

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Evangelical Quarterly* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_evangelical_quarterly.php

JESUS CHRIST IS JEHOVAH

(Continued from Vol. 5, p. 155).

2. Athanasius and other eminent representatives of the Church of the Ages teach that Christ is Jehovah.

A.—THE ANTE-NICENE FATHERS

By applying to the Lord Jesus Christ Old Testament passages which refer to Jehovah the New Testament writers were ascribing to Christ Divine Existence; in continuing the practice the early church fathers insisted on His Pre-existence; while Calvin and the Reformed tradition declared that Christ was Jehovah with an eye primarily to His Self-Existence.

With this generalization the thesis of the paper is immediately brought into collision with Harnack's doctrine that an Adoptionist Christology occupied a large place in the primitive Church;¹ and Dr. K. Lake's dictum that this Adoptionism was the regnant Christology in Rome until the second third of the second century, when Justin Martyr brought the Logos Christology to the capital. In support of his contention Harnack says that the only work which gives clear expression to this early Adoptionism is the *Shepherd* of Hermas. Lake offers "the undeniable fact that early in the second century Hermas held this view"; and that the other books which, on his interpretation, were known to Rome, Romans, Hebrews, 1 Peter, 1 Clement and Mark, would be similarly interpreted by "any one who had Adoptionist views already".²

HERMAS

Just how Dr. Lake can affirm that this interpretation of Hermas is undeniable remains an enigma. Prior to his writing, the Adoptionism of Hermas had been denied by F. Loofs, *Leitfaden zum Studium der Dogmengeschichte*, p. 95; by R. Seeberg *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, p. 122; by Link and Weizsacker as cited by Harnack (*Ibid.*, 194). The dean of American "liberal" scholars, Dr. A. C. McGiffert, has just given another

¹ Harnack: *History of Dogma*, English translation by Buchanan, ii. 183, 191-2. Cf. Duchesne: *Early History of the Church*, i. 170.

² Lake, K.: *Landmarks of Early Christianity*, 1920, p. 80, etc.

convincing denial to the Adoptionist interpretation of Hermas, *A History of Christian Thought*, p. 72.

In Hermas one reads : " First of all, Sir, I said, tell me this, the rock and the door, what is it ? This rock and door, he said, is the Son of God. How is it, said I Sir, that the rock is old ; but the door is new ? Listen, said he, and understand, foolish man. The Son of God is more ancient than all His creation, so that He was the Counsellor of His creation to the Father ; therefore also the rock is old. But why, Sir, I said, is the gate new ? Because, he said, He was made manifest in the last days of the consummation " (Sim. ix. 12, 1-3). Again, " The name of the Son of God is great and illimitable and supports the whole world . . . the whole creation is supported by the Son of God " (ix, 14, 5). In the parable of the vineyard, which is supposed to teach Adoptionism, it is clearly stated : " The Holy Spirit which pre-existed, which created all creation, God made to dwell in flesh that he desired " (Sim. v. 6, 5). Further, according to the Latin text, " the Son, however, is the Holy Spirit " (ix. 1).

The parable is that a servant did more than he was required, and for this was adopted to co-heirship with the Son. The parable is first interpreted as offering a special merit to any one who does more than his duty. A second and forced interpretation is then made with reference to Christ. The interpretation which satisfies the Christological interpretation of the parable, as well as the simpler Christological statements already quoted from Hermas, is that the Holy Spirit which pre-existed is a description of Christ as the pre-existent Son of God ; the servant is the human flesh in which He, a pre-existing holy spiritual Being, came to dwell. Since this flesh served well the holy *Geistwesen* and did not defile the Spirit, He chose it as companion. Whatever adoption there is refers to Christ's " flesh " ; Hermas teaches that Christ is the pre-existing Son of God. The somewhat clumsy description of the pre-existing Christ as the Holy Spirit, which pre-existed, which created all creation, is in accord with the probable interpretation of similar phrases in Romans, " the Spirit of holiness," and in Hebrews, " the Eternal Spirit ".

Seeing that Hermas, " the only work which gives clear expression to this early Adoptionism ", does not teach Adoptionism, the remainder of Dr. Lake's hypothesis may be disposed of by laying aside a method of exegesis which begs the question

to be proven. The other books which Lake connects with Rome yield the following data : (a) Hebrews i. 2, 10 ; Hebrews i. ; Hebrews iii ; and 1 Clement xvi., xxii. 1, xxxii., xxxvi., both directly teach and indirectly imply the pre-existence of Christ¹ ; (b) Romans viii. 3 and 1 Peter i. 11, imply the pre-existence of Christ ; as (c) do the following facts in Mark : (1) the opening quotations presenting Christ's coming as the coming of the Lord, the Angel of the Covenant (Mal. iii. 1) and of Jehovah (Is. xl. 3) ; (2) the eschatological Son of Man found in such passages as viii. 38, xiv. 62, identifying Christ with the pre-existing Son of Man of Dan. vii. 13 and 1 Enoch, chapters xlvi.-lxxi. ; (3) the declaration that David a millenium before " the days of His flesh " recognized Christ as Lord (xii. 35-37) ; (4) the implications in the descriptions of His ministry as a mission, e.g. x. 45 ; (5) the fact that the Son in Mark's parable of the Vineyard was Son, of a different category from the servants (the prophets), prior to His mission to the vineyard (xii. 1-12). Protest is hereby filed against the cancellation of the Christological implications of Mark's parable of the vineyard by Adoptionist implications drawn from Hermas' parable of the vineyard ; first, because the Markan parable comes from the triple tradition, from a primitive narrative and a book, each historical in form ; while the *Shepherd* is an apocalyptic writing ; secondly, because the Christological application of the parable in Mark is the essence of the primary and sole interpretation of the parable ; while the Christological application of the parable in the *Shepherd* is a second and forced interpretation of a parable that offers as its primary interpretation the general doctrine of supererogatory merits ; thirdly, as has been shown, the Adoptionist interpretation of Hermas is not the correct interpretation.

The phenomena of second century Christianity have been carefully collated by Dr. McGiffert in his *God of the Early Christians*. Citations from the Apostolic Fathers, those New Testament writings which he dates late, heretical writings, apocryphal writings, fragments, Apologists, even from non-Christian and anti-Christian writings, show that the Christians of this century regularly spoke of Jesus as God and addressed to Him religious worship. Such data have been the occasion of diverse interpretations. Dr. McGiffert holds that these Christians worshipped

¹ McGiffert : *A History of Christian Thought*, p. 72. Moore, G. F. : *History of Religions*, ii., p. 137.

Jesus as a finite cult deity and were generally non-theistic. Dr. S. J. Case sees a radical bifurcation issuing in di-theism.¹ On the other hand Dr. Harnack can scarcely find language adequate to express his certainty that the early Christians carried onward the Jewish polemic in favour of monotheism²; while R. Seeberg makes a clear cut theism the first feature common to the Apostolic Fathers.³ Leaving the Apologist for later consideration, the writer would align himself with those who recognize the theistic character of early Christianity, acknowledging, however, that many writers do not state a systematic metaphysics. These theistic Apostolic Fathers thought of Jesus Christ as of God (2 Clement i. 1); and mingled their notes in the antiphonal chorus singing to Christ, as to God.⁴ Their common confession was: "Faith in Jesus Christ, the Son of God, who was already actively engaged at the creation under the old covenant; who is God, and appeared in the flesh at the end of days."³

DIDACHÉ

This summation leads one to expect in the Apostolic Fathers confirmation of the thesis of this paper, an expectation which is not disappointed. The *Didaché* certainly once, and probably twice, identifies the Saviour as the Jehovah of the Old Testament. The sixteenth chapter is devoted to the Second Coming of "our Lord", Section 1. This verbiage, as well as a quotation from Matt. xxiv. 30, makes clear that the Coming One is the returning Christ. The seventh section applies to Him a quotation drawn from Zechariah xiv. 5: "The Lord shall come and all the saints with Him." Now the Lord in this passage stands for "Jehovah, my God". A similar phenomenon occurs in the fourteenth chapter. The phrase, the Lord's day, identifies the Lord of this chapter as Jesus. The third section reads: "This is that which was spoken by the Lord, 'In every place and time offer me a pure sacrifice, because I am a great King, saith the Lord, and my name is wonderful among the Gentiles.'" The quotations are somewhat loosely drawn from Malachi i. 11, 14, in each case the reference being to Jehovah of hosts.

¹ Case, S. J.: *Jesus Through the Centuries*, Chapter vii.

² Harnack: *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity*, i., 96, etc.

³ Seeberg-Hay: *Text-book of History of Doctrine*, i., 78.

⁴ *C. Plini et Traiani Epistulae*, x., xcvi. 7.

CLEMENT

I Clement presents Christ as "our Lord Jesus Christ, the sceptre of the majesty of God" (xvi.); as the Lord whom Malachi expected to come suddenly to His Temple (xxiii.); who already in the Old Testament had spoken through the Holy Ghost (xxii. 1). In this citation Clement makes Christ the author of Ps. xxxiv. 11-17 and Ps. xxxii. 10, both of which are addressed to Jehovah.

Other Apostolic Fathers are less definite but in fundamental accord with this way of speaking. Barnabas describes Jesus as "Lord of all the world to whom God said, at the foundation of the world, Let us make man"; and from whom the Old Testament prophets obtained grace to prophesy concerning Himself (v. 5-7; cf. vi.). Polycarp, according to the reading L which McGiffert accepts, writes: "To all under heaven that shall believe in our Lord and God, Jesus Christ." Ignatius regularly speaks of "our God, Jesus Christ".

The Apologists of the second century were more familiar with Platonic cosmology than they were with Biblical soteriology, and hence stretched the Christian doctrine to fit a philosophical Procrustean mold. They conceived God as above and beyond all essence, ineffable, incommunicable, impassible, exalted beyond any commerce with matter, time or space. This Platonic God put forth the Word, *λόγος προφορικός*, by an act of His Will to be His intermediary for creation, revelation and redemption. The doctrine construes the Son as pre-existent; but not as eternal; as a "product" *γέννημα* of the Father, not as the one God. This cosmological scheme threatened to issue in binitarianism or even di-theism. But one must differ with Dr. Case's reading of this duality as: (1) Jesus and (2) Jehovah.¹ Indeed, even this subordinationist Christology allows, rather it requires, that the Logos be the God who appears in the Old Testament theophanies.² It requires the identification of Jesus Christ as the pre-existing Logos with the Jehovah of Old Testament creation and revelation, since the eternal God is invisible, incommunicable, nameless, incomprehensible Pure Being. The

¹ *Ibid.*, Chapter "Jesus and Jehovah." Dr. Case is correct in finding this duality in Marcion, i.e. (1) Jesus and (2) Jehovah; but, in the opinion of the writer, mistaken in so far as he ascribes this duality to the catholic tradition that was contemporary with or successive to Marcion.

² Cf. G. F. Moore: *Judaism* i. 416, on Philo's God where the same phenomena appear. "In his theology the Logos is the manifest and active deity; and in his interpretation of the Scriptures, where God appears to men, converses with them, reveals His will and purpose, it is, according to Philo, of the Logos that all this should be understood.

duality demanded by the scheme is: (1) Jesus-Logos-Jehovah, and (2) the invisible God, the Father, the ineffable Lord. Cf. Justin Martyr, *Dial.* 127.

JUSTIN

Justin Martyr writes: "I have said often enough that when my God says, 'God went up from Abraham', or 'the Lord spake unto Moses' and 'the Lord came down to see the tower which the sons of men had built', or 'God shut Noah within the Ark', you must not imagine that the unbegotten God himself came down or went up anywhere. For the ineffable Father and Lord of all neither comes anywhere, nor walks, nor sleeps, nor rises up." Abraham and Isaac and Jacob saw not the ineffable Lord, but God, His Son, "who was also fire when He spoke with Moses from the bush". *Dial.* 127. In the First Apology this writer returns at length to the story of the burning bush, declaring "Our Christ conversed with Moses under the appearance of fire from a bush, and said put off thy shoes, and draw near and hear" (lxii.). The whole sixty-third section is devoted to proving that it was not the Father of the universe who thus spoke to Moses; but "Jesus, the Christ", "the Angel and Apostle", "who also is God", yea "the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob", "the I am that I am". "Of old He appeared in the shape of fire and in the likeness of an angel to Moses and to the other prophets; but now . . . having become Man by Virgin." Justin also uses the twenty-fourth Psalm to describe the Ascension of the Saviour, further identifying Him with Jehovah of Hosts (li.).¹

IRENÆUS

Similarly Irenæus held that the Old Testament Scriptures testified of Jesus Christ; that Moses, in particular, wrote of Him, "because the Son of God is implanted everywhere throughout his writing: at one time indeed, speaking with Abraham, when about to eat with him; at another time with Noah, giving him the dimensions; at another, inquiring after Adam; at another, bringing down judgment upon the Sodomites; and again, when He becomes visible and directs Jacob on his journey, and speaks with Moses from the bush. It would be endless to recount

¹ The late Dr. Neal L. Anderson opened the Synod of Georgia with a similar application of this psalm, Decatur, 1927.

(the occasions) upon which the Son of God is shown to Moses" (*Against Heresies* iv., x.). A reference to the American Revision will quickly show that these references by Justin Martyr, a representative apologist, and by Irenaeus, a typical "catholic" theologian, identify Jesus Christ with Jehovah.

TERTULLIAN

Tertullian justifies the naming of both the Father Lord and the Son Lord by, among other passages, the double use of Lord in Gen. xix. 24. The word translated Lord in each of the two cases in this verse is Jehovah. Tertullian applies, "The Lord spake face to face with Moses, even as a man speaketh unto his friend", to "the visible God", i.e. to Jesus Christ. Further, he says that in a glass, "God, I mean the Son of God, appeared . . . to the prophets and the patriarchs as also to Moses". (*Against Praxeas*, 13, 14.) Most of these Old Testament theophanies are manifestations of God under His proper name, Jehovah.

With Irenaeus there is a turn toward a more soteriological interpretation of Christianity. With Tertullian there is a rise in the Christological line. Tertullian inherited and used the Logos Christology; holding with this Christology that the Logos was not eternally Son, nor God eternally Father. But he transcended the Logos speculation by positing pre-prolate distinctions in the Godhead. God eternally had His Reason and implicitly in His Ratio was His Word (Sermo). Tertullian also insisted that the three Persons were of one substance.

ORIGEN

Origen likewise received a subordinationist teaching, speaking on occasion of Christ as a second God midway between the nature of the unbegotten Father and the nature of all things that have been made. (*Contra Gelsum* iii. 34, v. 39.) But in at least two points Origen indicated the path to a loftier view. He revised and clarified the doctrine which Justin Martyr had taught, that the Logos was a "product" γέννημα, holding rather that He was "begotten not made" γέννητος but ἀγέννητος. Further Origen supplied the doctrine of eternal generation by which the fathers were able to think of the Logos as Son without thereby sacrificing His eternity, and able to affirm that God is eternally Father and eternally love (i.e. ever has an object for His love).

B.—NICENE AND POST-NICENE FATHERS

ATHANASIUS

Athanasius entered upon this higher heritage in Origen and Tertullian; while Arius and his supporters sought a still lower subordinationist level of Logos Christology. They represented the Son as a creature, who once was not, whose glory could not be blended with the glory of the Unbegun. Those who insist on making over-simplifications with which to characterize great issues may describe the difference between Arius and Athanasius as a question of the reduplication of the letter nun in a Greek word; the description of it as the question of a diphthong *oi*, or of an iota *i* is not correct.¹ Arius taught that the Son was a creature *γέννητος* and a work *ποίημα*; Athanasius that He was eternally begotten *γέννητος* but not a creature *ἀγέννητος*. Judged by later terminology Arius was an Anomoean; not a Homoiousian.

For the purposes of this paper it is not necessary to re-argue the Arian controversy. The challenger has appealed to Athanasius as the representative of the Church of the Ages under whose aegis he would controvert the thesis of this article. The writer assures the New York professor that he is entirely willing to have the issue hang on Athanasius' doctrine.

Athanasius certainly teaches the necessity of "a union in Christ of the nature of God and the nature of man",² that "the Logos assumed real human flesh", that "God the Word is Himself Christ from Mary, God and Man".³ Athanasius magnified the Incarnation.

But it is also true that Athanasius' Christology is *totaliter aliter* than that taught in *The Place of Jesus Christ in Modern Christianity*. This "modern" doctrine is that Jesus Christ is "altogether one of ourselves", whose ego had a temporal beginning (even the Arians made Christ pre-temporal; although not eternal), "one of our human selves", in and through whom the eternal God did something.⁴ On the other hand Athanasius is never tired of insisting that Christ is the eternal God, the

¹ Cf. Arius: *Thalia*. For a recent repetition of this error cf. Thompson, Jas. W.: *History of the Middle Ages*, 300-1500, 1931, *in loco*.

² McGiffert: *Ibid.*, p. 253.

³ Athanasius: *Four Discourses Against the Arians*, ii. 70; i. 36.

⁴ Baillie, J.: *The Place of Jesus Christ in Modern Christianity*, pp. 201-202, 210, 107, 108, 109, 114, 115, 116, 126, 129, 130, 135, 136. Cf. *A Letter from Dr. John Baillie*, paragraph 7; *Christ Re-interpreted to the Modern Mind*, *Union Seminary Review*, October, 1929, p. 21; and Dr. W. P. Paterson's similar estimate of Ritschl's Christology, *The Rule of Faith*, 1932, pp. 381-385.

Son eternally “co-existing, in the Father’s eternity” (*Ibid.*, iii. 26), who without ceasing to be God became man by taking flesh (iii. 27).

The Place of Jesus Christ in Modern Christianity reads: “Jesus Christ is not another name for God, but the name of a Man in whom God was and through whom God came to meet us” (p. 201).

Athanasius reads: “And the illusion of demons is come to nought, and He only who is really God is worshipped in the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ” (*Ibid.*, i. 11).

The challenger has appealed to Athanasius¹ to support his strictures upon the writer of this article for having written that “Christ is indeed God, the self-existent Jehovah”. But the veteran scholar of Union, New York, Dr. A. C. McGiffert, has ascribed to Athanasius what the writer only went so far as to ascribe to Calvin and the Reformed Faith. Resting on the *Four Discourses Against the Arians*, iii. 1, 6, McGiffert shows that Athanasius taught that God, the Son, was *αὐτόθεος*. As God He is self-existent; but as Son eternally begotten.²

Turning more directly to the theme of this thesis, Athanasius declares that Abraham worshipped our Lord Jesus Christ in the tent, that Moses worshipped Him in the bush, and that the psalmist addressed Him when he wrote: “Some put their trust in chariots, and some in horses, but we will remember the Name of the Lord our God” (*Ibid.*, i., xi. 38, 40, 43). In each of these Old Testament references (Gen. xviii., Ex. iii., Ps. xx. 7), the object of worship and of trust is Jehovah. Therefore Athanasius does clearly and repeatedly teach that Jesus Christ is the eternal Word who manifested Himself as the Jehovah of the Old Testament. “For as He was ever worshipped as being the Word and existing in the form of God, so being what He ever was, though become man and called Jesus, He none the less has the whole creation under foot, and bending their knees to Him in this Name . . . the powers in heaven, both Angels and Archangels, ever worshipping the Lord, as they are now worshipping Him in the name of Jesus” (*Ibid.*, 42).

HILARY

Hilary of Poitiers joins his collaborator in the defence of Nicaea, Athanasius, in ascribing to Jesus Christ the worship of

¹ *A Letter from Dr. John Baillie*, p. 3.

² McGiffert: *Ibid.*, p. 255.

Abraham (Gen. xviii. 1), and of Moses at the bush (Ex. iii.).¹ Hilary insists, "He, who is God eternally, became man at a point of time". The incident of the burning bush is expounded as teaching: (1) the identity of the speaker as the Angel of God with Him who as the Son was to accomplish human salvation; and (2) that this Angel is "God eternally", "the absolute God". Thus Hilary may be said to have exhausted language in an effort to make unmistakable his identification of that Person who was to appear in history as Jesus Christ with the Person who spoke at the burning bush. But this Person, as the Person at Abraham's tent, is Jehovah.

BASIL

Hilary further indicates his views by his treatment of the thirteenth through to the sixteenth anathemas of the Council of Sirmium, 351. These anathemas, which incidentally show that Basil the Great and the large council of Sirmium support the thesis of this paper, are as follows:

XIII. "If any man says *Let us make man* was not spoken by the Father to the Son, but by God to Himself: let him be anathema.

XIV. "If any man says the Son did not appear to Abraham, but the Ingenerate God, or part of Him: let him be anathema.

XV. "If any man says that the Son did not wrestle with Jacob as a man, but the Ingenerate God, or a part of Him: let him be anathema.

XVI. "If any man does not understand *The Lord rained from the Lord* to be spoken of the Father and the Son, but says that the Father rained from the Son: let him be anathema. For the Lord the Son rained from the Lord the Father."²

Hilary says that these points were inserted lest any "should attach to the Ingenerate God with the foolish perversity of an insane heresy all the above passages which refer to the Son of God, and, while applying them to the Father, deny the Person of the Son".²

CHRYSOSTOM

Chrysostom, commenting on John i. 10, likewise identifies Jesus with the Lord of the Old Testament. He interprets this verse to mean that though the multitude knew Him not, "the friends and favourites of God all knew Him even before His coming in the flesh". Thus Abraham, David, Moses, Samuel and all the prophets knew Him. "Jacob and his father, as well as his

¹ *De Trinitate*, v. 15, 16, 17, 18, 22.

² Hilary: *De Synodis*, Sects. 49, 50. Athanasius: *De Synodis*, Sect. 27, anathemas numbered 14-17.

grandfather, He both appeared to and talked with, and promised that He would give them many and great blessings, which He also brought to pass.”¹

AUGUSTINE

Augustine occupies an epochal place in the history of the doctrine of the Trinity. In elucidating this doctrine Augustine's *motif*, as that of his great precursors, Tertullian and Athanasius, and his great follower, John Calvin, was to do full justice to the absolute deity of Christ. In this effort the great African superseded a scheme of thought which subordinated the Son and the Holy Spirit, with the doctrine of equal and reciprocal personal relations in the Godhead; and thereby reaffirmed the unity of God, for which Monarchianism had unsuccessfully striven. According to Augustine, the Son is not less or lower than the Father; nor is He less than the entire trinity, since each possesses the totality of the Divine nature, each is contained by each and all by each. Augustine, thinking of the Triune God as a Person, presents “the doctrine of the Trinity as the Divine unity of Personality.” Within this unity personal relations preserve the doctrine of “three persons in one God.”²

In accord with this theology he denied that the Father was any more invisible or transcendent than the Son. The loftiest passages, e.g. 2 Tim. i. 17 and 1 Tim. vi. 15, 16, are not to be understood of the Father to the exclusion of the Son or the Holy Spirit.³ Theophanies of the Old Testament are no longer limited exclusively to the Son; but may refer to the Father, to the Spirit, or be construed “as manifesting the Person of that Trinity” (ii. 10). In discussing this point Augustine holds that the Son is spoken of as Lord, as is the Father, and as is the Spirit; that therefore it is very hard to determine which one is meant in particular Old Testament passages, since each is worthy to be identified with the Jehovah of Old Testament theophanies. In the case of the three who visited Abraham and the two who went to see Lot, Augustine is of the opinion that the three, the Father, the two (identified by him as the Son and the Holy Spirit) are at several points in the story addressed as Lord. In these chapters, Gen. xviii., xix., Lord alternates as the translation of Adhonay and Jehovah.

¹ Chrysostom *Homilies on Jobn*, Homil. VIII.

² Green F. W. In *Essays on the Trinity and the Incarnation*, pp. 290, 295.

³ *De Trinitate*, Book 2, chapter 8.

However, Augustine's allegorical interpretation persuaded him that Christ was the one manifested in Moses' vision of Jehovah (Ex. xxxiii. 11-23). The "back parts" of this vision mean the resurrection of Christ; while "the place that is by Him" means the Catholic Church. Therefore, Christ manifested Himself to Moses in this theophany, and forgave his sins by faith in the resurrection of the Lord, just as the psalmist found forgiveness by confessing his transgressions unto this Lord, who forgavest the iniquity of his sin (Ps. xxxii. 5).¹ Thus Augustine understood that the Jehovah who spake to Moses face to face (Ex. xxxiii. 11); who initiated Moses into the sacred precincts of His name Jehovah while all His goodness passed before (Ex. xxxiii, 12-23); the Jehovah unto whom the psalmist confessed his sins and from whom he received forgiveness was Christ.¹

Augustine's thought is that the God of the Old Testament is the Triune Jehovah; and hence that either Person may rightly be identified with Jehovah as He manifested Himself in an Old Testament theophany. Jehovah of Exodus xxxiii. is, according to Augustine, Christ. Generally Jehovah is the manifestation of the Triune God. Now the New Testament has enabled the Christian to see in the memorial name Jehovah, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit (Matt. xxviii. 19; cf. *Didache* viii. 1-3). Therefore the same Old Testament text (Is. xlv. 22-24), which perhaps was used of the undifferentiated Jehovah may be applied at one time to God the Father, (Rom. xiv. 11), and at another to our Lord Jesus Christ (Phil. ii. 10-11).²

JUSTINIAN

The Emperor Justinian, who defined orthodoxy in his *Corpus Juris Civilis*, wrote to the Fifth Ecumenical Council: "We hold fast to the decrees of the four councils, and in every way follow the holy Fathers, Athanasius, Hilary . . . John (Chrysostom) of Constantinople . . . Augustine . . . and their writings on the true faith." The writings already quoted from these fathers indicated the thinking which underlies the credal statement made by the First Ecumenical Council and repeated as the received faith by every subsequent ecumenical

¹ *De Trinitate*, Book 2, Chapter 13, Sect. 32: "Or if in some cases Christ was manifested, as the consideration of this passage persuades us."

² Compare a similar set of phenomena in Thessalonians, the four cases in which the Apostle begins, *αὐτὸς δὲ*, 1 Thess. iii. 11; v. 23; 2 Thess. ii. 16; iii. 16.

council, " by whom (our Lord Jesus Christ) all things were made, both in heaven and those in earth ". " For," as Cyril and the Third Ecumenical Council assert, " ' In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was God, and the Word was with God ', and he is the Maker of the ages, co-eternal with the Father, and Creator of all." The ecumenical councils assert for Christ the eternity, glory and work of Jehovah ; the Fathers, whose writings are endorsed with the four councils as defining orthodoxy, formally apply to Jesus texts and passages written of Jehovah.

3. Christ is Jehovah according to John Calvin and the genuine tradition of the Reformed Faith.

CALVIN

The thirteenth chapter of the first book of *The Institutes of the Christian Religion* is devoted to the doctrine of the Trinity, which, with the concepts of immensity and spirituality, Calvin regards as essential to any idea of the true God. The largest part of this long chapter is devoted to proving that Jesus Christ is God, that is Jehovah ; and that because Jehovah He is self-existent. Calvin does not merely imply the truth of this thesis, he does not merely assert it—though he does assert it in the most categorical fashion—he devotes sections 7 through to 13 and section 20 to proving the thesis of this paper ; while the remaining sections of the chapter are chiefly occupied with showing the self-existent character of the Son, as deduced from the fact that He is Jehovah.

Calvin argues as directly for this thesis as the writer is doing—and much more cogently. He uses, in general, the arguments which by now are familiar to the reader. In the seventh section he shows that Christ inspired the Old Testament prophets by His Spirit ; and as the Word of God was active in the creation of the universe. The eighth section develops the eternity of God, the Word. In the ninth section, after maintaining that Christ is addressed as God in Ps. xlv. and in Is. ix. 6 ; Calvin reasons : " But nothing can be required plainer than a passage in Jeremiah, that this should be the name whereby the Branch of David shall be called, ' Jehovah our righteousness '. For since the Jews themselves teach that all other names of God are mere epithets, but that this alone, which they call ineffable, is a

proper name expressive of His essence ; we conclude that the Son is the one eternal God, who declares, in another place, that He ‘ will not give His glory to another ’.” This testimony shows “ that Christ is the true Jehovah, from whom righteousness proceeds ”. The tenth section is devoted to showing that the Old Testament angel of Jehovah is really Jehovah Himself. Out of his wide and thorough acquaintance with the fathers Calvin writes : “ But the orthodox doctors of the church have truly and wisely understood and taught that the same angel was the Word of God, who even then began to perform some services introductory to his execution of the office of Mediator.” “ For though he was not yet incarnate . . . his familiar intercourse with men gave him the name of an angel ; yet he . . . continued the ineffably glorious God. The same truth is attested by Hosea, who, after relating the wrestling of Jacob with an angel, says, ‘ The Lord (Jehovah) God of hosts ; Jehovah is his memorial.’ ” Again, “ when it is said in Isaiah, ‘ Lo, this is our God ; we have waited for him, and he will save us : this is Jehovah ’ ; all who have eyes may perceive that this is God, who ariseth for the salvation of his people. And the emphatic repetition of these pointed expressions forbids an application of this passage to any other than to Christ . . . whence it follows, that he is the same God that was always worshipped among the Jews.”

The eleventh section is devoted to showing that the New Testament writers refer Old Testament texts in which “ the Lord ” and “ the Lord of hosts ” occur to Christ ; and that they rightly so applied them. In the twelfth section Calvin argues that Christ claimed the right to forgive sins, thus making His own the claim of Jehovah in Is. xliii. 25. In the thirteenth section, after quoting “ Whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord (Jehovah) shall be delivered ”, Calvin adds : “ But the name of Christ is invoked for salvation : it follows, therefore, that he is Jehovah.” After discussing the Deity of the Spirit and the Trinity, Calvin returns to Christ in the twentieth section, showing that the apostles assert the same one to be the Son of God whom Moses and the prophets represented as Jehovah, and “ that the name ‘ Jehovah ’ in an indefinite sense is applicable to Christ ” as appears from the words of Paul and of Peter.

In the nineteenth section Calvin asserts the aseity of God the Son. “ Therefore, when we speak simply of the Son without

reference to the Father, we truly and properly assert him to be self-existent, and therefore call him the sole first cause: but, when we distinctly treat of the relation between him and the Father, we justly represent him as originating from the Father." In the twenty-third section Calvin justifies this doctrine by resummarizing the texts which show that Jesus Christ is Jehovah, continuing: "For, since the name of Jehovah is used in each of these passages, it follows that in respect to his deity he is self-existent. For, if he is Jehovah, he cannot be denied to be the same God who in another place proclaims by Isaiah, 'I am the first and I am the last; and beside me there is no God' . . . the deity of the Son of God is frequently proved by Isaiah from the creation of the world. But how shall the Creator, who gives existence to all, not be self-existent, but derive his existence from another? For whoever asserts that the Son owes his essence to the Father denies him to be self-existent. But this is contradicted by the Holy Spirit, who gives him the name of Jehovah." "Nothing is more proper to God than to BE, according to that declaration, 'I AM hath sent me unto you.'" Referring to Christ, Calvin writes: "When we are speaking, apart from consideration of the Person of His divinity or simply of the essence, which is the same thing, I say that it is rightly predicated of Him that he is *a se ipso*. For who, heretofore, has denied that under the name of Jehovah there is included the declaration of *αὐτοουσία*?"¹ Speaking according to relation, Calvin held that the Son was of the Father, a doctrine inexactly expressed by the phrase, *Deus de Deo*. But speaking *simply* of the essence, he held that the *αὐτοουσία* of His divinity was justified by the ascription to Him of the name Jehovah.²

THE REFORMED FAITH

Thus Calvin's identification of Jesus Christ with Jehovah led him to formulate a distinctivity in the Reformed Faith. Calvin's position created a party; "and that party was shortly the Reformed Churches, of which it became characteristic that they held and taught the self-existence of Christ as God and defended, therefore, the application to Him of the term *αὐτόθεος*; that is to say, in the doctrine of the Trinity they laid the stress upon the equality of the Persons sharing in the same essence, and thus

¹ Calvin's letter to the Neuchatel pastors, 1545.

² *Defense Against the Calumnies of Peter Caroli*, 1545.

set themselves with more or less absoluteness against all subordinationism in the explanation of the relations of the Persons to one another." "It is . . . a part of the heritage, particularly of the Reformed Churches, that they have learned from Calvin to claim for Christ the great epithet of *αὐτόθεος*; and their characteristic mark has therefore become the strength of the emphasis which they throw on the complete deity of the Lord."¹

Ere developing the evidence for this statement a distinction must be made. Those who accept the Reformed tradition of the aseity of Christ consciously or unconsciously affirm the propriety of Calvin's contention that Christ is Jehovah; for this is the exegetical foundation for his doctrine. On the other hand it may not be logically inferred that those who reject the aseity of Christ, as a Reformed distinctivity differing from the common theological tradition, are thereby rejecting the general teaching of the Fathers and the New Testament that Christ is Jehovah. The evidence for the thesis of this paper cannot be dismissed by merely remarking that the thesis is a Calvinistic novelty. The doctrine based on Calvin's exegesis is one thing; the identification of Christ with Jehovah is much more broadly supported.

In support of the view that the aseity of the Son is characteristic of the Reformed Faith stand the anti-Reformed polemics. Opponents of the Reformed position have consistently charged against them this doctrine. As a term of reproach Calvinists have been stigmatized as Autotheanites. In this opposition are found: (1) Roman Catholic theologians, some of whom oppose the doctrine, others only the mode of statement; (2) Lutheran theologians with certain notable exceptions, among which exceptions may be mentioned Professor Milton Valentine of Gettysburg;² (3) Arminian theologians, especially Episcopius and other followers of Arminius;³ (4) Anglican subordinationists, such as George Bull; and (5) naturally modern Arians and psilanthropists.⁴

The direct evidence that the self-existence of Christ is a characteristic mark of the Reformed Faith is the testimony of the

¹ Warfield, B. B.: *Calvin and Calvinism*, pp. 251, 274.

² Valentine, Milton, *Christian Theology*, i. 309, 321-322.

³ Sheldon, H. C.: *History of Christian Doctrine*, ii. 97.

⁴ Warfield: *Ibid.*, pp. 252-272. Berkhof: *Reformed Dogmatics*, i., 69-70, in "the Humanitarian view—of present day Modernists—Christ is reduced to a mere man".

representative Reformed theologians, who with some variations of meaning have held this doctrine. The great body of Reformed teachers led by Theodore Beza, Josiah Simler, Zacharias Ursinus and Francis Turretin, and including Principal William Cunningham,¹ and Professor Louis Berkhof² have been both good Autotheanites and good Nicenists, holding that the person of the Son is eternally generated; but that the Son as God is self-existent. This seems to be the thought that Dr. McGiffert has ascribed to Athanasius; and preserves the higher or non-subordinationist sense for which the word *ἰσοούσιον* was written into the older phraseology at Nicaea. Then there is a group of Reformed theologians, of which Dr. Charles Hodge is a conspicuous example, who walk more exactly in Calvin's own interpretation of *ἀντόθεος*. These men decline to encumber their Trinitarian thought with the speculation used by the Nicene Fathers to explain their creed; that is they like Calvin are unwilling to assert that the act of generation or of procession is a continuous eternal process. Hodge defines his position by quoting from Calvin's letter to Simon Grynee, May 1537, as follows:

"If the distinction between the Father and the Word be attentively considered, we shall say that the one is from the other. If, however, the essential quality of the Word be considered, in so far as He is one God with the Father, whatever can be said concerning God may also be applied to Him, the Second Person in the glorious Trinity. Now, what is the meaning of the name Jehovah? What did the answer imply which was spoken to Moses? I AM THAT I AM. Paul makes Christ the author of this saying."³

Hodge adds to the quotation: "This argument is conclusive. If Christ be Jehovah, and if the name Jehovah implies self-existence, then Christ is self-existent." The third group of Calvinists go beyond their teacher in holding that the terms "Son" and "Spirit" are perhaps not expressive of communication or derivation at all; but of consubstantiality. "That is to say, in the Semitic view, sonship denotes broadly oneness of kind, class; more specifically, likeness; at the height of its meaning, consubstantiality; and does not suggest derivation. As the son of a man is a man, the Son of God is God. It is the Indo-European consciousness which imparts to the terms Son, Spirit, the idea of derivation."⁴ The last class includes Herman

¹ Cunningham, William: *Historical Theology*, i., 304.

² Berkhof, Louis: *Reformed Dogmatics*, i., 74, citing as also of this view Bavinck.

³ Hodge, Charles: *Systematic Theology*, i., 467.

⁴ Warfield: *Ibid.*, p. 278, note 136. For names of other representative Reformed theologians, see Voetius list in note 127, p. 274; and text, pages 272-284.

Alexander Roell, Herman Muntinge, Nathaniel Emmons, Moses Stuart, and that writer from whom this section of the paper has been largely drawn, B. B. Warfield. These scholars have found in Calvin's term *ἀυτόθεος* an instrument by which to do full justice to the absolute deity of Christ.

Moreover, this Reformed tradition has been incorporated into the Westminster Standards. The eleventh question of the Westminster Larger Catechism asserts that the Scriptures manifest that the Son is God equal with the Father ascribing unto Him names that are proper to God only. According to an official Scottish edition of these Standards, dated 1688, the Scripture on which the Westminster Divines based this assertion and which the Kirk of Scotland accepted as an adequate basis was: "Is. vi. 3, 5, 8 with John xii. 41."

Later Scottish editions of the Standards published these texts in full, as does a 1921 edition of the *Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.* In other words the aforesaid statement of the Larger Catechism was based originally and is now based by the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., on the *single* phenomenon that the Scriptures identify Jesus Christ with Jehovah. American Presbyterianism has, however, added another Jehovistic proof text, namely Jer. xxiii. 6. For a long time this text was printed in the American Standards, thus: "THE LORD (OUR JEHOVAH) OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS."

As proof for the relevant part of answer eleven the Presbyterian Church in the United States¹ now prints Jer. xxiii. 6; 1 John v. 20; Ps. xlv. 6, as each is given in the King James Version of the Bible. Thus churches which accept the Westminster Standards do interpret the Scriptures as teaching that Jesus Christ, God the Son, is Jehovah.

CONCLUSIONS

I. As a logical proposition.

The proposition that Jesus Christ is on occasions identified with Jehovah is a particular affirmative. As such it may not logically be controverted by the simple enumeration of one or several negative instances, nor by the conversion of an "all is not" into a "nothing is". The writer has sought to give

¹ Popularly known as the Southern Presbyterian Church.

each text and passage used the interpretation it fairly bears. Nevertheless, the truth of this thesis is by no means dependent on the acceptance of the interpretations herein put upon every citation. A reader may differ from one, or many, or even a majority of the interpretations and references given. A reasonable residuum is sufficient to refute the New York theologian.

2. As an academic proposition.

There is no reason why "liberal" scholarship may not acknowledge as freely as conservative scholarship that the writer has shown that the phrase "Christ is Jehovah" is orthodox and is not new, as indeed Dr. A. C. McGiffert, perhaps America's greatest "liberal" scholar, seems to have acknowledged in the citations made from his writings.

3. As a juridical proposition.

A volume written by a theological professor to whom the phrase "Christ is Jehovah" is new and unorthodox seems scarcely a safe criterion to be accepted by the courts of the Southern Presbyterian Assembly as a satisfactory statement of a minister's orthodoxy.

4. As a Trinitarian doctrine.

As already indicated in the discussion of Augustine's doctrine the writer holds that Jehovah "is applied to Christ equally with the Father and the Spirit."¹ Jehovah is the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Hence, according to Augustinian Trinitarianism all the glory of Jehovahship belongs to each person of the Trinity. The replacement of THE NAME (of Jehovah) by THE NAME (of Jesus) in Acts vindicates the part of the last statement involved in this thesis. The Christian consensus that the Second Person is the revealer of the Godhead supports the pre-Augustinian teaching that the Jesus Christ of the New Testament is personally the Jehovah of the Old Testament theophanies.²

¹ Mack, E.: *I.S.B.E.*, p. 1,268.

² Professor R. Seeberg's view is worthy of careful consideration and further study. Taking advantage of a rabbinical distinction by which the name Elohim designated God in his character as a judge, while Jehovah designated Him in His merciful and gracious aspect (Moore: *Judaism*, i., 387). Seeberg maintains that Paul identified the Lord Jesus Christ with Jehovah-Adonai, God in His covenant relationship with Israel, and identified God, the Father, with Elohim, the Creator. See further his third edition, i., 89.

5. As a support for faith.

The most profound dogma of the Christian religion is the *aseitas Dei*.¹ Because God is self-existent He is sufficient for Himself and for His people. "His Jehovahship is the pledge of the absolute fulfillment of all His promises." He alone gives what is His own. "He is life and imparts it. He is holiness and therefore infuses it. He is salvation and therefore bestows it. All that He promises He is." Therefore "it is only in Jesus Christ that the full import of this name is or can be realized to us. Here and here alone is Jehovah, as Jehovah, known by the rich experience of the heart".²

WM. CHILDS ROBINSON.

Columbia Theological Seminary,
Decatur, Ga.

¹ Hepp, V. : "The Distinctive Doctrines of Calvinism," *Evangelical Quarterly*, October, 1932, p. 343.

² Thornwell, J. H. : *Collected Writings*, i., 153-155.