

# The Identification of Jesus with YHWH in the Book of Revelation: A Brief Sketch

Brandon D. Smith  
Ridley College, Melbourne, Australia

## I. INTRODUCTION

Most scholars admit that John the Seer's views of God and the future are inextricably linked to the person of Jesus Christ, in whom God's purposes are not only telescoped, but consummated. But an important question that is being engaged today is whether John intentionally tied the Old Testament (OT) identity of YHWH to Jesus. Scholars such as A. Y. Collins, James McGrath, James Dunn, and the like say no. However, side-by-side with debates over the *Gottesbild* and Christology of Revelation are ongoing discussions led by scholars like Richard Bauckham, Wesley Hill, Matthew Bates, and Kavin Rowe who argue that scriptural texts actually frame and drive Trinitarian doctrine, thereby derivatively affecting Christology as well.<sup>1</sup> And as we shall see, the collective insights of these scholars can help us mount a case that answers the above question with an affirmative.

At the outset, though, we must first acknowledge that the Christology of Revelation in particular is not a universally agreed upon doctrine. A major reason for this is because of the rise of the historical-critical method, which has narrowed the hermeneutical task to recreating history or past events rather than engaging dogmatic inquiry. This shift gradually

---

<sup>1</sup>As we will see, some of these contributors are not working directly with the content of Revelation itself, but rather are offering theological-exegetical patterns that they think should be imported into the interpretation of Scripture in general.

led to a clear division between an assortment of NT Christologies. A prominent example of this was the evolving distinction between “low” and “high” Christology. Proponents of “low” Christology argued that early Christians did not equate Jesus with God, but rather believed him to be an exalted, unique human being who was specially empowered and anointed to act in God’s name. The “high” Christology group shared the same basic affirmations of Jesus’ unique and exalted humanity, but also asserted that early Christians understood Jesus as divine. The current debate is more often centered on views of the so-called Early High Christology Club (EHCC),<sup>2</sup> which focus on the Christologies of intermediary figures, divine identity, Christological monotheism, and devotional practices of the early Church. Within this framework stands the Christology of Revelation.

James McGrath serves as an example of one who challenges the EHCC categories. He highlights an apparent subordinationism in the relationship between God and Jesus. He notes that certainly worship is a key theme in Revelation, but “were Revelation intended to make a Christological point by applying worship-language to Jesus that is normally reserved only for God,” then “it misses many opportunities to make this point in a clear and unambiguous manner.”<sup>3</sup> Jesus does not share an identity with God, but instead, “What is shared are the divine throne and titles.”<sup>4</sup> However, other scholars working under the EHCC banner take a different route. For instance, Bauckham emphasizes that John has an “extraordinarily high Christology” and “makes absolutely clear that what Christ does, God does.”<sup>5</sup> Even James Dunn admits that “unlike the other main writings in the New Testament [Revelation’s] affirmation of the deity of Christ is unqualified” and “should not be played down.”<sup>6</sup> German scholar Udo Schnelle is torn between them because...

On the one hand, in Revelation Christ or the Lamb is clearly subordinate to God. ... On the other hand, this clear primacy of theology in Revelation has its counterpart in the comprehensive participation of Jesus in the work of God, yielding a Christology with

---

<sup>2</sup>This phrase came to more public light in Larry Hurtado’s dedication page in *Lord Jesus Christ* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003).

<sup>3</sup>James F. McGrath, *The Only True God* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2009), 72.

<sup>4</sup>*Ibid.*, 74. We will interact with his work more later, but McGrath’s basic point is that transferring names and titles were common within Jewish agency tradition wherein a unique person might have the authority to act on God’s behalf (e.g., Enoch-Metatron in *3 Enoch*).

<sup>5</sup>Richard Bauckham, *The Theology of the Book of Revelation* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 63.

<sup>6</sup>James D. G. Dunn, *Did the First Christians Worship Jesus?* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2010), 130–32. Dunn hedges his bets slightly, however, noting the rebuttal that the highly symbolic nature of Revelation might skew whether or not John still belongs to the low Christology guild. He asks, “Is the imagery perhaps better described as surreal than as regal metaphysics?”

a theocentric profile. ... The tension cannot be resolved in one direction or the other...<sup>7</sup>

Thus if the Christology of Revelation elicits a range of views of Jesus' identity and role vis-à-vis God, these disputes are multiplied even more if we try to map Revelation in relation to Trinitarian beliefs.

That being said, this article will demonstrate how the identification of Jesus with YHWH does not distort the text of Revelation or its claims, but rather showcases the coherence and consistency of its central claims about God's being and actions. Due to the limited space here, we will primarily discuss Revelation 1-3 with some attention being given to a few other select passages that pertain to either Jesus and the divine throne or the role of the Holy Spirit in relation to him. But before we engage in this investigation, we should begin with a brief exploration of Trinitarianism in the early Church because it directly pertains to the Christology of Revelation.

## II. CANON AND CREEDS

One should not try to create a Trinitarian theology from an arbitrary reading of Revelation. Indeed one must take care not to fall into the trap that Robert Jenson describes as “scrabb[ling] around in the Bible for bits and pieces of language to cobble together into a sort of Trinity-doctrine” which can result in “intellectually lamentable and indeed sometimes heretical results.”<sup>8</sup> Rather, we should see that Jesus' identification with YHWH is actually the most faithful representation of the message of Revelation, acknowledging that “God must not be an ‘afterthought’ in biblical interpretation ... instead, God is prior to both the community and the biblical texts themselves.”<sup>9</sup> Or said another way, when balancing the theological with the historical-critical, one must remember that the exegete is studying not only a text or a text written in a particular time, but also a text in relation to its subject matter—the triune God. Consequently, similar to “the fourfold witness of the Gospels to the divine identity of Jesus, viewed in light of their intertextual engagement

---

<sup>7</sup>Udo Schnelle, *Theology of the New Testament*, trans. M. Eugene Boring (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2009), 755. Malcolm B. Yarnell III also employs this quote to make a similar point in *God the Trinity* (Nashville, TN: B & H Academic, 2016), 211.

<sup>8</sup>Robert W. Jenson, “The Trinity in the Bible,” *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 68, no. 3/4 (2004), 196.

<sup>9</sup>Kevin J. Vanhoozer, “Introduction: What is Theological Interpretation of the Bible?” in *Dictionary for Theological Interpretation of the Bible*, ed. Kevin J. Vanhoozer (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2005), 22.

with Israel's Scripture,"<sup>10</sup> John, at some level, self-consciously rereads Jesus' identity in light of the OT as well as the NT tradition(s).<sup>11</sup>

Such a practice is not unique to other NT writings. Matthew Bates, for example, rightly argues that while NT writers did not yet have stable "nomenclature to express the Trinity..., the die had been cast" through their understanding of the OT.<sup>12</sup> Likewise, while Wesley Hill's hermeneutical lens is pointed in another direction, he furthers this idea in his work on the Trinitarianism of Paul. Whereas Bates focuses on the NT writers' reading and exegesis of the OT, Hill is more concerned with arguing that creedal notions of the Trinity offer a better way of conceptualizing Paul's views. While again NT scholars often balk at this method, Hill makes a plea for "a rereading ... that treats the concepts and categories of trinitarian theology as hermeneutical aids rather than as liabilities."<sup>13</sup> Further, he claims that theology and exegesis should not be enemies, and that "If trinitarian theology can assist in the task of interpreting Paul," then "interpreting Paul is of benefit to trinitarian theology."<sup>14</sup>

So the proposal here is that when readers look at both the biblical text and the creeds together, they discover that Trinitarian theology is not a foreign concept to Scripture, forced onto its pages by the Church Fathers. Instead, the Church's traditional belief about the Trinity in its dogmatic form is drawn from their reading of Scripture. As David Yeago asserts:

The New Testament does not contain a formally articulated "doctrine of God" of the same kind as the later Nicene dogma. What it does contain is a pattern of implicit and explicit judgements concerning the God of Israel and his relationship to the crucified and risen Jesus of Nazareth. The dogma was the church's attempt to take account articulately of this more basic state of affairs: in both the preaching and the worship of the church, according to the witness of the New

---

<sup>10</sup>Richard B. Hays, *Reading Backwards* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2014), x.

<sup>11</sup>This essay is sympathetic toward Beale's conclusion that John consciously and subconsciously borrows from both the Hebrew and the Septuagint, considering that he seemingly "draws from both Semitic and Greek biblical sources and often modifies both." See G. K. Beale, *The Book of Revelation* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1999), 78. As far the NT is concerned, this essay also affirms Matthew Emerson's claim that John intentionally wrote Revelation as both a thematic and structural ending to the biblical canon, giving the impression that he had significant access to early Christian/NT texts; Cf., Matthew Y. Emerson, *Christ and the New Creation* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2013), 142–66.

<sup>12</sup>Matthew W. Bates, *The Birth of the Trinity* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2015), 40. While I am both sympathetic and cautious toward his "prosopological" way of arriving here, his conclusion that the OT had significant bearing on the NT writers' early development of the Trinity cannot be understated.

<sup>13</sup>Wesley Hill, *Paul and the Trinity* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2015), 31.

<sup>14</sup>*Ibid.*, 47.

Testament, God is inescapably *apprehended and identified* as the *triune* God.<sup>15</sup>

Here Yeago offers a promising way forward with this concept/judgment proposal. In short, he claims that doctrinal terminology, such as the word “Trinity,” can be useful even if it is technically extra-biblical because its referents still correspond to the judgments that biblical texts originally made. Using Philippians 2 as an example, Yeago substantiates his point by showing how the Nicene concept of *homoousia* emphasizes the same judgments that Paul makes in Philippians 2:6ff. Specifically, Paul’s description of Jesus as being “equal to God” and receiving a “name above every name” renders the same judgment as the Nicene language “of one substance.”<sup>16</sup> Daniel Treier, commenting on Yeago’s argument, explains,

Therefore, Philippians 2 must include the Son eternally in the identity of Israel’s God, the one unchanging Creator of everything else. And, in the larger context of Isaiah 45, there must be anticipation of further revelation concerning YHWH’s identity.<sup>17</sup>

Kavin Rowe reflects the same sentiment in his treatment on the use of κύριος (“Lord”) in the Gospel of Luke. Building off of his concept of “biblical pressures,”<sup>18</sup> he notes that “Luke chose a different way to express the identity of Jesus, one much more like Mark and Matthew, but he shares with Paul and John a remarkably similar—if not the same—underlying judgment about the identity of Jesus...”<sup>19</sup> The way Luke uses “Lord” evokes OT designations from Zechariah and numerous other texts. Further, Luke’s OT hermeneutic shows solidarity with other NT writers who set the stage for later creedal theological concepts. Thus, taking their cues from NT writers who took their cues from OT writers, early Christians strove to render judgments with contextualized terminology that reflected the major themes strung throughout the entirety of biblical revelation.

This very connection between biblical language and theological discourse is what brings us to the initial precipice of our argument that traditional Trinitarian language accurately depicts the view(s) of Christ

---

<sup>15</sup>David S. Yeago, “The New Testament and the Nicene Dogma,” *Pro Ecclesia* 3, no. 2 (1994), 153. Emphasis in the original.

<sup>16</sup>*Ibid.*, 160–61.

<sup>17</sup>Daniel J. Treier, *Introducing Theological Interpretation of Scripture* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2008), 61.

<sup>18</sup>C. Kavin Rowe, “Biblical Pressure and Trinitarian Hermeneutics,” *Pro Ecclesia* 11, no. 2 (2002), 295–312. Rowe argues here that biblical writers were “pressured” by Israel’s Scriptures into making theological claims about Jesus’ oneness with YHWH.

<sup>19</sup>C. Kavin Rowe, *Early Narrative Christology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2009), 29. It is important to note that Rowe most likely would diverge from my contention that there is an incipient Trinitarianism in Revelation, seeing it as somewhat anachronistic. Nonetheless, we are in primary agreement on his proposal regarding biblical pressures.

that John the Seer displays in Revelation. We discover the cluster of nuanced ideas that he pieced together regarding Christ's identity as YHWH are a legitimate basis for how later early Christians would speak about the Christ in relationship to the Triune God.

### III. GOD AND JESUS IN REVELATION 1

Moving now to the book of Revelation itself, we begin with part of the prologue in Revelation 1:4–5, where an indication is made that distinct persons should be separated from one another in one sense, yet tied together in another. We read,

Grace to you and peace from (ἀπό) him who is and who was and who is to come, and from (καί ἀπό) the seven spirits who are before his throne, and from (καί ἀπό) Jesus Christ the faithful witness, the firstborn of the dead, and the ruler of kings on earth.

Note here that each divine person is connected (καί, “and”) to the divine action of offering grace and peace (ἀπό, “from”). This textual wrinkle is subtle, but it is intentional enough to trigger Trinitarian perceptions. It is no mistake that the persons are joined together grammatically and theologically, for as we will see time and again, John uses grammar to his advantage. Bauckham agrees, explaining that this salutation “suggests that his understanding of the divine is deliberately ‘trinitarian.’”<sup>20</sup>

Also, earlier Jesus is described in Revelation 1:2 as τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ and καὶ τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, meaning that this unveiling is about both God and Jesus—it is delivered through them both.<sup>21</sup> This aligns perfectly with other NT writings that portray Jesus, the Son, as inseparable from his Father and the deliverer of his Father's message (Jn 5:19, 6:38, 7:16-17, 14:9; 1 Cor 1:3, 8:6; Jam 1:1). He is also the inaugurator of the New Covenant (Rev 1:5), who sacrifices his own life for the salvation of God's people (cf., Matt 26:27-28; Acts 20:28; Rom 3:25; Eph 1:7; Heb 9:12-14; 1 Pet 1:2). Likewise, in Revelation 1:7, Jesus is described as being “pierced” (αὐτὸν ἐξεκέντησαν)—a noticeable allusion to a Hebrew version<sup>22</sup> of Zechariah 12:10, which “contains an ambiguity in that God is the one who is pierced, yet he apparently identifies himself with an associate.”<sup>23</sup> The conclusion is when Jesus the man is pierced, somehow God is pierced.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>20</sup>Bauckham, *The Theology of the Book of Revelation*, 24.

<sup>21</sup>Beale, *The Book of Revelation*, 183. Beale asserts that these genitive phrases offer “an intentional ambiguity and therefore a ‘general’ genitive which includes both subjective and objective aspects.”

<sup>22</sup>This rendering is found in the Masoretic Text (MT), for example.

<sup>23</sup>Beale, *The Book of Revelation*, 198.

<sup>24</sup>Jesus is clearly the focal character in the Apocalypse, as he receives the most references of the Trinitarian persons (or any persons) and the narrative consistently points to

This theme continues in Revelation 1-3 with Jesus appearing as the recipient of God's revelation (1:1), the one who addresses each church with the message (1:11, 2:1, et al.), and the one through whom Revelation's recipients were freed from sin (1:6). Jesus is continually displayed as more than a mere messenger—he is the one who himself “is coming” (1:5b), a designation paralleled identically with God's name in 4b, “he who is and who was and who is coming.”<sup>25</sup> The “first and last” language is used by Jesus in 1:17, showing he is clearly designating himself as the coming God,<sup>26</sup> and he also self-identifies as “the Alpha and the Omega” in 22:13, signifying his own sovereignty over history. He is coming and he is sovereign, just like his Father. As Athanasius says of 1:8,

The Godhead of the Son is the Father's. It is indivisible. Thus there is one God and none other but he. So, since they are one, and the Godhead itself one, the same things are said of the Son, which are said of the Father, except his being said to be the Father.<sup>27</sup>

Against this conclusion, A. Y. Collins has made a strong case that Revelation “...seems to portray the risen Jesus as an angel or at least in angelomorphic terms” rather than the high Christology associated with the Gospel of John and Hebrews.<sup>28</sup> Collins suggests that the message-delivering angel in 1:1 could be Jesus since John states in the same verse that God gave the revelation to Jesus.<sup>29</sup> But as we mentioned above, the identity of Jesus in the prologue parallels more with God than an angel (Rev 1:1-8). Also, it would be uncharacteristically sloppy syntax for John to have tied the angel and Jesus together in the same sentence in such a vague manner. In fact, we have already seen that John often holds argumentative clarity above even grammatical precision. It is also possible that he is reflecting the OT tradition of the “angel of the LORD,”

---

him in the most powerful and climactic moments. As such, this section is larger than the others. Jesus' primacy in the Revelation narrative should clue the reader into John's radical exaltation of him. He is not portrayed only as a messianic figure or divine-like being—he is put on par with YHWH in ways that might seem shocking, but ways in which John seems to view as entirely appropriate. Thus, Jesus' role in the Apocalypse elevates God-worship rather than distracting from it.

<sup>25</sup>R. Kendall Soulen, *The Divine Names and the Holy Trinity* vol. 1 (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2011), 181. Soulen remarks, “Jesus Christ is, quite literally, the one who comes ‘in the name of the Lord.’”

<sup>26</sup>Baucham, *The Theology of the Book of Revelation*, 19.

<sup>27</sup>William C. Weinrich, *Revelation*, Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture, ed. Thomas C. Oden (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2005), 7.

<sup>28</sup>Adela Yarbro Collins and John J. Collins, *King and Messiah as Son of God* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2008), 189. Yarbro Collins wrote the latter four chapters of the volume, according to the introduction.

<sup>29</sup>*Ibid.*, 190.

but interpreting the angel's appearing as a Christophany rather than a purely angelic being.<sup>30</sup>

Further, she notes that the appearance of the risen Christ in 1:12–16 does not explicitly portray him as either divine or an angel, but that the “features of that description are attributed elsewhere to angels.”<sup>31</sup> She defends this conclusion by observing that John does not apply the “Son of Man” title to Jesus, but instead disobeys grammatical rules to call him the more subdued “one like a son of man.”<sup>32</sup> John, in effect, re-semitizes the Son of Man tradition, dropping the articles that the gospel traditions added. By removing the articles, Collins infers that John is going back to the historical context of Daniel 7:13 wherein the “one like a son of man” is more likely a messiah or an angel, but not a divine being.<sup>33</sup> This is a lucid observation considering this previous point that John is not haphazard in breaking grammatical rules. Her point is noted, but this debatable deduction is untenable compared to his intentional connecting between divine identity and Jesus in this passage. Whereas Collins asserts that this portion of Revelation “may, but need not, imply divinity,”<sup>34</sup> the following will show that it not only *may* imply divinity, it actually *does*. The links that John connects between Daniel 7 and Jesus are indeed in reference to the Son of Man figure. Yet he does not stop there; he also folds Jesus into the identity of YHWH through Daniel 7 and select other OT allusions.<sup>35</sup>

Likewise, it is worth mentioning that even if descriptions of Jesus appear to be angelic in nature, this does not dismiss his divinity. As Bogdan Bucur has rightly said, John can use “angelic characteristics in descriptions of God or humans, while not necessarily implying that the latter are angels *stricto sensu*.”<sup>36</sup> In fact, though Hebrews 1:5–14 indicates a distinct superiority of Jesus over the angels, it was not uncommon in early Christian communities to use polymorphism as a way to indicate the transcendence of Jesus over the material realm and the restrictions of

---

<sup>30</sup>Though he does not deal with Revelation explicitly, there is an interesting discussion of the Christophany interpretation in the reception of Genesis 18 in Bogdan G. Bucur, “The Early Christian Reception of Genesis 18: From Theophany to Trinitarian Symbolism,” *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 23, no. 2 (2015), 245–72.

<sup>31</sup>Collins and Collins, *King and Messiah as Son of God*, 190–91.

<sup>32</sup>*Ibid.*, 191. In 1:13, she points out that the phrase ὅμοιον υἱὸν ἀνθρώπου probably is either a translation of the Aramaic in Daniel 7:13 or the Hebrew in Daniel 10:16, and that υἱὸν is in the accusative though it should be in the dative or genitive.

<sup>33</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>34</sup>*Ibid.*, 192.

<sup>35</sup>Oecumenius argued that dropping the articles was John's way of showing Jesus as both man and divine. By saying Jesus is *like* a son of man, he is not relegating him to solely human status; See Weinrich, *Revelation*, 12. This is an interesting take, but it seems more likely, as we will see, that John does not employ this rhetorical strategy because he makes ample use of the “Ancient of Days” as well.

<sup>36</sup>Bogdan G. Bucur, “Hierarchy, Prophecy, and the Angelomorphic Spirit: A Contribution to the Study of the Book of Revelation's *Wirkungsgeschichte*,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 127, no. 1 (2008), 175.



mortality.<sup>37</sup> So even if Collins is correct in her assessment, she must still concede that there are qualified uses of angelomorphism and polymorphism in early Christological reflection that in the end support the ideas of deity rather than deconstruct them.

Moving forward, in Revelation 1:10–11, Jesus speaks with an undeniably authoritative voice, getting John’s attention with “a voice like a trumpet,” much like YHWH’s voice in Exodus 19:16. He then tells John to write down all he sees, reminiscent of the Lord’s command to the prophets (Jer 30:2; Dan 12:4). The order of events in 1:17 mirrors the sequence found in Daniel 10:8–20: “(1) the prophet observes a vision, (2) falls on his face in fear, (3) subsequently is strengthened by a heavenly being, and (4) then receives further revelation...”<sup>38</sup> As mentioned above and reiterated here, it is no surprise then that John gets the impression he is, in fact, a prophet himself receiving words from God.

John subsequently turns “to see the voice that was speaking”<sup>39</sup> and sees “one like a son of man,” wearing a robe and golden sash, with hair “white as snow,” eyes “like a blazing fire,” glowing feet, and “a voice like the sound of rushing waters” (1:13–16). The parallels are striking, but most importantly—Jesus is portrayed as both the Son of Man *and* explicitly connected with the divine characteristics of the Ancient of Days mentioned in Daniel’s account. He is the Son of Man in that he receives the keys to the eternal kingdom (Dan 7:13–14) which, contra Collins, is authority unfitting of any mere messiah or angel. YHWH is not simply giving some underling a piece of his kingdom—he is giving his divine Son, Jesus, the keys to the whole thing.

John may also be giving Jesus OT angelic characteristics such as wearing a long robe (Ezek 9:2) and golden sash (Dan 10:5 LXX=MT), and having bronze feet (Dan 10:6 LXX). However, Jesus’s white-as-wool hair and flaming eyes in 1:14 are then paralleled with that of the theophany in Daniel 7:9–14. John is also amazed at Jesus’ face “like the sun shining in all its brilliance” and blazing eyes, akin to the description of the angel in Daniel 10:5–6 (LXX). While the Daniel parallel is still there, his description of his voice “like the roar of many waters” (ὡς φωνῆ ὑδάτων πολλῶν) reads more like God’s voice in the MT of

---

<sup>37</sup>For more on polymorphism in early Christianity, see Paul Foster, “Polymorphic Christology: its Origins and Development in Early Christianity,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 58, no. 1 (2007), 66–99.

<sup>38</sup>G. K. Beale and Sean M. McDonough, “Revelation,” in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, eds. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007), 1092.

<sup>39</sup>This phrase βλέπειν τὴν φωνὴν ἣτις ἐλάλει appears to be taken from Daniel 7:11 (LXX). Beale notes that John is purposeful in his use of Daniel in the surrounding context, but may have “spontaneously used this language without much forethought” because Daniel 7:11 speaks about the beast’s “boastful words.” If subconscious, this furthers the hypothesis that John inescapably alludes to the OT/LXX throughout the Apocalypse; Cf., Beale, *The Book of Revelation*, 85.

Ezekiel 1:24 and 43:2.<sup>40</sup> Whether Daniel is actually describing an angelophany or theophany in 10:5–6, John intentionally protects his own triadic form by attaching the divine characteristics to Jesus, which does not allow the reader to associate Jesus with a mere exalted being or angel.<sup>41</sup> In a similar vein, Robert Gundry discusses the potential use of angelomorphism in John 10 and argues that while John certainly uses angelic descriptors for Jesus, (1) Jesus is not merely another angel compared to others in Revelation, and (2) deification language also is present.<sup>42</sup> The point then is that Jesus is not perceived as some sort of generic exalted figure; he is associated with the divine identity and divine actions of YHWH. Dennis Johnson highlights this when he states:

We might infer that this merely indicates that Christ reflects the glory of the One who sent him ... but the white hair of the Son of Man says more than this. In the symbolic vocabulary provided by Daniel's vision, John sees "one like a son of man" who is distinguished from and identified with the Ancient of Days—a mysterious combination but consistent with the fact that he lays claim to the title "the first and the last" (1:17) ... The Son of Man is God, infinite in wisdom and holiness.<sup>43</sup>

Johnson goes on to explain that John's reaction to interacting with Jesus ("I fell down like a dead man," 1:17) is similar to Daniel's response to hearing God's voice (Dan 10:9).<sup>44</sup> Of course, one could argue that John falls down at the sight of non-divine beings elsewhere (e.g., Rev 22:9) and therefore his response does not prove the deity of Jesus. However, Jesus does not deflect worship away from himself like the angel does. Further, one cannot mistake the evident connections in authority, activity, and appearance that John continues to reveal between the persons. These connections undercut Collins, showing that John's method is to tie Jesus into the divine identity in this passage and the Apocalypse as a whole. Additionally, this language brings to mind Jesus own words in John 14:9 ("anyone who has seen me has seen the Father") or Paul's statement in Colossians 1:15 ("he is the image of the invisible God").

Elsewhere Collins has also rejected the idea that Jesus himself explicitly linked his identity to the heavenly figure in Daniel 7:13, but

---

<sup>40</sup>Beale, *The Book of Revelation*, 210.

<sup>41</sup>Loren T. Stuckenbruck, *Angel Veneration and Christology* (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1995), 213.

<sup>42</sup>Robert H. Gundry, *The Old Is Better* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2010), 377-97. Citing Jesus's description of himself in Revelation 3:14, he notes that Jesus was "acting out of a sense that God was his Father in a distinctive way."

<sup>43</sup>Dennis E. Johnson, *Triumph of the Lamb* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P & R Publishing, 2001), 59.

<sup>44</sup>*Ibid.*, 61.

instead “closely associated” himself.<sup>45</sup> In fact, according to her, it is the fault of his followers that his Son of Man teachings were twisted from association to identification.<sup>46</sup> Nevertheless, she does not take into account the possibility that his followers were influenced, for example, by the account in Matthew 26:64 wherein the high priest tore his clothes and accused Jesus of blasphemy for self-identifying with Daniel 7’s Son of Man. Nowhere does Jesus tell the high priest to stop overreacting. Rather, at least in some sense his followers rightly understood Jesus as referring to his own divinity in that moment. So applying her argument to the Apocalypse, should one assume that John is mistaken in his exegesis of Daniel because he misunderstood Jesus’ view of the Son of Man figure. The proper response is that John visionary presentation of the glorified Christ does not go against the claims of the synoptic traditions. Instead, John cannot make sense of his visions unless Jesus both *is* the heavenly Son of Man and *is* somehow identified ontologically with God. This is illustrated perfectly in Revelation 14:14 where Jesus receives worship alongside the Father and then is identified as “one like a son of man” (ὅμοιον υἱὸν ἀνθρώπου) wearing a golden crown and wielding a sharp sickle as a divine judge.<sup>47</sup> Here John takes the divinity of Jesus for granted since he has already explained that the Son of Man role is a divine one. He is connecting OT themes as he documents the visions of Revelation, and joins other NT writers by following “the lead *given by Jesus himself* concerning his presence in the ancient events.”<sup>48</sup> John is not mistakenly reinterpreting his Lord—he is correctly interpreting the previous biblical stratum of data concerning the relationship between the Son of Man and YHWH.

Furthermore, John points out in 1:16 that Jesus has a “sharp, double-edged sword coming from his mouth.” He also has a sharp sword coming from his mouth in 19:15 as he declares eschatological war on God’s enemies. And in the beginning of John’s Gospel, we also see that he *is* God’s Word. Depicted here, then, is a two-fold image. First, Jesus is identified as owning and being God’s Word. He is not a mere conduit; his words are the very words of the Father. Second, Jesus is the divine judge who defeats Satan and his message. These actions fulfill such prophecies as Isaiah 11:4 and 49:2 where YHWH is shown to be acting in divine judgment, which further solidifies the Son’s divine-identity-sharing role

---

<sup>45</sup>Adela Yarbro Collins, “The Origin of the Designation of Jesus as ‘Son of Man,’” *The Harvard Theological Review* 80, no. 4 (1987), 406.

<sup>46</sup>Ibid.

<sup>47</sup>Beale, *The Book of Revelation*, 776–800. Beale also discusses the debate surrounding 14:14–19, concluding that the background of “sickle” (δοῦρεῖνα) in Isaiah 2:4, Joel 4:10, and Micah 4:3 coupled with the grape harvest metaphors of Isaiah 18, Jeremiah 28:33 and 32:30 LXX, et al. lean toward a picture of war and judgment.

<sup>48</sup>Graeme Goldsworthy, *The Son of God and the New Creation* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway: 2015), 123. Though Goldsworthy’s work here only tackles the last few chapters of Revelation, he shows that Jesus repeatedly and inescapably refers to his own divinity, using the OT as his apologetic.

as eschatological judge.<sup>49</sup> Serving in this capacity, the churches in Asia would have understood that their eschatological hope was coming through him.

#### IV. REVELATION 2–3

Identifying the Father as YHWH/God instigates no serious protest. Yet seeing how John appropriates the Son in Revelation 1 is more challenging, as we have seen. Now, as we discuss his message to the seven churches, we see Jesus offering other descriptors that allude to his divine identity. He sets the stage early on by standing in the midst of lampstands, or the churches, as though he is the epicenter to whom his audiences will gravitate (1:13). From here, the subtle Trinitarian allusions in the prologue transition to the loud trumpeting voice of Jesus in 1:17 where he addresses the churches, applies divine terms to himself, and ends each message with a reminder that he is delivering the message in conjunction with the Spirit.

To Thyatira in 2:18, Jesus calls himself “the Son of God” and rehearses the Son of Man language mentioned above. Collins challenges the divinity of Jesus here as well, saying that 2:18 is the only instance in which the Apocalypse explicitly calls Jesus “the son of God.”<sup>50</sup> For her, this Daniel 10 allusion points to a lesser identity—that of “an angelic heavenly messiah.”<sup>51</sup> Yet the bulk of the Thyatiran message gives more. First, Jesus tells the church that he will “strike dead” or “kill” Jezebel’s children. This is rendered ἀποκτενῶ ἐν θανάτῳ and compares to Ezekiel 33:27, which is followed by the phrase “and they will know that I am the Lord” (Ezek 33:29).<sup>52</sup> This parallel reinforces the idea that he is the righteous, divine judge who “searches mind and heart” and “gives to each according to his deeds” (2:23). This formula of omniscience is startlingly parallel to the Lord’s words in Jeremiah 17:10 as well. In both instances, he declares his ability to know their hearts and minds as well as his capacity to reward or punish because of his knowledge. Second, John’s use of the rehearsed Son of Man language has already been shown to reflect deity rather than angelic identity, even if polymorphism is possibly involved. It is worth pointing out that biblical writers like Mark

---

<sup>49</sup>Beale and McDonough, “Revelation,” 1092.

<sup>50</sup>Collins and Collins, *King and Messiah as Son of God*, 202.

<sup>51</sup>Ibid. She refers to other instances where Jesus is described as a “son,” such as “the son of David” in 5:5 and 22:16 and the son of the woman in chapter 12. Since these are somewhat ambiguous and symbolic, she suggests that the language “ought not be pressed.” This an unfortunate pass on her part because the message to Thyatira gives ample clues to the divinity of Jesus.

<sup>52</sup>Beale, *The Book of Revelation*, 264. As Beale notes, “and they will know that I am the Lord” is used approximately 50 times in the LXX of Ezekiel, mostly referring to “God being known as a result of judgment, as in Revelation 2:23, which also highlights further the divine nature of Jesus’ judicial function.”

and John the Seer were not alone in making the Daniel 7-Son of Man parallel. As Markus Zehnder has argued, the divinity of the Son of Man figure was used in post-biblical Jewish Second Temple literature as well.

[So] we are compelled to deduce that the use of the expression “Son of Man” in some of its instances in the NT, insofar as it relates to Dan 7:13, points to a conception of Jesus as more than an exemplary ideal human being but as a divine figure.<sup>53</sup>

And the Son of Man characteristics here are not merely traits that John says he sees. Jesus himself claims these divine descriptions and actions.

To Sardis in 3:1, the risen Lord employs a slight twist on his greeting to Ephesus as the one “who has the seven spirits of God and the seven stars.” Bruce Metzger rightly observes that this phrase indicates his “sovereign control over churches and the source of spiritual power.”<sup>54</sup> But to take a step further, Jesus’ control over the seven spirits may have a more specific application, signifying his sending of and working with the Holy Spirit. Thomas and Macchia give helpful input here by pointing out that the mention of the “book of life” is akin to language that appears in Exodus 32:31-33. While in Exodus, the book belongs to YHWH, here Jesus “has [the same] authority to expunge names from the book of life. For this book belongs to [Jesus].”<sup>55</sup> Though one could counter that Jesus is only exerting borrowed or channeled power from God, the language used here is not describing an action empowered by God (the Father); rather, God (the Son) performs it.

To Philadelphia in 3:7, he is “the holy one, the true one, who has the key of David.” Only God is truly holy and so this title is grounded in allusions to deity. The key of David, however, is a little more ambiguous. Beale and McDonough argue that this phrase is a quote from Isaiah 22:22, with the name “David” being substituted for “death and Hades” and the phrase “open doors that shall not be closed” deriving from language used in Isaiah 45.<sup>56</sup> They also rightly point out that Isaiah 22 itself points back to the prophecy of Isaiah 9:6 that predicts this future Israelite ruler to be the “Eternal Father.”<sup>57</sup> More than just the exalted Messiah on David’s throne, Jesus is equivalent with the eternal sovereignty of God over the Kingdom of all kingdoms. Christ alone can

---

<sup>53</sup>Markus Zehnder, “Why the Danielic ‘Son of Man’ Is a Divine Being,” *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 24, no. 3 (2014), 347.

<sup>54</sup>Bruce Metzger, *Breaking the Code* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1993), 39.

<sup>55</sup>John Christopher Thomas and Frank D. Macchia, *Revelation*, in *The Two Horizons New Testament Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing, 2016), 116–17.

<sup>56</sup>Beale and McDonough, “Revelation,” 1096–97.

<sup>57</sup>*Ibid.*

open the door;<sup>58</sup> he has the authority to admit people into God’s Kingdom or send them away to eternal punishment.<sup>59</sup>

To Laodicea in 3:14, Jesus refers to himself as “the Amen, the faithful and true witness, the beginning of God’s creation.” This is a tripartite statement that triggers one central idea—Jesus is to be trusted because of his unique identification and sharing of identity with God. The background for Jesus being “a faithful and true witness” (ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστὸς καὶ ὁ ἀληθινός) harkens back to the “the notion of God and of Israel as a ‘faithful witness’ to the new creation in Isaiah 43:10–12.”<sup>60</sup> And as God’s Ἀμήν, “Amen,” (cf., 2 Cor 1:20), he is as reliable as his Father who is the God of truth.<sup>61</sup> This is a critical link because the use of “Amen” as a proper noun is used only here in the NT as an echo of God’s name in Isaiah 65:16.<sup>62</sup> Similarly, we see this idea reflected in John 8:18 where Jesus is one who speaks as his Father speaks, but who can simultaneously claim to be his own witness. As the “beginning of God’s creation,” he is not merely saying he is the first created being. He is the ἀρχὴ or “ruler,” paralleling what John 1:1–3 and Colossians 1:15–17 later says—that he was an authoritatively active agent in the triune God’s creation of all things and the one who has set in motion God’s plan for a new creation.

Adding this together, we see that the messages to the churches fall into one of two categories. On the one hand, there are consistent promises of impending judgment if repentance is not expressed. Ephesus, Pergamum, Thyatira, Sardis, and especially Laodicea are recipients of such sobering warnings. In these confrontations, John applies the exhortative formulas found in the Deuteronomic tradition as well as the language of the prophets Joel, Zechariah, Isaiah, and Ezekiel to summon the people to restoration lest they fall under the punitive judgment of God.<sup>63</sup> On the other hand, there are always promises of salvation as well. We see such comforting words especially in the messages to Smyrna and Philadelphia where the people are encouraged to remain faithful as they await their hope of eternal redemption.<sup>64</sup> But regardless of each message’s tone, there is always a hopeful promise at the end, as seen in the phrase τῷ νικῶντι (2:7) or some variant of it—“to the one who overcomes” or “conquers.” The conquering saint is promised that he will have authority over the nations (2:26), will not have his name blotted out of the Book of

<sup>58</sup>Joseph L. Mangina, *Revelation* (Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos Press, 2010), 65.

<sup>59</sup>Craig R. Koester, *Revelation and the End of All Things* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing, 2001), 66.

<sup>60</sup>Beale, *The Book of Revelation*, 297. On page 300, Beale expands on this comment by suggesting that this phrase comes from Isaiah 43:10 LXX (“‘You [Israel] are my witnesses and I am a witness,’ says the Lord, ‘and my servant whom I have chosen.’”) and its parallel in vv. 11–12.

<sup>61</sup>Leon Morris, *Revelation* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 1987), 81. Morris points to Isaiah 65:16, where “the God of truth” is literally “the God of Amen.”

<sup>62</sup>Thomas and Macchia, *Revelation*, 126.

<sup>63</sup>Robert L. Muse, “Revelation 2–3: A Critical Analysis of Seven Prophetic Messages,” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 29, no. 2 (1986), 158.

<sup>64</sup>*Ibid.*, 159.

Life (3:5), et al. So even in the midst of warning or commendation, hope is offered and there is a call to perseverance. Persevere, Jesus says, and he will be faithful and true to his promise of salvation as the eschatological divine judge, which according to the OT is the task that only YHWH fulfills.

## V. REVELATION 5 AND 7

Though much more can be said about Jesus' divinity within Revelation, only a few examples beyond chapters 1–3 can be covered here. Most notably is John's subsequent description of the heavenly throne of God. At first one might expect this throne to be occupied solely by the Father, yet ironically this is not how John describes it. After receiving God-worthy worship while sitting on God's throne in 5:12,<sup>65</sup> the Lamb (Jesus) is with his Father in 5:13b receiving co-equal worship from the mouths of every being in creation. Looking at ancient texts like Daniel 7:9–14, *b. Sahn* 38b, and *b. Hag.* 14a, Craig Evans notes that the position at a deity's "right hand" could refer to that figure's vice-regency with God, not his inferiority.<sup>66</sup> Or as Alan Hultberg explains, this is "an astonishing imposition on the worship of God in heaven, though John reports the acclamation with no sense of impropriety!"<sup>67</sup> This "is particularly remarkable in a book like Revelation, which is so concerned with true and false worship ... Thus is it noteworthy that Christ does not admonish him for his obeisance in 1:17 and more so that such explicit worship can be paid Christ here in chapter 5."<sup>68</sup> Hultberg also observes that this is another recapitulation by John of Daniel 7, though "what was implied earlier, becomes explicit in Revelation 5: the Lamb is divine, and is to be worshipped alongside the Lord of hosts."<sup>69</sup>

Countering these points, McGrath contends that neither of these dynamics solidifies the assertion that Jesus shares God's identity. He states that it is not abnormal in Revelation for people to bow down to non-deities. In fact, Jesus tells the Philadelphians that he "will cause [those of the synagogue of Satan] to come and worship before your feet" (ποιήσω αὐτοὺς, ἵνα ἤξουσιν καὶ προσκυνήσουσιν ἐνώπιον τῶν ποδῶν σου). This shows, then, that "sharing the throne nor receiving worship was something this author reserved exclusively for God alone, or even exclusively for God and Christ."<sup>70</sup> McGrath further explains that

<sup>65</sup>The Greek word here, μέσσω, could be translated as "in the midst of" (KJV, NKJV), "between" (ESV, NLT), or "at the center of" (NIV). The NIV might be the closest here, as the worship the Lamb receives seems to mirror the same kind that is directed at God.

<sup>66</sup>Craig A. Evans, *Mark 8:27-16:20*. Word Biblical Commentary Series. Vol. 34b, revised ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2015), lxxvii.

<sup>67</sup>Alan David Hultberg, "Messianic Exegesis in the Apocalypse: The Significance of the Old Testament for the Christology of Revelation" (PhD diss., Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 2001), 326.

<sup>68</sup>*Ibid.*, 326–27.

<sup>69</sup>*Ibid.*, 327.

<sup>70</sup>McGrath, *The Only True God*, 75.

when the Lamb shares God's throne in 5:6–14, the elders are not described as offering prayerful worship to the Lamb. "It is thus possible that the author assumed such prayers to be either offer to God in thanksgiving for Christ, or offered to God *through* Christ..."<sup>71</sup> At this point, though, Dunn does note the "striking" fact that "*worship is given to the Lamb unreservedly*" in the throne-sharing scenes of Revelation 5 and 7.<sup>72</sup> But he still agrees with McGrath that this worship does not necessitate Jesus' sharing in the divine identity since "*worship is quite a broad category*" that "can embrace everything from polite acknowledgement of a superior ... to the full worship appropriate only to God."<sup>73</sup>

Now admittedly, Dunn's and McGrath's point warrants serious consideration. However further developments in Revelation shed helpful light on a flaw in their proposal. The relationship between the Lamb and the throne in 7:9–10 is clearer than they assert, as Jesus seems to receive worship alongside God from those who survived the great tribulation. Whereas in chapter 6 the throne reflects the wrath and judgment of God, the scene in chapter 7 offers eschatological hope as the overcoming elect celebrate in unison. These positive and negative judgments lend themselves to the Lamb's co-equal status with God as the divine eschatological judge, as we have seen previously in the Apocalypse. The phrase ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου σκηνώσει ἐπ' αὐτούς brings to mind God's presence in the midst of his people. The word σκηνώσει more directly means that God will spread his tabernacle over them like a tent. "All the blessings of the Jerusalem Temple, in other words, will be theirs."<sup>74</sup> Jesus is also standing next to God, receiving the same glory and honor, co-offering grace to the elect. Consequently, this passage, along with the accompanying throne scenes leading up to it, work against Dunn and especially McGrath's conclusion. Jesus is certainly the high priest between God and man (Heb 5), but he receives honor and praise in Revelation 5 and 7 in ways that no other being in the book is allowed. Most notably, in 5:12, he receives glory, indicating the majesty of a king.<sup>75</sup> Finally, while the Philadelphians were given an abnormally high honor above the false worshipers, they never share a throne with God—neither do angels, for that matter. The Father only reserves space for Jesus on his throne, and as Michael Gorman contends,

The slaughtered Lamb is now not only our central and centering vision, but also the interpretive lens through which we read the remainder of the book. Divine judgment and salvation must be understood in light of—indeed defined by—the reality of the slaughtered Lamb who is worthy of divine worship.<sup>76</sup>

---

<sup>71</sup>Ibid. Emphasis original.

<sup>72</sup>James D. G. Dunn, *New Testament Theology* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 2009), 65–66. Emphasis original.

<sup>73</sup>Ibid., 66. Emphasis original.

<sup>74</sup>N. T. Wright, *Revelation for Everyone* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2011), 75.

<sup>75</sup>Charles Brüttsch, *Die Offenbarung Jesu Christi* (Zürich: Zwingli, 1970), 263–64.

<sup>76</sup>Michael J. Gorman, *Reading Revelation Responsibly* (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2011), 115. "The remainder of the book" indicates chapters 6 and following.



Likewise, looking again to the work of Hultberg, one sees that the co-equal worship of Jesus and God in the temple stretches all the way to the eschatological finale of Revelation. He notes:

In 21:22, the Lord God almighty and the Lamb function as the Temple of the New Jerusalem, obviating the need for a physical structure. It is clear that John envisions the eschatological worship to center on both. God and his Christ; the Lamb reigns with God as the objects of the cult in the New Jerusalem. Similarly, in Rev 21:23, the New Jerusalem requires no sun or moon because the glory of God illumines it, and its lamp is the Lamb. . . . So when John tells us of the single throne of God and of the Lamb in chapter 22, the Lamb has been elevated to a place co-equal with God and he is no longer merely his messianic vice-regent.<sup>77</sup>

Finally, we see in 14:1 that the faithful 144,000 have the names of both God and the Lamb on their foreheads in a similar scene of “cultic service.”<sup>78</sup> So what John sees is not God being worshiped and his exalted Messiah standing next to him in a strictly subordinate position. Both of them receive co-equal worship and the elect are not redeemed without their co-mutual divine activity.

## VI. CONCLUSION

Rudolf Bultmann famously accused Revelation of being “weakly Christianized Judaism” that limits “the significance of Christ” and merely gives “the passionate eschatological hope a certainty which the Jewish apocalyptists lack.”<sup>79</sup> In one sense, he is right because Revelation does present a more focused, fulfilled, and certain eschatological hope than is found in Daniel or 1 Enoch. Instead of merely anticipating the Messiah’s arrival like the Jewish apocalypse writers, John speaks of the Second Advent of the Spirit-empowered and glorified Messiah as though it is as certain to occur as the first. And such a focus coincides with our contention that John constantly appealed to the OT and apostolic witness when he wrote the Apocalypse. To be more emphatic, his visionary claims about the identity of Christ as the co-eternal Son of the Father match other claims about his divine identity that are made throughout the gospels and other apostolic writings. So, in the end, Bultmann actually

<sup>77</sup>Hultberg, “Messianic Exegesis in the Apocalypse,” 328–29.

<sup>78</sup>Ibid., 330.

<sup>79</sup>Rudolf Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2007), 175. His complaint with Revelation is that John “does not reflect about the past which in Christ has been brought to its end and out of which believers have been transplanted into a new beginning. Hence the present is understood in a way not basically different from the understanding of it in the Jewish apocalypses: namely as a time of temporariness, of waiting. The clear symptom of this understanding is the fact that *pistis* is essentially conceived as ‘endurance,’ as in Judaism.”

shortchanges the value of the Apocalypse, because he dismisses or outright rejects John's richly *proto-Trinitarian* focus.

Contrary to skepticism that we have mentioned thus far, we have argued that the book's descriptions of the divine persons' economic functions indicate a clear link with what other NT traditions claim about the deity of Jesus as well as his relationship to his Father and the Spirit. In fact, the very heart of Revelation, which is its eschatological hope, hinges upon the cooperative actions of the triune God. Such a deduction then compels us to address the kinds of oversights that scholars like Bultmann have popularized so we can uphold the primacy of a Trinitarian reading of Revelation in particular and Scripture in general. We resonate with Vanhoozer and Treier who have posited,

The significance and plausibility of Jesus' resurrection, the nature of the gospel, the structure of the story now coming to its consummation, the meaning of Christ being the ultimate Word—all these “concepts” of biblical theology relate to the identity of Israel's God as Father, Son and Holy Spirit. ... It seems difficult to conclude that prioritizing the Trinitarian identity of the Bible's God makes an undigested imposition on Christian interpretation of scriptural texts.<sup>80</sup>

Keeping this hermeneutical commitment in mind then, we discover that a Trinitarian reading of Revelation is a justified assessment of the book's message which is that the messianic fulfillment expected in the OT has been revealed in the person of Jesus Christ, who in the power of the Spirit ushered in the last days and the kingdom of his Father.<sup>81</sup> Furthermore, the unfolding narrative of the Apocalypse presents Christ as uniquely distinct from his Father and yet equally divine at the same time.

---

<sup>80</sup>Kevin J. Vanhoozer and Daniel J. Treier, *Theology and the Mirror of Scripture* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2015), 172.

<sup>81</sup>Matthew Emerson fleshes out this point in more detail in *Between the Cross and the Throne* (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016), 33.