulfills the role of the rational soul of Christ by virtue of its inherent characteristics, which are identical to those required for a human rational soul. This model addresses the historical heresy of Apollinarianism, not by denying the existence of a human mind in Christ, but by proposing that the divine Logos can fulfill the rational functions of the human soul without altering the integrity of Christ's human nature.[95]

---

[94] Crisp, *Divinity and Humanity*, 88-89.

[95] J.P. Moreland and William Lane Craig, *Philosophical Foundations for a Christian Worldview*, 606-608.

Strengths:

Affirmation of Divinity: Craig's model ensures that Christ's divinity is fully preserved by placing the divine Logos at the center of Christ's self-awareness and rational faculties, safeguarding His divine nature.[96]

Criticisms:

Reduction of Humanity: A major critique of Reformulated Apollinarianism is that it risks diminishing Christ's humanity by substituting the divine Logos for a human rational soul. Critics argue that this reduces the fullness of Christ's human experience, particularly His capacity for growth in wisdom and understanding.[97]

Craig also suggests that certain divine aspects of Jesus' personality were subliminal during His state of humiliation (incarnation). Drawing on psychological analogies, such as hypnotism and multiple personality disorders, Craig explains that while Christ's human mind was fully conscious and limited, His divine mind acted as a subliminal guide. This model explains how Christ could experience genuine human limitations while being guided by His divine nature in subtle ways, without direct access to the omniscience of His divine mind.[98] [99]

---

[96] Ibid., 607.

[97] Ibid., 608.

[98] William Lane Craig, *"A Possible Model of the Incarnation (Cont'd)," Reasonable Faith* podcast, January 2022, accessed January 2022, https://www.reasonablefaith.org/podcasts/defenders-podcast-series-3/s3-doctrine-of-christ/doctrine-of-christ-part-7.

[99] William Lane Craig, *"Doctrine of Christ (Part 7)," YouTube* video, uploaded January 2022, accessed January 2022, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=80WW2o9mpzQ.

IHUM's Alternative:

The IHUM model maintains that Christ possesses both a fully human rational soul and the divine Logos, integrated within a single unified consciousness. By preserving the distinctness of Christ's human mind and will, IHUM ensures that Christ fully participates in human experience while remaining divine. This integration avoids the reductionism present in Craig's model, affirming the fullness of Christ's humanity and divinity.

C   Kenotic Christology

Kenotic Christology focuses on the concept of kenosis, derived from Philippians 2:7, where Christ *"emptied Himself"* in the Incarnation. Theologians such as Charles Gore and P.T. Forsyth propose that Christ voluntarily relinquished certain divine attributes, such as omniscience and omnipotence, to fully experience human limitations.[100]

Strengths:

Genuine Human Experience: Kenotic Christology emphasizes that Christ's human experiences were genuine, as He relinquished certain divine attributes to live fully as a human being, subject to the limitations of human existence.[101]

Criticisms:

Compromise of Divinity: The primary concern with Kenotic Christology is that it risks compromising Christ's divinity by suggesting that He could temporarily relinquish

---

[100] Charles Gore, *The Incarnation of the Son of God* (New York: Scribner, 1891), 90-94.

[101] P.T. Forsyth, *The Person and Place of Jesus Christ* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1909), 154-158.

or suspend divine attributes, raising concerns about whether Christ's divinity remained intact during His earthly life.[102]

IHUM's Alternative:

The IHUM model reinterprets kenosis not as a literal relinquishment of divine attributes but as a voluntary self-limitation or strategic concealment. In IHUM, Christ retains all His divine attributes throughout His earthly life but chooses not to exercise them fully in certain circumstances, allowing for a genuine human experience without compromising His divine nature.

D   The Perichoretic Model

The Perichoretic Model, though primarily applied to the Trinity, is sometimes used in Christology to describe the mutual indwelling or interpenetration of Christ's divine and human natures. This model highlights the relational aspect of these two natures, suggesting that they exist in a seamless relationship of unity, akin to the persons of the Trinity, without confusion or blending.[103]

Strengths:

Relational Unity: The Perichoretic Model affirms the deep relational unity between Christ's divine and human natures. This approach emphasizes the interpenetration of the natures, suggesting they work in harmony without confusion or division.[104]

---

[102] Gore, *The Incarnation of the Son of God*, 95-97.

[103] For a detailed understanding of perichoresis as it applies to the Trinity and Christology, see John Zizioulas, *Being as Communion: Studies in Personhood and the Church* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1997), 133-137.

[104] The relational unity of Christ's two natures is explored in greater depth in Jürgen Moltmann, *The Trinity and the Kingdom of God* (London: SCM Press, 1981), 154-156.

Criticisms:

Potential for Over-Integration: A concern with the Perichoretic Model is that it may blur the lines between Christ's divine and human natures, making it difficult to maintain the distinctness of the two natures as articulated in the Chalcedonian Definition.[105] The model's emphasis on relational unity might inadvertently suggest over-integration, where the distinction between divine omniscience and human limitations becomes unclear.[106]

IHUM's Alternative:

The IHUM offers a more precise distinction between Christ's divine and human natures, addressing the potential for confusion present in the Perichoretic Model. While IHUM affirms the unity of Christ's person, it emphasizes that this unity is achieved through Kenosis and Selective Communication, where Christ voluntarily limits the full expression of His divine nature to experience genuine human limitations. IHUM avoids the potential pitfalls of over-integration by maintaining clear boundaries between Christ's

---

[105] For a discussion on the risks of over-integration in perichoretic Christology, see Sarah Coakley, *God, Sexuality, and the Self: An Essay 'On the Trinity'* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 201-203.

[106] The Chalcedonian Definition's insistence on maintaining the distinctness of Christ's two natures is crucial for orthodox Christology. See Leo the Great, *The Tome of Leo*, in *Documents of the Christian Church*, ed. Henry Bettenson and Chris Maunder (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 66-67.

divine and human natures, ensuring that neither is compromised in the relational dynamic.[107]

E   One Consciousness Christology (Karl Rahner - German Jesuit Priest)

Karl Rahner*'s One Consciousness Christology* asserts that Jesus possessed a unified consciousness, integrating His divine and human natures. Rahner argues that Christ*'s* consciousness was not divided between divine and human experiences but rather that Christ had a singular self-awareness that fully encompassed both natures. This unification allowed Christ to experience life as a single subject, while maintaining the distinction between His divine and human attributes. Rahner emphasizes that Christ*'s* divine nature was not diminished in this unified consciousness, but His human experiences were genuine, offering a model where both natures operate seamlessly in one personal experience.[108]

Strengths:

    i   **Unified Consciousness**: Rahner*'s* model avoids the Nestorian error of dividing Christ*'s* person into two separate centers of self-awareness. By maintaining one unified consciousness, it preserves the unity of Christ*'s* person while fully integrating His divine and human natures.

Criticisms:

---

[107] For more on Kenosis and Selective Communication as explained in the IHUM, see Thomas F. Torrance, *Incarnation: The Person and Life of Christ* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2008), 115-118.

[108] Karl Rahner, *Foundations of Christian Faith: An Introduction to the Idea of Christianity*, trans. William V. Dych (New York: Crossroad, 1996), 313–320.

ii   **Diminished Distinction**: Critics argue that Rahner's model may risk blurring the distinction between Christ's human and divine natures. Some theologians claim that if Christ's consciousness is entirely unified, it becomes difficult to maintain the Chalcedonian affirmation of the two distinct natures functioning without confusion or mixture.[109]

IHUM's Alternative: The Integrated Hypostatic Union Model (IHUM) shares similarities with Rahner's approach in affirming a unified consciousness. However, IHUM goes further by introducing the concept of **Selective Communication**, where Christ's divine omniscience is fully retained but is selectively communicated in His human experience. This ensures that Christ's human limitations are experienced authentically, while His divine knowledge remains intact but concealed when necessary for His mission. This approach preserves the integrity of both natures without risking over-integration or confusion.

F   The Chalcedonian Definition

The Chalcedonian Definition (451 A.D.) affirms that Christ is one person with two natures—divine and human—*"without confusion, change, division, or separation."* This definition remains the orthodox foundation for understanding the hypostatic union of Christ's divine and human natures.[110]

Strengths:

---

[109] William C. Placher, *The Domestication of Transcendence: How Modern Thinking About God Went Wrong* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996), 115–18.

[110] J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, 289-292.

Orthodox Framework: Chalcedon provides the doctrinal boundaries for Christology, ensuring that Christ's divinity and humanity are not compromised or confused.[111]

Criticisms:

Unresolved Philosophical Questions: While the Chalcedonian Definition affirms the unity of Christ's person, it leaves certain philosophical questions unresolved, particularly regarding the precise interaction of the two natures within the one person of Christ.[112]

IHUM's Contribution:

The IHUM builds upon the Chalcedonian framework by addressing these unresolved philosophical questions. By emphasizing a unified consciousness, IHUM provides a more coherent understanding of how Christ's divine and human natures interact without confusion or division. This model offers a clearer explanation of the communication of properties (communicatio idiomatum), ensuring that Christ's actions, whether divine or human, are attributed to His single personhood.

VIII.   **SUPPORT FOR DICHOTOMY AND TRICHOTOMY**

The Integrated Hypostatic Union Model (IHUM) offers a versatile framework that can support both dichotomous and trichotomous views of human nature. By accommodating both perspectives, the IHUM demonstrates its flexibility in engaging

---

[111] Ibid., 290.

[112] Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, 293-294.

with diverse theological interpretations, while maintaining the integrity of Christ's full humanity and personhood.

A   Support for Dichotomy

The **dichotomous view** posits that humans are composed of two essential parts: **body** and **soul/spirit**. This perspective has long-standing support within Christian theology from figures like Thomas Aquinas and John Calvin. In this view:[113]

- The **soul/spirit** encompasses all immaterial faculties, such as the mind (thoughts and reasoning), conscience (moral compass), and will (decision-making). These are unified and seamlessly connected to the body.

The IHUM aligns with this view by emphasizing the unity of Christ's body and soul. In the Incarnation, Christ assumed a complete human nature, including both a physical body and a rational soul. This unity is central to the IHUM's understanding of the hypostatic union, where the Logos fully united Himself with a complete human nature without confusion or separation. Genesis 2:7 (*"the Lord God formed man of dust from the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of "life, and man became a living being"* and Matthew 10:28 *"do not fear those who kill the body "but are unable to kill the soul"* provide scriptural support for the dichotomous view, as they affirm the distinction between body and soul while maintaining their unity in the person.[114]

---

[113] Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, I, Q. 75, A. 4.

[114] John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, 2.16.3.

By incorporating the dichotomous view, the IHUM ensures that Christ's human nature is fully integrated, avoiding any reduction of His human experience. This understanding allows the IHUM to affirm the completeness of Christ's humanity, which is necessary for His mediatorial role as the Second Adam (1 Corinthians 15:45).[115]

B   Support for Trichotomy

The **trichotomous view** holds that humans consist of three distinct parts: **body**, **soul**, and **spirit**. Historically, figures like Origen and Irenaeus upheld this perspective, which assigns unique roles to the soul and spirit:[116]

- The **soul** involves the mind (thoughts and emotions), conscience (moral reasoning), and subconscious (storehouse of experiences).

- The **spirit** represents the God-conscious aspect of human nature, including the will (guiding decisions and intentions) and consciousness (direct connection with God).

IHUM incorporates this view by distinguishing between these faculties while maintaining their unity within Christ's human nature. For example:

- The **soul** governs Christ's human emotions and rational faculties.

- The **spirit** reflects His perfect communion with the Father, enabling His divine alignment and theandric actions.

Biblical support for trichotomy includes Hebrews 4:12 (*"For the word of God is living and active... piercing to the division of soul and spirit, of joints and marrow, and discerning the thoughts and intentions of the heart"*) and 1 Thessalonians 5:23 (*"May*

---

[115] Ibid., 2.13.4.

[116] Origen, *On First Principles*, trans. G.W. Butterworth (Gloucester: Peter Smith, 1973), 2.10.

your whole spirit and soul and body be kept blameless at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ"). In this model, Christ fully participates in both the psychological (soul) and spiritual (spirit) dimensions of humanity. The integration of these faculties within His unified consciousness reflects the unique harmony of His human and divine natures.

Conclusion

By engaging with both dichotomous and trichotomous perspectives, the IHUM demonstrates its theological flexibility and ensures that it can address a wide range of anthropological concerns. This capacity to integrate various views of human nature enhances the IHUM*'s* applicability within different theological traditions and allows for a more comprehensive understanding of Christ*'s* full humanity.

IX. THEOLOGICAL AND PHILOSOPHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The Integrated Hypostatic Union Model (IHUM) addresses a range of theological and philosophical issues, ensuring that it remains consistent with classical Christology while engaging with contemporary debates. The model is firmly rooted in the Chalcedonian Definition, which asserts the full divinity and humanity of Christ in one person *"without confusion, change, division, or separation."*[117]

A   The Incarnation and Divine Immutability

---

[117] Chalcedonian Definition, *Acts of the Council of Chalcedon*, 451 AD.

One of the key theological challenges that the IHUM addresses is how the Incarnation can be compatible with divine immutability. Critics often argue that the Incarnation implies a change in God, as the Logos takes on human flesh. The IHUM resolves this tension by emphasizing that while the Logos assumes a human nature, this does not result in a change in the divine essence.

Instead, the Incarnation represents a relational dynamic in which the Logos enters into human experience without altering His divine nature. From the perspective of the *"Eternal Now,"* the Logos exists outside of time and has always possessed the knowledge of what it means to be human. Therefore, the Incarnation is not a change in the Logos but a manifestation within time for the sake of humanity.[118]

The concept of the Eternal Now provides a philosophical framework that bridges the gap between Christ's divine immutability and His human experience. While the human nature of Christ moves through time, experiencing moments sequentially, the divine Logos exists outside of time, perceiving all of history in a single, eternal act. This resolves the tension between Christ's omniscience and temporality, as His divine mind, from the Eternal Now, fully grasps all events, even those He chooses not to reveal during His Incarnation.

This view aligns with the insights of Anselm of Canterbury, who argued that the Incarnation was necessary for human redemption because only someone who was both fully God and fully man could reconcile humanity to God.[119] By maintaining the integrity of the divine essence, including the Logos' eternal Sonship, the IHUM ensures that God's

---

[118] Anselm of Canterbury, *Cur Deus Homo*, trans. Sidney Norton Deane (Chicago: Open Court Publishing, 1903), 105.

[119] Ibid., 77.

immutability is preserved even as the Logos takes on human flesh. This approach also facilitates engagement in interfaith dialogues, particularly with Islam and Judaism, which often reject the Incarnation on the grounds of divine immutability.

B   The Hypostatic Union and Communicatio Idiomatum

Another theological issue addressed by the IHUM is the nature of the Hypostatic Union and the principle of Communicatio Idiomatum—the communication of properties between Christ's divine and human natures. According to the Chalcedonian Definition, Christ is one person in two natures, and the properties of each nature can be predicated of the one person. For example, Christ's divine nature is omniscient, while His human nature experiences hunger and fatigue. The IHUM emphasizes that these attributes belong to the one person of Christ, ensuring that the actions and experiences of both natures are attributed to the same person.[120]

Maximus the Confessor argued that the divine and human natures of Christ operate distinctly within the Hypostatic Union, yet both participate fully in the actions of the one person. The IHUM builds on this insight by affirming that the distinct operations of Christ's divine and human natures do not imply a duality of persons but rather reflect the full reality of the Hypostatic Union. This allows the IHUM to avoid the Nestorian error of dividing Christ into two persons, as well as the Monophysite error of blending the two natures into one.

---

[120] Maximus the Confessor, *On the Cosmic Mystery of Jesus Christ*, 110.

Philosophically, the IHUM engages with contemporary discussions on personhood and consciousness, particularly in relation to the nature of Christ's divine and human minds. Drawing on the work of modern philosophers like J.P. Moreland, the IHUM proposes that Christ possesses a single consciousness that integrates both His divine and human experiences without leading to dualism or confusion.[121] By maintaining this unified consciousness, the IHUM avoids the theological pitfalls of both Nestorianism and Monophysitism, ensuring a consistent account of Christ's personhood and the Hypostatic Union.

X.   CRITICAL REFLECTIONS ON THE INTEGRATED HYPOSTATIC UNION MODEL

While the Integrated Hypostatic Union Model (IHUM) offers a robust theological framework, several potential objections warrant consideration. These critiques address whether the IHUM adequately maintains the unity of Christ's personhood, the integrity of His two natures, and the philosophical coherence of its claims. Addressing these concerns is crucial for further developing the model and ensuring its alignment with orthodox Christology.

A   Objections Regarding Unity of Consciousness

One significant concern is whether the IHUM's emphasis on Selective Communication leads to a form of Nestorianism by implying a functional disunity between Christ's divine and human natures. Nestorianism was condemned for dividing

---

[121] J.P. Moreland and William Lane Craig, *Philosophical Foundations for a Christian Worldview*, 617.

Christ into two persons, each with its own will and consciousness. Critics may argue that

Selective Communication, which posits that Christ voluntarily limited His divine

attributes in certain contexts, risks separating His divine and human natures too

sharply.[122]

However, the IHUM counters this objection by emphasizing that Selective

Communication reflects a unified personhood with a single consciousness. Christ's

divine and human natures operate in distinct ways, but they remain fully integrated within

His one person. The concept of Kenosis further supports this unity, as Christ's voluntary

self-limitation does not imply any disunity but rather enhances His ability to fully

experience human life while remaining fully divine. Thus, the IHUM preserves the unity

of Christ's person without compromising the integrity of His natures.

Moreover, Maximus the Confessor supports this idea by asserting that while

Christ's two natures operate distinctly, they do so within the same person, thus avoiding

the Nestorian error of dividing the natures into separate persons.[123] By following this

patristic framework, the IHUM ensures that Christ's two natures function harmoniously

without creating dual persons or consciousnesses. This approach upholds the traditional

Chalcedonian understanding of one person in two natures.

B   Philosophical Objections Regarding Personhood and Identity

From a philosophical standpoint, critics may raise concerns about how the IHUM

handles personal identity across Christ's divine and human natures. The Hypostatic

---

[122] Gregory of Nazianzus, *"Epistle 101: On the Unity of Christ,"* in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers: Second Series*, vol. 7, ed. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1894), 439-440.

[123] Maximus the Confessor, *On the Cosmic Mystery of Jesus Christ*, 108.

Union presents a challenge in explaining how one person can possess two distinct natures without leading to a hybrid identity that is neither fully divine nor fully human. The IHUM addresses this by adhering to the Chalcedonian Definition, which affirms that Christ is one person in two natures without confusion or blending.[124]

Philosophers like J.P. Moreland have explored the concept of personhood in relation to dual consciousness. However, the IHUM avoids the potential pitfalls of dualism by maintaining a single consciousness in Christ, which encompasses both His divine and human experiences. The model posits that Christ's divine nature retains full knowledge and omnipotence, while His human nature experiences genuine limitations, such as hunger and fatigue. This unified consciousness allows the IHUM to maintain a coherent account of Christ's personhood, ensuring that His identity remains fully intact as both fully God and fully man.[125]

By maintaining this functional synthesis, the IHUM preserves the full integrity of both natures, ensuring that Christ's personhood remains consistent with orthodox Christology. This philosophical approach also aligns with contemporary understandings of personhood and consciousness, bridging the gap between traditional theology and modern philosophical discourse.

C   Objections from Kenotic Christology Advocates

Advocates of Kenotic Christology may object to the IHUM's interpretation of Kenosis as a strategic concealment rather than a relinquishment of divine attributes. Traditional Kenotic models suggest that Christ relinquished certain divine attributes, such

---

[124] Chalcedonian Definition, *Acts of the Council of Chalcedon*, 451 AD.

[125] J.P. Moreland and William Lane Craig, *Philosophical Foundations for a Christian Worldview*, 606-607.

as omniscience and omnipotence, during the Incarnation. Critics may argue that the IHUM's interpretation of Kenosis as a voluntary, functional limitation does not go far enough in explaining how Christ could truly limit Himself while remaining fully divine.[126]

The IHUM responds to this critique by demonstrating that any reduction of Christ's divinity would undermine the Incarnation itself. If Christ ceased to be fully divine at any point, He could no longer function as the mediator between God and humanity. Instead, the IHUM views Kenosis as a strategic concealment of divine attributes, ensuring that Christ retains full divinity while voluntarily limiting their exercise. This interpretation aligns with Philippians 2:7, which describes Christ as *"emptying Himself"* by taking the form of a servant, rather than by ceasing to be divine.

Thus, the IHUM preserves both the fullness of Christ's divinity and the integrity of His humanity, providing a balanced approach to Kenosis that avoids the extremes of Kenotic Christology. By framing Kenosis as a functional limitation rather than a diminution of divine nature, the IHUM ensures that Christ's two natures remain fully intact and in harmony within His one person.

XI. **PASTORAL APPLICATIONS OF THE INTEGRATED HYPOSTATIC UNION MODEL**

The Integrated Hypostatic Union Model (IHUM) provides significant insights for pastoral theology, particularly in how it relates to human suffering, temptation, and the

---

[126] Thomas F. Torrance, *Incarnation: The Person and Life of Christ,* 89-90.

Christian life. By emphasizing the full humanity and divinity of Christ, the IHUM offers a framework for addressing the spiritual and emotional challenges faced by believers.

A   Christ's Empathy in Human Suffering

One of the most profound pastoral applications of the IHUM is its emphasis on Christ's full participation in human suffering. The model affirms that Christ, in His human nature, experienced genuine pain, temptation, and sorrow. For instance, in Hebrews 4:15, it is noted that Christ was *"tempted in every way, just as we are—yet He did not sin."* This verse highlights Christ's solidarity with humanity, demonstrating that He fully understands the struggles of human life.

In pastoral counseling, this understanding can provide deep comfort to believers who feel abandoned or overwhelmed by suffering. The IHUM allows pastors to explain that Christ's experiences of hunger, fatigue, and emotional distress were fully real, and His presence in times of suffering is equally real. This model offers a theological basis for reassuring believers that Christ's empathy is not merely intellectual but rooted in His full experience of human life. By integrating the IHUM into pastoral care, pastors can offer hope and encouragement to those who feel isolated in their suffering, knowing that Christ Himself endured similar trials and temptations.

B   Ecclesial Unity and Christ's Dual Natures

In addition to addressing individual suffering, the IHUM has significant implications for ecclesial unity. Just as Christ's two natures are fully united without confusion or division, the Church is called to embody unity in diversity. Ephesians 4:4-6 speaks of one body, one Spirit, and one hope, calling the Church to maintain unity amid its diverse expressions.

The IHUM serves as a model for how the Church can embrace diverse gifts, cultures, and backgrounds without compromising its theological unity. Just as Christ's two natures coexist in harmony, the Church is called to reflect this divine harmony in its own community life. This has practical implications for issues like racial reconciliation, social justice, and the inclusion of cultural diversity in the Church. The IHUM provides a theological framework for navigating these challenges, ensuring that unity is not achieved at the expense of truth, and diversity is celebrated without leading to division.

Moreover, the Communicatio Idiomatum, which describes the sharing of attributes between Christ's divine and human natures, can be applied to the Church's mission. Just as Christ's human actions (e.g., suffering) and divine actions (e.g., performing miracles) are attributed to His one person, the Church's human efforts in ministry are empowered by the divine presence of Christ. This analogy underscores the importance of integrating spiritual and practical aspects of ministry, ensuring that the Church's mission reflects the unity of faith and works in Christ's person.

XII.   COMPARISON WITH HISTORICAL HERESIES

The Integrated Hypostatic Union Model (IHUM) is robust in its ability to address and counter various Christological heresies while maintaining the full divinity and humanity of Christ within a single person. For clarity, this section briefly revisits previously discussed heresies and introduces additional heretical concerns to further demonstrate the IHUM's orthodox stance.

A   Arianism

Arianism taught that Christ was a created being and not co-eternal with God the Father. This heresy, originating from the teachings of Arius in the 4th century, was

condemned at the Council of Nicaea (325 AD) because it undermined the full divinity of

Christ. The IHUM explicitly affirms Christ's full divinity and co-eternity with the Father,

aligning itself with the Nicene Creed and rejecting any notion that the Son is subordinate

or created (John 10:30).[127]

B   Nestorianism

Nestorianism posited a separation between Christ's divine and human natures,

effectively dividing Him into two persons. Nestorius was condemned at the Council of

Ephesus (431 AD) for teaching that the two natures were not sufficiently united. The

IHUM addresses this by asserting that Christ is one person with two natures fully united

without confusion or division, maintaining the essential unity of the Incarnation.[128]

C   Monophysitism

Monophysitism claimed that Christ's human nature was absorbed into His divine

nature, resulting in a single, unified nature. The Council of Chalcedon (451 AD) rejected

this heresy, affirming that Christ's two natures are distinct yet united. The IHUM upholds

this Chalcedonian doctrine, maintaining that Christ's two natures—divine and human—

exist distinctly within one person, thus refuting the Monophysite error.[129]

D   Apollinarianism

Apollinarianism taught that Christ had a human body but a divine mind, denying

the completeness of His humanity. This was condemned because it failed to affirm the

---

[127] Gregory of Nazianzus, *"Epistle 101: On the Unity of Christ,"*, 439–40.

[128] Maximus the Confessor, *On the Cosmic Mystery of Jesus Christ,* 35–89.

[129] Chalcedonian Definition, *Acts of the Council of Chalcedon*, 451 AD.

fullness of Christ's human experience. The IHUM asserts that Christ possesses both a fully human mind and a fully divine mind, which are integrated into a unified personhood without compromising the integrity of either nature.[130]

E   Eutychianism

Eutychianism proposed that Christ's human nature was entirely absorbed by His divine nature, creating a new, hybrid nature. The IHUM rejects this model by maintaining that Christ's two natures—divine and human—coexist without confusion, blending, or alteration, in accordance with the Chalcedonian Definition.[131]

F   Sabellianism (Modalism)

Sabellianism (also known as Modalism) denied the distinct persons of the Trinity, suggesting that Father, Son, and Holy Spirit were merely different modes of one person. This was rejected at the Council of Nicaea, which affirmed the Trinitarian doctrine. The IHUM upholds the distinct personhood of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit while preserving Christ's full divinity and His distinction from the Father.[132]

G   Adoptionism

Adoptionism taught that Jesus was a mere human who was later adopted as God's Son at His baptism or resurrection. This view is incompatible with orthodox Christology, which affirms Christ's eternal identity as the Son of God, preexisting from eternity. The

---

[130] J.P. Moreland and William Lane Craig, *Philosophical Foundations for a Christian Worldview*, 250–51.

[131] Thomas F. Torrance, *Incarnation: The Person and Life of Christ*, 39.

[132] Athanasius, *On the Incarnation*, 53.

IHUM strongly rejects Adoptionism, affirming that Christ's divinity did not begin at a particular point in time (John 1:1-2).[133]

H   Ebionitism

Ebionitism denied Christ's divinity and viewed Him as a human prophet. The IHUM counters this by affirming the full divinity and humanity of Christ, emphasizing that the Incarnation (John 1:14) is central to Christian doctrine. The IHUM remains firmly within orthodox boundaries by rejecting any views that reduce Christ to merely a human figure.[134]

I   Monothelitism

Monothelitism held that Christ had only one will despite having two natures. This was condemned at the Third Council of Constantinople (681 AD), which affirmed that Christ had both a divine will and a human will that existed in perfect harmony. The IHUM aligns with this view, maintaining the two wills of Christ within His single personhood.[135]

J   Miaphysitism

Miaphysitism teaches that Christ has one united nature that is fully divine and fully human. While this view emphasizes unity, it risks conflating the natures of Christ. The IHUM adheres to the Chalcedonian Definition, preserving the distinctiveness of Christ's two natures while emphasizing their union in one person.[136]

---

[133] John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, 528.

[134] N.T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996), 33.

[135] Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, III, Q.18.

[136] Gregory of Nazianzus, *"Theological Orations,"* in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers: Second Series*, vol. 7, ed. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1894), 102–05.

XIII.   IHUM, ORTHODOX CHRISTOLOGY, AND THE GLORIFIED BODY IN HARMONY

The Integrated Hypostatic Union Model (IHUM) builds upon the foundation of Orthodox Christology, offering solutions to unresolved questions regarding the interaction between Christ's two natures. While the early ecumenical councils affirmed the duality of Christ's human and divine natures, they left significant gaps in understanding how these natures function together.[137]

In Christ's Divine Nature, His theandric actions demonstrate the seamless unity between divine and human energies in one person.[138] In His Human Nature, the Holy Spirit empowers His actions through synergy, enabling Him to transcend human limitations during His earthly life.[139] This model deepens our understanding of both the unique role of the hypostatic union and the cooperative work of the Spirit within the Trinity.[140]

IHUM provides a conceptual framework for understanding how Christ, as the Admiral, guides both His human and divine natures in unison, fulfilling His redemptive mission. It reveals that while theandric actions are exclusive to Christ's person, synergy with the Holy Spirit allows believers to participate in God's mission without blending

---

[137] Council of Chalcedon. *"Definition of the Faith."* In *The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon*, translated by Richard Price and Michael Gaddis. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2005.

[138] Maximus the Confessor. *The Ambigua*. Translated by Nicholas Constas. Vol. 1, *On Difficulties in the Church Fathers*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014.

[139] Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, III, Q. 7, Art. 1.

[140] Cyril of Alexandria. On the Unity of Christ. Translated by John Anthony McGuckin. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1995, 77.

natures, reflecting divine empowerment (Phil. 2:13; 2 Pet. 1:4). In this way, believers

follow Christ's example, relying on the Spirit's power for daily living.[141]

The Glorified Body: Transformation Through Resurrection

The concept of the glorified body is integral to understanding the culmination of

Christ's redemptive work and its implications for believers. After His resurrection,

Christ's human nature was glorified, exhibiting properties that transcend ordinary human

experience. Theologians identify several characteristics of the glorified body:

- **Impassibility**: Freedom from suffering and death, indicating a state where the

  body is no longer subject to pain or mortality.[142]

- **Subtlety**: A spiritualized nature, allowing the body to operate unhindered by

  physical limitations, as exemplified by Christ's ability to appear in locked rooms

  (John 20:19).[143]

- **Agility**: The capacity for the body to move with ease and swiftness, fully

  responsive to the soul's direction.[144]

---

[141] Athanasius, *On the Incarnation*, 54.

[142] Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, Supplement, Q. 82.

[143] Augustine. *City of God*. Translated by Henry Bettenson. London: Penguin Books, 1972. Book 13, Chapter 20.

[144] Gregory the Great. *Morals on the Book of Job*. Translated by James Bliss. Vol. 1. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1844. Book 13, Chapter 20.

- **Clarity**: Radiance and beauty reflecting the soul's inner glory, as seen in Christ's transfigured appearance (Matthew 17:2).[145]

These attributes illustrate the harmonious operation of Christ's divine and human natures in His glorified state, where His humanity fully participates in the divine life without losing its distinctiveness

For believers, the promise of a glorified body signifies a future transformation where they will share in Christ's victory over death. While they will not attain divinity, their glorified bodies will reflect God's glory and exhibit qualities such as incorruptibility and immortality (1 Corinthians 15:42–44). This transformation underscores the believer's hope in resurrection and eternal life, aligning with the transformative nature of Christ's work.[146]

By integrating the concept of the glorified body into IHUM, we gain a fuller picture of the believer's journey toward sanctification and ultimate union with God. Embracing the difficulties in fully understanding these profound mysteries, IHUM enriches Orthodox Christology, encouraging believers to live out their calling through the empowering presence of the Holy Spirit and the hope of future glorification. Through this model, we glimpse the beautiful harmony within the Trinity and the transformational nature of Christ's work in us.

---

[145] Augustine. *The Literal Meaning of Genesis*. Translated by John Hammond Taylor. Vol. 2. New York: Newman Press, 1982.

[146] Augustine. *On the Trinity*. Translated by Stephen McKenna. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1963. Book 4, Chapter 17.

XIV.   CONCLUSION

The Integrated Hypostatic Union Model (IHUM) offers a comprehensive framework that aligns with the Chalcedonian Definition while addressing unresolved theological challenges. By synthesizing classical doctrines with contemporary insights, IHUM provides an innovative explanation of Christ's dual natures—fully divine and fully human. It resists both historical heresies and modern critiques, making it relevant for both academic and ministerial contexts, with practical applications for pastoral care, ecclesial unity, and doctrinal clarity.

IHUM engages with contemporary theological questions—particularly those concerning consciousness, personhood, and the integration of Christ's divine and human natures—demonstrating its robustness without falling into extremes such as Monophysitism (blending of natures) or Nestorianism (dividing natures).[147] By addressing the tension between divine omniscience and human limitations, IHUM provides a coherent resolution to these theological complexities, filling gaps that have persisted in Christological studies.

By framing the Divine Logos as eternally possessing both divine and human experiences within the *'Eternal Now,'* IHUM clarifies that Christ's assumption of human nature added nothing new to the divine consciousness. Rather, the Incarnation was undertaken for humanity's salvation, whereby the eternal experience of the Logos entered

---

[147] Rowan Williams, *Arius: Heresy and Tradition*, 23.

time without altering or diminishing the divine nature.[148] In this way, IHUM upholds God's immutability while affirming the full reality of Christ's human experiences.[149]

The **Integrated Hypostatic Union Model (IHUM)** serves as the theological foundation for its companion, the Two-Ship Model, which illustrates Christological principles through a tangible and relatable analogy. Together, these works aim to present a cohesive understanding of Christ's dual natures, combining systematic theological depth with accessible visualization.

Building on IHUM, the Two-Ship Model acts as a pedagogical tool to simplify and clarify its theological insights. It depicts Christ's divine and human natures as distinct yet perfectly synchronized vessels under the command of a single Admiral, representing Christ's unified personhood. This analogy translates IHUM's complex constructs into an engaging framework, shedding light on the interplay between Christ's omniscience, human limitations, and redemptive mission.[150]

This approach is further supported through the Christology Bible Study, which integrates IHUM and the Two-Ship Model into a comprehensive curriculum. Designed to engage believers at all levels, the study combines key scriptural passages, discussions on historical heresies, and practical applications of the Hypostatic Union. The Two-Ship

---

[148] Thomas F. Torrance, *Incarnation: The Person and Life of Christ*, 98.

[149] Gregory of Nyssa, *Against Eunomius*, 35–89.

[150] D. Gene Williams Jr., *The Two-Ship Model of Christ's Dual Natures: Navigating the Hypostatic Union*, accessed November 27, 2024, https://triinitysem.academia.edu/GeneWilliamsJr; https://defendtheword.com/insights-and-studies.html.

Model complements IHUM by making abstract theological concepts accessible and relatable, enriching participants' understanding of Christ's dual natures.[151]

By embracing the IHUM framework and its visualization through the Two-Ship Model, this paper and the accompanying Bible study aim to deepen faith, enhance theological comprehension, and equip believers to articulate the profound mystery of the Hypostatic Union in both ministry and worship.

Future Research Directions

IHUM opens several promising avenues for future research. Its potential for interfaith dialogue is significant, particularly in discussions with Islam and Judaism, which challenge the Incarnation and the divinity of Christ.[152] IHUM provides a model that preserves Christ's divine unity while articulating how the second person of the Trinity could assume human nature without compromising God's essence. In Judaism, where the expectation of a fully human Messiah is central, IHUM bridges this understanding by affirming Christ's genuine humanity and defending His divinity based on Scriptural and patristic foundations.

IHUM's engagement with modern studies on consciousness and personhood also presents fertile ground for philosophical theology. The concept of a unified consciousness in Christ, where divine omniscience and human experience coexist without confusion, opens new avenues for understanding personhood in the context of the Incarnation.[153]

---

[151] D. Gene Williams Jr., *Christology Bible Study Syllabus (IHUM)*, accessed December 23, 2024, https://triinitysem.academia.edu/GeneWilliamsJr; https://defendtheword.com/insights-and-studies.html.

[152] Maximus the Confessor, *On the Cosmic Mystery of Jesus Christ*, 112.

[153] J.P. Moreland and William Lane Craig, *Philosophical Foundations for a Christian Worldview*, 67.

Additionally, IHUM's concepts of selective communication and kenosis invite further theological reflection, particularly within pastoral care. By emphasizing Christ's genuine engagement with human suffering, IHUM provides a framework that comforts believers by demonstrating that Christ fully understands and shares in human trials, all without compromising His divinity.[154]

Conclusion as Resolution

IHUM offers a coherent resolution to the mystery of how Christ's divine and human natures coexist within one person. By framing the Divine Logos as eternally possessing both divine and human experiences in the *'Eternal Now,'* IHUM clarifies that the Incarnation did not introduce anything new to the Logos.[155] Instead, the Incarnation was a necessary act for humanity's salvation, manifesting the timeless reality of divine-human experience within history.[156] In doing so, IHUM preserves God's immutability while affirming the full reality of Christ's human experiences, providing clarity to long-standing Christological dilemmas.[157]

---

[154] Thomas F. Torrance, *Incarnation: The Person and Life of Christ*, 98.

[155] Maximus the Confessor, *On the Cosmic Mystery of Jesus Christ*, 112.

[156] N.T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 41.

[157] Gregory of Nyssa, *Against Eunomius*, 35–89.

APENDDIX A: TWO SHIP MODEL BASED ON IHUM

A majestic depiction of the divine ship, representing the eternal and immutable nature of Christ's divinity. Radiating with celestial light and intricate designs, this ship embodies transcendence and omnipotence. At the helm stands Jesus Christ as the Admiral, exuding authority and peace, dressed in regal, flowing garments. The ethereal background of glowing clouds and serene skies highlights the ship's heavenly essence, symbolizing Christ's guidance of His divine and human natures in perfect harmony. For a more detailed breakdown of the two-ship model, see my study *The Two-Ship Model of Christ's Dual Natures*. [158]

---

[158] D. Gene Williams Jr., *The Two-Ship Model of Christ's Dual Natures: Navigating the Hypostatic Union*, accessed December 14, 2024, https://triinitysem.academia.edu/GeneWilliamsJr; https://defendtheword.com/insights-and-studies.html.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Source

The Holy Bible, English Standard Version. Crossway Bibles, 2001.

Secondary Source

Anselm of Canterbury. *Cur Deus Homo*. Translated by Sidney Norton Deane. Chicago: Open Court Publishing, 1903.

Aquinas, Thomas. *Summa Theologica*. Translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1947.

Athanasius of Alexandria. *On the Incarnation of the Word*. Translated by a Religious of C.S.M.V. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1993.

Augustine. *City of God*. Translated by Henry Bettenson. London: Penguin Books, 1972.

———. *On the Trinity*. Translated by Stephen McKenna. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1963.

———. *The Literal Meaning of Genesis*. Translated by John Hammond Taylor. Vol. 2. New York: Newman Press, 1982.

Balthasar, Hans Urs von. *Mysterium Paschale: The Mystery of Easter*. Translated by Aidan Nichols. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1990.

———. *Theo-Drama: The Person in Christ*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1992.

Basil the Great. *"Letter 236."* In *Church Fathers: Letters*. Accessed November 2018. https://www.original-sinner.com/resources/church-fathers/basil-the-great/letter-236/.

Brannan, Rick, Ken M. Penner, et al. *The Lexham English Septuagint*. 2nd ed. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2020.

Calvin, John. *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Edited by John T. McNeill. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960.

Carson, D.A. *The Expositor's Bible Commentary: Matthew.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984.

Chalcedonian Definition. *Acts of the Council of Chalcedon*. 451 AD.

C.F.D. Moule. *The Birth of the New Testament*. 3rd ed. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1981.

Clayton, Philip. *Mind and Emergence: From Quantum to Consciousness*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Council of Chalcedon. *Definition of Faith*, in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, edited by Philip Schaff. Vol. 14. Translated by Henry Wace and William Bright. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1994.

Crisp, Oliver. *Divinity and Humanity: The Incarnation Reconsidered*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Craig, William Lane. *Dyothelitism vs Monothelitism* [YouTube Video]. Accessed March 2025. https://youtu.be/OzUczFrtLgU.

———. *Philosophical Foundations for a Christian Worldview*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2003.

———. *The Only Wise God: The Compatibility of Divine Foreknowledge and Human Freedom*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1987.

Cyril of Alexandria. *On the Unity of Christ*. Translated by John Anthony McGuckin. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1995.

———. *Third Letter to Nestorius*, in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers: Second Series*, Vol. 7, edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1894.

Deacon, Terrence. *Incomplete Nature: How Mind Emerged from Matter*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2011.

Forsyth, P.T. *The Person and Place of Jesus Christ*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1909.

Gerald F. Hawthorne. *The Presence and the Power: The Significance of the Holy Spirit in the Life and Ministry of Jesus*. Dallas: Word Publishing, 1991.

Gregory of Nazianzus. *Epistle 101: On the Unity of Christ*, in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers: Second Series*, vol. 7, edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1894.

Gregory of Nyssa. *Against Eunomius*, in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers: Second Series*, Vol. 5, edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1893.

———. *On the Soul and the Resurrection*. In *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series, Vol. 5*, edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1893.

———. *The Great Catechism*. Translated by William Moore and Henry Austin Wilson. New York: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1892.

Gregory the Great. *Morals on the Book of Job*. Translated by James Bliss. Vol. 1. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1844.

Gumerlock, Francis. *Mark 13:32 and Christ's Supposed Ignorance*. Accessed December 2018. https://francisgumerlock.com/wp-content/uploads/2009/01/Mark%2013.32%20and%20Christ's%20Supposed%20Ignorance.pdf.

Ignatius of Antioch. *Letter to the Smyrnaeans*. In *Apostolic Fathers*. Translated by Bart D. Ehrman. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003.

Irenaeus. *Against Heresies*. In *Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. 1*, edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1885.

John of Damascus. *An Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith*. In *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series, Vol. 9*, edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1899.

Keener, Craig S. *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.

Kelly, J.N.D. *Early Christian Doctrines*. 5th ed. London: Continuum, 2006.

Leo the Great. *Tome to Flavian*. In *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series, Vol. 14*, edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1893.

———. *The Tome of Leo*, in *Documents of the Christian Church*, edited by Henry Bettenson and Chris Maunder. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Lewis, C.S. *Mere Christianity*. New York: HarperOne, 2001.

———. *The Problem of Pain*. New York: HarperOne, 2001.

Maximus the Confessor. *The Ambigua*. Translated by Nicholas Constas. Vol. 1, *On Difficulties in the Church Fathers*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014.

———. *The Ambigua*. Translated by Nicholas Constas. Vol. 2. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014.

———. *On the Cosmic Mystery of Jesus Christ*. Translated by Paul M. Blowers and Robert Louis Wilken. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2003.

Moreland, J.P., and William Lane Craig. *Philosophical Foundations for a Christian Worldview*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2003.

Morris, Thomas V. *The Logic of God Incarnate*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1986.

Moltmann, Jürgen. *The Trinity and the Kingdom of God*. London: SCM Press, 1981.

Nagel, Thomas. "What Is It Like to Be a Bat?" *Philosophical Review* 83, no. 4 (1974): 435-450.

Norris, Richard A., Jr. *The Christological Controversy*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980.

Origen. *On First Principles*. Translated by G.W. Butterworth. Gloucester: Peter Smith, 1973.

O'Collins, Gerald. *Christology: A Biblical, Historical, and Systematic Study of Jesus.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Pelikan, Jaroslav. *The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100–600).* Vol. 1 of *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971.

Rahner, Karl. *Foundations of Christian Faith: An Introduction to the Idea of Christianity*. Translated by William V. Dych. New York: Crossroad, 1996.

Rudolph, Kurt. *Gnosis: The Nature and History of Gnosticism*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1983.

Sanidopoulos, John. *"Was Jesus Ignorant of the Time of His Second Coming?" Orthodox Christianity Then and Now*. May 5, 2011. Accessed December 2018. https://www.johnsanidopoulos.com/2011/05/was-jesus-ignorant-of-time-of-his.html?m=1.

StudyLight.org. *"Mark 13:32 – Περὶ δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας..." Interlinear Study Bible*. Accessed January 2019. https://www.studylight.org/interlinear-study-bible/greek/mark/13-32.html.

Torrance, Thomas F. *Incarnation: The Person and Life of Christ*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2008.

Weinandy, "*Thomas G. Does God Suffer?*" Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000.

Williams, D. Gene Jr. *A Defense of the Trinity: The Foundation Without Which There Is No Christianity*. Accessed March 2025. https://triinitysem.academia.edu/GeneWilliamsJr; https://defendtheword.com/insights-and-studies.html.

———. *B-Theory of Time: A Defense of God's Eternal Now in Christian Theology*. Accessed March 2025. https://triinitysem.academia.edu/GeneWilliamsJr; https://defendtheword.com/insights-and-studies.html.

———. *Christian Theology Christology Bible Study Syllabus (IHUM)*. Accessed March 2025. https://triinitysem.academia.edu/GeneWilliamsJr; https://defendtheword.com/insights-and-studies.html.

———. *The Two-Ship Model of Christ's Dual Natures: Navigating the Hypostatic Union*. Accessed January 5, 2025. https://triinitysem.academia.edu/GeneWilliamsJr; https://defendtheword.com/insights-and-studies.html.

Wright, N.T. *Jesus and the Victory of God*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996.

Zizioulas, John. *Being as Communion: Studies in Personhood and the Church*. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1997.