

## A Critical Look at the Article of Faith on Jesus Christ from a Korean Perspective

Chun Kwang-Don

*We believe in Jesus Christ, the Second Person of the Triune Godhead; that He was eternally one with the Father; that He became incarnate by the Holy Spirit and was born of the Virgin Mary, so that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say the Godhead and manhood, are thus united in one Person very God and very man, the God-man.*

*We believe that Jesus Christ died for our sins, and that He truly arose from the dead and took again His body, together with all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature, wherewith He ascended into heaven and is there engaged in intercession for us.*

-Manual, Article II

### I. Introduction: Who do You Say I am?

In the middle of his evangelistic itinerary around the villages of Caesarea Philippi, Jesus asked his disciples two questions regarding his identity: "Who do people say I am?" (Mk 8:27), and "Who do you say I am?" (Mk 8:29). What he really wanted to know at that time was not their answers to the first question but to the second one. His second question can be certainly relevant and applicable for all men and women, especially those who intend to follow him throughout life. No matter how others may refer to him, no matter how eloquently or elaborately others may portray him, Jesus' primary and ongoing concern is for what *I* think of him. In this sense, each of us is required to answer who Jesus is – in terms of what *I* understand, by virtue of how *I* feel, and on the basis of why *I* believe. Rather than simply to say something about him from others' mouths, he wants me to profess him as I see through my own eyes, hear by my own ears, and experience with my own body. It is such a Jesus that can penetrate into my soul and spirit, permeate into my bone and marrow, and incarnate into my essence and existence. That Jesus was/is the Messiah Peter confessed, the Christ the early disciples encountered, and the Lord the primitive Christian community experienced: the living Son of God who deeply touched their hearts, continually moved their minds, and radically changed their whole beings.

My aim in this paper is to take a critical look at the Article II of the Nazarene Manual on Jesus Christ particularly from my own location, in order that we may reconsider, reappropriate, and reconstruct its theological, biblical, and social meaning in the indigenous context of the Korean people in particular and in the global context of the Nazarene people in general. My work attempts to honestly and earnestly answer for Jesus' question of "Who do *you* say I am?" In a similar vein, standing within my *Sitz im Leben*, I try to personally respond to Jesus' inquiry of "What do you think this Article on me is?" Here my own location, from which I clarify the identity of Jesus in the text and feel the reality of Jesus in the context, indicates an undeniable fact describing, designating, and determining who I am, ontologically and existentially. The fact is that I am a Korean. Before and after being a Nazarene, I will always remain as Korean. As

Korean I was born in the past, live in the present, and will die in the future. My Korean citizenship is *a priori*, whereas my Nazarene membership is *a posteriori*. Korean indeed is my name and frame of identity that shapes my way of ontological being and existential doing in the world. Apart from and independent of “Koreaness,” the ontic warp and woof of my life cannot come into being and becoming at all. That is why I feel the necessity of viewing the Article about Jesus Christ from my given location as a Korean not as a Western, white, American, so to speak, from my own hermeneutical standpoint that may hold a theological spectrum and fulcrum, deepening the vertical dimension of our faith, expanding the horizontal praxis of our work, and transforming the *modus operandi* and *modus vivendi* of the Church of the Nazarene around the globe.

## II. A Missing Second Paragraph in Article II

After a careful reading of Article II, I was somewhat struck by its absence of one important aspect of Jesus Christ--the aspect of his human personality revealed through his earthly life that can provide an essential key to understanding who he is, without theological bias and hermeneutical coloring. What most bothers me under the rubric of Article II is, curiously enough, that there is not any single indication and vindication of *how Jesus of Nazareth actually lived during his life-time*. Hardly can I sense the very smell of the very person, Jesus in that Article. Neither his holy passion nor his wholly compassion can I feel except a dry, cold, and pale Second Person of the trinity under the abstract canopy of dogmatism. Should the Article of Jesus Christ be always written and rewritten in such a way? That’s not the *sine qua non* for Articles of Faith. In my opinion, that’s a fatal abstraction [attraction]! Thus, my dissatisfaction with the current Article is that it neglects to take seriously the biography of Jesus Christ who spent his entire life *on the earth* rather than *on the cross*. Jesus Christ came to this world not just in order to die as a Son of God for a few hours, but also to live as a son of man exactly like each of us for thirty-three years. His life is as much important as his death. However, although the Article succinctly mentions about his death alongside his birth, unfortunately, it does not state at all his life between the manger and the cross in light of how Jesus as a human lived in his own context of the world. It talks about his death, but not about his life. In that Article, his death is alive; his life is dead. *The Article crucified his life!* The heartbeat and pulse of his life stop there. Quite obviously, there is no significant clue as to *what kind of life he chose to live on earth prior to his crucifixion*, as it were, no crucial glue that binds his life into a cohesive and coherent whole.<sup>1</sup> For this

---

<sup>1</sup> For example, suppose the following Article of Abraham Lincoln. “We believe in Abraham Lincoln, who was born Feb. 12, 1809 in a poor family of Kentucky. He was elected as the sixteenth president of the United States. On Good Friday, April 14, 1865, he was assassinated at Theatre in Washington by John Wilkes Booth. We believe that he died for our freedom, and that He is truly alive in the heart of American people.” This

reason, no one who has read the gospels can fail to gain the impression that the whole gamut of Article II is incognizant of, and indifferent to, the very life of Jesus Christ, a real human being with flesh and blood, who existed in a particular location of historical time and place. As a result, the Article, which seems excessively preoccupied with the divine nature of the Incarnation, shows us only one half of Jesus Christ without paying full or equal attention to the human nature of the Incarnation vividly manifested in and through his earthly steps of life. Thus, no one with a keen perception of Christology can seriously deny that the Article is oriented to be, theologically or dogmatically, too much concerned about the divine identity (*homoousious*) of Jesus Christ, but too little concerned about the human identity (*homo*) of Jesus Christ. There is no place, no hint, no sense of the life of a Mediterranean Jewish man in the first century, in the realm of the Article which prioritizes the essential being of Christ over the existential doing of Jesus in a reinforcing manner and matter. The Article is a place of Christological error where the divine Christ appears and the human Jesus disappears. Since the Article primarily sticks to “high Christology,” focusing on Jesus after resurrection in its negligence of “low Christology” based on Jesus before resurrection, it has also an unbalanced place of Christology where Christ of faith is overemphasized and Jesus of history is deemphasized.

It comes as no surprise that the Article II about Jesus Christ talks about his incarnation, yet not about his *incarnated life*. By way of effacing all the traces of his personal humanity left on the earthly life, it seemingly tends to de-incarnate Jesus Christ who incarnated himself into this world. In spite of the fact that his Incarnation reveals to us in a concrete term what it really means to be human and to live as human in this world, the Article keeps silent about the salient feature of Jesus’ human qualities. It uncovers the form of the Incarnation but covers the contents of the Incarnation. It means to indicate that the Article has definitely a missing part of Jesus’ life, namely, Christological vacuum in the continuum of its constituents, inevitably created by the early Nazarene writers of credo who, I think, seemed to be unmindful of their hermeneutical presuppositions, epistemological limitations, and dogmatic orientations. In order to fill such a vacuum, therefore, we need to insert the missing link (second paragraph) about the earthly life of the historical Jesus between the first and the last paragraph of the existing Article II. To dismiss the life of Jesus is to miss the quintessential truth of who he is, I believe, so that any doctrinal claims of Jesus Christ cannot be justified unless and until they are justified with his life. The life of the human Jesus is the immediate point of departure for, the intimate point of

---

Article mentions about his birth and death but not about his life itself. With this Article, we cannot know how the historical Lincoln actually lived in his own context of the world. It totally misses the most important portion of his life that enables us to understand who he was. The Article of Jesus Christ in Manual makes the same mistake by ignoring the life of the historical Jesus as reflected in the gospels of the New Testament.

reference to, and the ultimate point of arrival at, the heart of Christological tenet. This is the rationale why the Article should be linked with the neglected aspect of Jesus Christ, which is considered to be the unwritten part of the credo due to the Hellenistic captivity of Western traditional theology, consciously or unconsciously, addicted to metaphysical speculation for a long period of time. If so, as a corrective to the current Article's obfuscation of the biblical truth about the *lived* humanity of Jesus Christ, the missing link can be a vital link that connects us with the living, concrete reality of God in the midst of history, by means of making explicit what is implicit in the conventional credos of Church.

### **III. The Image of Jesus Christ as Reflected in the Article II**

At the crossroad of religion and philosophy, Tertullian, the early church father, once asked: "What has Athens to do with Jerusalem?" Covert in this question was his overt position that Athens and Jerusalem stood on the bedrock of radical antinomy and dichotomy, and hence that the ideas of Greek philosophers had nothing to do with the faith of Christian people. By the same token, "What has the Article II of the Nazarene Church to do with the Korean believers?" My candid answer is, "Not much." It is not because, from an orthodox standpoint of Christian tradition, there is something wrong with the Article, but because, from my Korean perspective, there is something lacking in the Article that has a serious deficiency in the image of Jesus Christ sufficient to grasp his full identity and integrity as manifested in the gospels. Let me descant upon the deficient image of the Article's Jesus Christ in the following categories.

#### **The Cloned Image of Jesus Christ**

The overall picture of Jesus Christ portrayed in the Article II bears a striking resemblance to his creedal image shaped and reshaped in the dogmatic matrix of Western traditional Christianity. My close observation of the Article enables me to come to the conclusion that the early Nazarene writers of the credo should heavily refer to and rely upon the Methodist's "Articles of Religion" and the Anglican's "Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion" in tandem with The Nicene Creed, because of the corresponding similarities among them. The general image of Jesus Christ, reflected on the mirror of Nazarene's Article, is nothing new, nothing more, and nothing less than his image described in these credos. It is the same image under the different name of creed: a cloned image to be duplicated onto Articles of Faith by the Nazarenes, who seemed inclined to uncritically or literally imitate the paragraphs and phrases of these traditional credos, without direct recourse to the gospel account. As a result, Article II shows us simply a typical image of Jesus Christ as presumably a Western white man, which has been theologically elaborated, ecclesiastically endorsed, and dogmatically enforced by the dominant elite groups of the Western religious status quo, from

their own perspective, with their own standard, and along their own image. In this sense, the Nazarene's official image of Jesus Christ was *made in the USA* exclusively in collaboration with its Western counterparts; neither made in Korea nor in Philippine nor in any other Asia-Pacific region! Such an image indeed is a Kansas version of Jesus Christ, for it still essentially embodies the theological sense and denominational consensus of particularly American-Nazarene members in a hegemonic position to exercise their jurisdiction over the rest of the world, assuming that they are the center of the Nazarene World, the subjects of the Nazarene history, and the measure of all Nazarene matters. Thus, there is little room left in the current Article II into which any other images of Jesus Christ in the eyes of either Korean or Asia-Pacific Nazarene members can easily take root. Personally and soteriology speaking, I believe that there is "No Other Name" but Jesus Christ. However, biblically and missiologically speaking, to claim "No Other Image" is to disclaim the very truth of the Incarnation. "To the African, God speaks as if He were an African; to the Chinese, God speaks as if He were a Chinese."<sup>2</sup> To the Koreans, God speaks and appears through Jesus Christ as if He were a Korean. Just as American-Nazarene people look at Jesus Christ from their "hamburger" perspective, we Koreans can see him from our "kimchi" perspective beyond cloning his westernized image, in such a way that we may have a much better picture of him that becomes more intelligible to our minds, more touchable to our hearts, and more reliable to our lives. This is an answer for the question of "What has Kansas to do with Seoul?"

### **The Colorless Image of Jesus Christ**

Another important yet little noticed aspect of the Article II is the colorless, neutral character of Jesus Christ. The Article has something to say about who Jesus Christ is theologically but nothing about what kind of man he is personally. My point here is that the Article's Jesus Christ has no human color at all. Needless to mention, every human being has one's own color: color of skin, color of speech, color of thought, color of action, color of faith, color of ideology, color of theology, and so forth. We are all colored people, no matter who we are. Human is *huan*, which means a colorful existence (*huexistence*) comprising a unique fabric of personality. There is no such person as colorless being with colorless life. Only a dead man has no color. To live is to paint a picture of life with colors one likes to choose. My favorite color tells who I am essentially and existentially. No color, no identity. Know color, know identity. From this point of view, it is a serious mistake that the Article erased all colors of Jesus Christ as a human being, albeit publicly and constantly he displayed his distinctive color of personality in and through his earthly life. Like us, he must surely have a color of

---

<sup>2</sup> Susan Brooks Thistlethwaite & Mary Potter Engel, eds. *Lift Every Voice: Constructing Christian Theologies from the Underside* (New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1990), 271.

emotion and motion, a color of attitude and aptitude, a color of intention and contention, as the gospel account graphically demonstrates what sort of life-color he preferred to choose in every nook and corner of the Palestinian land. In fact, it is because of the very color he chose that he had been hated, persecuted, and killed by those whose color was radically different from his own. Were Jesus Christ to live colorlessly in a neutral manner without turning either left or right, he would never suffer by dint of his opponent groups. In those days, he was undoubtedly a man of color with a conspicuous character and behaviour that were scandalous enough not only to cause a direct conflict with the order and law of the status quo, but also to create a shock wave over the entire Jewish terrain of Palestine. The color of his personal identity was so strong that it continued to draw much attention of many people and withal, they were often stunned by his words and actions deeply imbued with such color. Indisputably a colorless Jesus with an empty shell of humanity did not exist 2000 years ago. A colorless Jesus is neither a real human nor a real Jesus. A colorless Jesus is a faceless Jesus. Such a Jesus may have a place in the Article II but no place in the Bible. The Incarnation is not a colorless event but a colorful one through which God vividly revealed His true color by taking a particular color of human being in history. Jesus Christ without color is not identical with the "very God" and cannot be the "very man" in the Article. Thus, any Article bearing a color blind image of Jesus Christ is as theologically untenable as biblically false.

### **The Virtual Image of Jesus Christ**

Something also vexing in the Article II that has been brought to my attention is the worldless, virtual character of Jesus Christ. There is no question that the very text of the Article has no mention of the very context of the world where Jesus Christ of the Nazareth acted actually and lived lively. I cannot simply understand why the text of the Article gives no context of Jesus Christ. Nor can I easily accept the contextless text of the Article. Suffice it to say, the textual construction of the Article is built upon the contextual deconstruction of Jesus Christ. Sadly enough, the Article of Jesus Christ does not include any particle of his context, so he seems to appear as a worldless figure who dwells in a virtual and not an actual world. Such a strange image of Jesus Christ in the Article, in my opinion, has its root into a logocentric textualism that deeply runs throughout the orthodox stream of Western Christian thought repeating a catch phrase of *Sola Scriptura!* (only the text). What I mean by a logocentric textualism is that Western traditional theologians, whose mindsets are excessively obsessed with the truth of logos, have grappled with text itself rather than with the context in a dereistic thinking and eristic manner. What really matters to them in the explication of faith is not a lived world but a written world. Doing theology is nothing else than a kind of an endless hermeneutical play of language game moving from text to text without seriously getting stuck into the context of the

sheer reality in the world. Theology begins and ends with text. Theologians are those who live in the text rather than in the context: they are texttheologians and their theology is texttheology. So enmeshed and entangled in their own text are most traditional theological works that they hardly take the context of their subject into full account in the course of faith seeking understanding. Thus, under this text-oriented and context-disoriented circumstance, it is quite inevitable that the context of Jesus Christ has almost completely evaporated in the text of their traditional Articles. There is no exception to the Article II in that its text from start to finish is utterly bereft of Jesus' lived context. In the presence of the Article II, I feel the absence of his context, too. What I see through the Article is just his *textual image* not his *contextual reality*. I can be certain in the Article that Jesus Christ is textually alive but contextually dead. So, my recurring question is, "Why have we had to keep eliminating the contextual element of Jesus Christ and reciting his seemingly astigmatic, enigmatic, and unpragmatic image in the Article of Faith?" There is a strong sense in which I am compelled to insist that *we are called into the context not into the text*. We, Nazarenes, need to turn to the uncomfortable context of Jesus Christ over beyond our comfortable zone of the text.<sup>3</sup> We must be hungry for the context rather than the text. Let us remember that the text without the context is not a true text: the context cannot be replaced by the text under any pretext. The text is the text. The context is the core text within the text, without the context, without the text. There is nothing outside the context. *In the beginning was the context*. God was within the context,

---

<sup>3</sup> Let me paraphrase Psalm 23 in terms of text. It describes the way of Christians who comfortably and complacently live in the text without involving in their real context of the world.

"The text is my shepherd,  
I shall not be in want.  
It makes me lie down in desk;  
it leads me beside quiet room,  
It restores my mind.  
It guides me in paths of truth  
for the text's sake.  
Even though I walk  
through the valley of the shadow of ignorance  
I will fear no embarrassment,  
for the text is with me;  
its words and sentences,  
they comfort me.  
The text prepares a desk before me  
in the absence of my context.  
It anoints my head with ideas;  
my brain overflows.  
Surely goodness and love will follow me  
all the days of my life,  
and I will dwell in the house of the text  
forever."

and the context was with God. The locus where the Logos became incarnated was not the text but the context. That is to say, Jesus Christ was born in the context, lived with the context, died for the context, and arose from the context. Jesus was anything but a man of the text, secluded from and independently of, the context of his own world during his earthly life, so that neither Jesus nor the context was separated from each other. In all these respects, the understanding of him apart from his context may result in the misunderstanding or misrepresenting of who he really is, no matter how systematically or sophisticatedly the Article elaborates his image, since the loss of his context is the loss of his contents. The text of the Article which loses its point of contact with the context of Jesus Christ runs the risk of making him inappropriate and irrelevant to our own life situation. When the Western missionaries came to Korea, unfortunately, they introduced to us a contextless Jesus who was present merely in the text. Thus, it is a tragic error for any Article of Faith about Jesus Christ to remove his context from its text and to articulate his contextless image as if he were a virtual figure in an acosmistic world. The error will remain unchanged until we significantly recontextualize the text of the Article which decontextualizes the context of Jesus Christ. Any Article out of context is biblically out of order as well as theologically out of sense.

### **The Solitary Image of Jesus Christ**

In the Article II there appears the unspoken image of Jesus Christ, who can be properly characterized by being radically individualistic, solitary, and solipsistic without a nature of corporate interpersonality together with fellow human beings. Those who have been raised in and saturated by the Western cultural milieu may hardly recognize the fact that the Article predominantly cultivated and activated the image of Jesus Christ in private and personalized terms. Totally ignoring how he had socially correlated with others in the course of doing his ministry, the Article leads us to see only the individualistic dimension of Jesus Christ to the exclusion of his collectivistic aspect of life. It is my undeniable judgment that the Article has interpreted the essence and existence of Jesus Christ exclusively in the narrow sense of Western individualism hinged upon the great I AM, the self-enclosed ego, and the independent will to power. The Article's image of Jesus Christ which comes into view and play in the arena of Western Christendom is heavily drenched with the individualistic tone and narcissistic nuance devoid of any shared communal sensibility and perspective. Such an individualistic perception and conception about Jesus Christ is deeply grounded in the Western culture and tradition of *Gesellschaft* where there is no strong consciousness of community with common destiny, common value, common vision, common suffering, etc., and thus the personal interest of the solipsistic self always takes precedence over and against the common good of community. The self-centered and self-oriented language of

their daily conversation reflects the individualistic mindset of Westerners who are often used to saying *my* church, *my* school, *my* country, *my* blessing, and so too, *my* Lord alongside the strong subjective pronouns of I, me, mine, and myself. However, those Western expressions are quite contrary and even awkward to the Eastern mind of Koreans, who always talk like *our* church, *our* school, *our* country, *our* blessing, and herewith *our* Jesus, since we are born in the context of *Gemeinschaft* and still remain steeped in the collective culture where there is no radical sense of individuality, individualism, and egoism apart from the common good and interests of community. Thus, it is more appealing for us to realize the reality of Jesus Christ through the Eastern way rather than the Western way, and also is more sensible to identify the identity of Jesus Christ in a collectivistic sense rather than an individualistic term. For, the historical Jesus as an Eastern man was not an isolated individual of the autistic self preoccupied with his own private matters of concern intrinsically divorced from his encountered community, but a social being with a deep sense of togetherness who, interrelatedly and interdependently, was willing to associate himself with people in his world. As the gospel witnesses, his life was not just a one-man show but a collective social drama performed all together by Jesus, his disciples, as well as many others. His world was not *Gesellschaft* but *Gemeinschaft*. He lived not individualistically but collectivistically. His theology is not “me-ology” but “we-ology,” therewith he teaches us *our* heavenly Father, *our* Kingdom of God, *our* salvation, *our* holiness, *our* daily bread, etc., in a collective sense and terms. It is the case that Jesus and individualism are utterly incompatible with each other. Individualism is essentially and existentially antithetical to the very character of Jesus Christ who incarnated into people, stayed among people, worked by people, suffered with people, and died alongside people. He shows us what it really means to exist not individualistically but collectively in the world, by saying, “If anyone would come after me, he must deny himself and take up his cross daily and follow me” (Luke 9:23-24). To follow him is to deny my individualistic way of life and to take up my cross of social/collective responsibility for the community to which I belong. In a nutshell, individualism has nothing to do with our vocational calling for this world: discipleship means “communalship” not “individualship.” Thus any Article of Jesus Christ for discipleship that is constructed solely on the basis of the privatized selfhood is too individualistic in its concern, contour, and contents to do justice to the corporate image of Jesus Christ who lived in relation with his community, in solidarity with his people, and in contact with his world.

### **The Visual Image of Jesus Christ**

Alfred North Whitehead, the eminent thinker of process philosophy, once remarked about the nature of Western traditional epistemology: “Philosophers have disdained the information about the universe obtained through their

visceral feelings, and have concentrated on visual feelings.”<sup>4</sup> A visceral feeling here is a gut feeling that we bodily experience in and through our whole internal organs such as heart, stomach, lung, gall bladder, intestines, etc., whereas a visual feeling is a rational sense that we partially perceive by means of our eyes. A visceral feeling is a wholistic feeling of attachment to one’s body, and a visual feeling is a dualistic feeling of detachment from one’s body. Explicit in Whitehead’s statement based on their difference is the argument that for the purpose of exploring truth, Western philosophers have crucified a human body in the name of the Platonic idea by cursing a visceral feeling. Since a human body is negatively regarded as a stumbling block in the way to truth, they have always sought to examine and explain all the reality of the world with a visual feeling in capacity of a purely rationalistic mind, while suppressing their visceral sensation as much as possible in the cognitive process. They used to affirm what is visually seen to satisfy their reason but negate what is viscerally felt to shake their body. The difference between sense and nonsense is what I see and what I feel. It is a visual not visceral feeling that matters in doing philosophy. In Descartes’ famous dictum—“I [eye] think, therefore I am”—representing the core of Western philosophical discourse, “the *cogito* is *video ergo sum*, or the mind’s I is the mind’s eye.”<sup>5</sup> In this respect, their epistemology is *eyestemology*, their phenomenology is *eyenomenology*, and their hermeneutics is *eyermeneutics*. Western traditional philosophy is a visual thought standing alone with one leg of reason, more specifically speaking, a disembodied thought departed from a human body.

In dealing with the subjects of Christian truth, Western traditional theology is in substantial agreement with its philosophical counterpart. Western theology is a visual theology built on what I see by a mind of reason. It is not a visceral theology built upon what I feel through my entire body. It is a kind of “seen” or “scene” theology for eyes that makes sense rationally, so theologians have made an effort to visualize the truth of Christianity in a rationalistic terms. In opting for the negative stance of a human body under the influence of Platonism, Western Christian theology has been gradually visualized, literalized, and iconized as losing its viscerally carnal feelings. Consequently, its texts become surrounded by many folds of icons, images, and symbols, in such a visual way that Western traditional theology turns out to be an apathetic theology (apatheology), incapable of feeling viscerally. There is no smell of flesh, no pulsation of heart, no splitting of stomach, no twisting of bowel, no regurgitating of blood, no shivering of bone, and no piercing of marrow. Not surprisingly, the Articles of faith in Western traditional church are the same as their theology. They have changed the visceral reality of Jesus Christ into the

---

<sup>4</sup> Alfred North Whitehead, *Process and Reality: An Essay in Cosmology* (New York: The Free Press, 1978), 121.

<sup>5</sup> Hwa Yol Jung, “Writing the Body as Social Discourse: Prolegomena to Carnal Hermeneutics,” in *Signs of Change: Premodern, Modern, Postmodern*, edited by Stephen Baker (New York: State University of New York Press, 1966), 262.

visual image of Jesus Christ in their Articles as a tabloid edition of their theology. It is a matter of regret in Christian history. Because Jesus is not a visual man, but a visceral man, he came to this world in order to live viscerally rather than just to show up who he is in front of others. The Incarnation is not a visual event of the disembodied logos, but rather a visceral manifestation of “the Word [that] became *flesh* and dwelt among us” (John 1:14). Jesus Christ is a visceral image of God much more than a visible image of the invisible God. During his entire lifetime, he lived by his gut-wrenching feelings from within his whole internal organs fully charged with the divine empathy. Whatever he did, wherever he went, whomever he met, as the Bible says, it was his visceral feeling not visual one that, passionately and compassionately, moved him to do so at any cost. The saving activity was a visceral struggle with the victims of evil, a visceral confrontation against the root of evil, and finally a visceral conquest over the power of evil on the Cross. The Cross is the most visceral symbol to reveal who Jesus Christ is, ontologically and existentially. Therefore, my final question as a Korean(kimch has a visceral taste) is, “Where is such a visceral reality of Jesus Christ in our Article II?” There remains only a visual icon of Jesus Christ *I can see* with my reason, not a visceral reality of Jesus Christ *I can feel* with my gut. The Article on Jesus Christ was surely written with visual feelings without visceral feelings. A visual Jesus without his visceral reality in the Article seems to me like a oxymoran as intrinsically unparalelling as a Platonic or gnostic Jesus, who puts himself at odds with the way he lived in the really, fleshly world.

#### **IV. Conclusion: Toward a New Article of Faith on Jesus Christ**

The Articles of faith are neither the Bible nor a canon. No one should claim that one’s own Article of Christian belief is *ex cathedra*, synchronously and diachronously, applicable to all human beings, for every circumstance, and throughout ages, parochially proclaiming that there are “No Other Articles” but ours. God is one, Jesus Christ is one, the Holy Spirit is one, the Bible is one, but our Article to express and confess them should be more than one. There is no Article chosen by God for good but only an Article chosen by human beings. People make their Articles and their Articles make people. All and any Articles of Christian Church are a collaborative product of human attempt which is informed, confirmed, and affirmed by a certain group of people’s particular theological traditions, historical situations, and cultural conditions so as to serve the specific community of believers. The Articles are not a dead text of the past as a fossil; rather a living text to be dynamically adjustable according to the context of the present for the faith of the future. In all these respects, therefore, I’d like to propose that the Article II needs to be continually reviewed, seriously reconsidered, and appropriately rewritten in the perspective of Asian/Korean people, since the real reality of Jesus Christ is much bigger, broader, and deeper than his existing images embraced in the text of the Article.