# Paul's Christology of Divine Identity

© Richard Bauckham

## 1. Early Jewish Monotheism and Early Christology

In my book *God Crucified: Monotheism and Christology in the New Testament* (The Didsbury Lectures for 1996; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999) I set out in broad outline a particular thesis about the relationship of early Jewish monotheism and early Christian Christology, which also entails a relatively fresh proposal about the character of the earliest Christology.[1] My purpose in the present paper is to summarize the thesis of the first two chapters of *God Crucified,* and then to focus in considerably more detail than I have done hitherto on the Pauline epistles, to show how the thesis is verified and exemplified in Pauline theology.

The nature of Jewish monotheism in the late Second Temple period has been much discussed in recent years, often in connexion with early Christology. In very broad terms, one can identify two approaches. There is, first, the view that Second Temple Judaism was characterized by a 'strict' monotheism that made it impossible to attribute real divinity to any figure other than the one God. From this view of Jewish monotheism, some argue that Jesus cannot have been treated as really divine within a Jewish monotheistic context, so that only a radical break with Jewish monotheism could make the attribution of real divinity to Jesus possible.[2] In view of the obviously very Jewish character of earliest Christianity, this approach tends to interpret the evidence in such a way as to minimize the extent to which anything like really divine Christology can be found within the New Testament texts.

Secondly, there are revisionist views of Second Temple Judaism which deny its strictly monotheistic character. Such views focus on various kinds of intermediary figures - principal angels, exalted humans, personified divine attributes or functions - who are understood to occupy a subordinate divine or semi-divine status. The distinction between the one God and all other reality was therefore by no means absolute in the Judaism of this period. Such views are closely related to a search for Jewish precedents for early Christian Christology. Scholars in this trend often recognize both that many New Testament texts treat Jesus as in some way divine, and also that these texts are working within a fundamentally Jewish conceptual context. The attempt to understand how such high Christology could develop within a Jewish

---

[1]I have also made these further contributions to the same argument: 'The Worship of Jesus in Philippians 2:9-11,' in R. P. Martin and B. J. Dodd ed., *Where Christology Began: Essays on Philippians 2* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1998) 128-139; 'The Throne of God and the Worship of Jesus,' in C. C. Newman, J. R. Davila and G. S. Lewis ed., *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism: Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus* (SJSJ 63; Leiden: Brill, 1999) 43-69; 'Monotheism and Christology in the Gospel of John,' forthcoming in R. N. Longenecker ed., *Contours of Christology in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002); 'Monotheism and Christology in Hebrews 1,' forthcoming in L. T. Stuckenbruck ed., *Christological Monotheism* (title not certain; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 2002?).

[2]A. E. Harvey, *Jesus and the Constraints of History* (London: Duckworth, 1982) chapter 7; P. M. Casey, *From Jewish Prophet to Gentile God* (Cambridge: J. Clarke/Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1991); idem, 'The Deification of Jesus,' *SBLSP 1994,* 697-714; idem, 'Monotheism, Worship and Christological Developments in the Pauline Churches,' in Newman, Davila and Lewis ed., *The Jewish Roots,* 214-233.

movement focuses then on the intermediary figures of Second Temple Judaism who in some way participate in divinity. Such figures provide, as it were, an already existing Jewish category into which early Christian estimations of Jesus' exalted status fit. Because Jewish monotheism was not strict but flexible, and the boundary between the one God and all other reality relatively blurred by the interest in intermediary figures, the highest New Testament Christology can be understood as an intelligibly Jewish development.[3]

The view I argued in *God Crucified* differs from both these approaches. In common with the first view, I argue that the monotheism of Second Temple Judaism was indeed 'strict.' Most Jews in this period were highly self-consciously monotheistic, and had certain very familiar and well-defined ideas as to how the uniqueness of the one God should be understood. In other words, they drew the line of distinction between the one God and all other reality clearly, and were in the habit of distinguishing God from all other reality by means of certain clearly articulated criteria. So-called intermediary figures were not ambiguous semi-divinities straddling the boundary between God and creation. Some (such as God's wisdom and God's word) were understood as aspects of the one God's own unique reality. Most were regarded as unambiguously creatures, exalted servants of God whom the literature often takes pains to distinguish clearly from the truly divine reality of the one and only God. Therefore, differing from the second view, I do not think such Jewish intermediary figures are of any decisive importance for the study of early Christology. (We shall return to the issue of Jewish precedents for early Christology after our study of Paul, which will enable us to focus on the most relevant of such alleged precedents.)

In my view high Christology was possible within a Jewish monotheistic context, not by applying to Jesus a Jewish category of semi-divine intermediary status, but by identifying Jesus directly with the one God of Israel, including Jesus in the unique identity of this one God. I use the term 'unique identity' as the best way of speaking of the uniqueness of God as generally conceived in early Judaism. The concept of identity is more appropriate, as the principal category for understanding Jewish monotheism, than is that of divine nature. In other words, for Jewish monotheistic belief what was important was *who* the one God is, rather than what divinity is. (This is not intended to exclude all concepts of divine nature from the Jewish theology of this period - such attributes as eternity and supreme power were essential to the Jewish understanding of God - but I do regard the identity of God as the more comprehensive and important category.)

---

[3]C. Rowland, *The Open Heaven* (London: SPCK, 1982) 94-113.; A. Chester, 'Jewish Messianic Expectations and Mediatorial Figures and Pauline Christology,' in M. Hengel and U. Heckel ed., *Paulus und antike Judentum* (WUNT 58; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1991) 17-89; M. Barker, *The Great Angel: A Study of Israel's Second God* (London: SPCK, 1992); C. A. Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology* (AGAJU 42; Leiden: Brill, 1998). See also, for a variety of related views which stress the importance of Jewish intermediary figures for the development of Christology: M. Hengel, *The Son of God* (tr. J. Bowden; London: SCM Press, 1976); J. D. G. Dunn, *Christology in the Making* (London: SCM Press, 1980); idem, 'Was Christianity a Monotheistic Faith from the Beginning?,' *SJT* 35 (1982) 303-336; idem, 'The Making of Christology - Evolution or Unfolding?,' in J. B. Green and M. Turner ed., *Jesus of Nazareth: Lord and Christ* (I. H. Marshall FS; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans/Carlisle: Paternoster, 1994) 437-452; L. W. Hurtado, *One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988).

The one God of Second Temple Jewish belief was identifiable as unique by two kinds of identifying features. The first concerns his covenant relationship with Israel. He is the God of Israel, known from the recital of his acts in Israel's history and from the revelation of his character to Israel (Exod 34:6). He has revealed to Israel his name YHWH, which was of great importance to Jews of the Second Temple period because it names precisely the unique identity of their God. As well as such identifications of God from his relationship with Israel, this God was also characterized as unique by his relationships to the whole of reality: especially that he is the only Creator of all things and that he is the sole sovereign Ruler of all things. Such identifications of YHWH are extremely common in Second Temple Jewish literature.[4] They were the simplest and clearest way of answering the question: What distinguishes YHWH, the only true God, from all other reality? In what does his uniqueness consist? These characteristics make a clear and absolute distinction between the true God and all other reality. God alone created all things; all other things, including beings worshipped as gods by Gentiles, are created by him. God alone rules supreme over all things; all other things, including beings worshipped as gods by Gentiles, are subject to him. These ways of distinguishing God as unique formed a very easily intelligible way of defining the uniqueness of the God they worshipped which most Jews in most synagogues in the late Second Temple period would certainly have known. However diverse Judaism may have been in many other respects, this was common: only the God of Israel is worthy of worship because he is sole Creator of all things and sole Ruler of all things. Other beings who might otherwise be thought divine are by these criteria God's creatures and subjects. (Thus so-called intermediary figures either *belong to* the unique identity of God or else *were created by* and remain *subject to* the one God, as his worshippers and servants, however exalted.)

We could characterize this early Jewish monotheism as *creational* monotheism, *eschatological* monotheism and *cultic* monotheism. That God alone - absolutely without advisors or collaborators or assistants or servants - created all other things was insisted on (even when he was understood to have created out of pre-exisiting chaos rather than out of nothing). That God was the sole Creator of and the sole Lord over all things required the expectation that in the future, when YHWH fulfils his promises to his people Israel, YHWH will also demonstrate his deity to the nations, establishing his universal kingdom, making his name known universally, becoming known to all as the God Israel has known. This aspect I call *eschatological* monotheism. Finally, there is also *cultic* monotheism. Only the sole Creator of all things and the sole Lord over all things should be worshipped, since worship in the Jewish tradition was precisely recognition of this unique identity of the one God.

The early Christian movement, very consciously using this Jewish theological framework, created a kind of *christological* monotheism by understanding Jesus to be included in the unique identity of the one God of Israel. Probably the earliest expression of this to which we have access - and it was certainly in use very early in the first Christian community's history - was the understanding of Jesus' exaltation in

---

[4]God as Creator of all things: e.g. Isa 40:26, 28; 42:5; 44:24; 45:12, 18; 48:13; 51:16; Neh 9:6; Hos 13:4 LXX; 2 Macc 1:24; Sir 43:33; Bel 5; Jub 12:3-5; Sib Or 3:20-35; 8:375-376; Frag 1:5-6; Frag 3; Frag 5; 2 Enoch 47:3-4; 66:4; ApAbr 7:10; Pseudo-Sophocles; JosAsen 12:1-2; TJob 2:4. God as Ruler of all things: e.g. Dan 4:34-35; Bel 5; Add Est 13:9-11; 16:18, 21; 3 Macc 2:2-3; 6:2; Wis 12:13; Sir 18:1-3; SibOr 3:10, 19; Frag 1:7, 15, 17, 35; 1 Enoch 9:5; 84:3; 2 Enoch 33:7; 2 Bar 54:13; Josephus, *Ant.* 1:155-156.

terms of Psalm 110:1. Jesus, seated on the cosmic throne of God in heaven as the one who will achieve the eschatological lordship of God and in whom the unique sovereignty of the one God will be acknowledged by all, is included in the unique rule of God over all things, and is thus placed unambigously on the divine side of the absolute distinction that separates the only sovereign One from all creation.[5] God's rule over all things defines who God is: it cannot be delegated as a mere function to a creature. Thus the earliest christology was already *in nuce* the highest christology. All that remained was to work through consistently what it could mean for Jesus to belong integrally to the unique identity of the one God. Early Christian interest was primarily in soteriology and eschatology, the concerns of the Gospel, and so in the New Testament it is primarily as sharing or implementing God's eschatological lordship that Jesus is understood to belong to the identity of God. But early Christian reflection could not consistently leave it at that. Jewish eschatological monotheism was founded in creational monotheism. If Jesus was integral to the identity of God, he must have been so eternally. To include Jesus also in the unique creative activity of God and in the uniquely divine eternity was a necessary corollary of his inclusion in the eschatological identity of God. This was the early Christians' Jewish way of preserving monotheism against the ditheism that any kind of adoptionist Christology was bound to involve. Not by adding Jesus to the unique identity of the God of Israel, but only by including Jesus in that unique identity, could monotheism be maintained. This applies also to the worship of Jesus, which certainly began in Palestinian Jewish Christianity.[6] This expressed the inclusion of Jesus in the unique identity of the sole Creator of all things and sole Sovereign over all things.

Early Christology was framed within the familar Jewish framework of creational, eschatological and cultic monotheism. The first Christians developed a *christological* monotheism with all three of these aspects. From this perspective I call the Christology of all the New Testament writers, rooted as it was in the earliest Christology of all, a Christology of divine identity, proposing this as a way beyond the standard distinction between 'functional' and 'ontic' Christology. This latter distinction does not correspond to early Jewish thinking about God and has therefore seriously distorted our understanding of New Testament Christology. When we think in terms of divine identity, rather than of divine essence or nature, which are not the primary categories for Jewish theology, we can see that the so-called divine functions which Jesus exercises are intrinsic to who God is. This Christology of divine identity is already a fully divine Christology, maintaining that Jesus Christ is intrinsic to the unique and eternal identity of God.

My purpose in the rest of the present paper is to examine some of the evidence for this kind of Christology of divine identity in the letters of Paul. We shall begin with the phenomenon of christological interpretation of scriptural passages about YHWH, which we shall see to be closely connected with a deliberate attempt by Paul to reformulate Jewish monotheism as christological monotheism. We shall then examine three important christological passages in Paul which combine an explicit monotheistic concern with the inclusion of Jesus in the divine identity (Rom 10:13;

---

[5]For the significance of God's cosmic throne in Jewish monotheism and in the earliest Christology, see Bauckham, 'The Throne of God.' The topic is now also well developed, in a way that coheres closely with my arguments, in T. Eskola, *Messiah and the Throne: Jewish Merkabah Mysticism and Early Christian Exaltation Discourse* (WUNT 2/142; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001).

[6]See R. Bauckham, 'Jesus, Worship of,' *ABD* 3.812-819; L. W. Hurtado, 'The Binitarian Shape of Early Christian Worship,' in Newman, Davila and Lewis ed., *The Jewish Roots* , 187-213.

Phil 2:5-11; 1 Cor 8:5-6). Finally, we shall return to two examples of intermediary figures in Second Temple Judaism that have often been cited as precedents for early Christology and demonstrate how little they parallel the phenomenon of divine identity Christology in Paul.

## 2. Christological reading of scriptural YHWH texts

Paul's christological interpretation of scriptural passages about YHWH, taking the name YHWH (kuvrio" in LXX) to refer to Jesus Christ, is an important phenomenon that has often been under-estimated both in extent and in significance. The basic data are set out here:[7]

(1) YHWH texts with Jesus Christ as referent:[8]

(1a) Five quotations including kuvrio"

| | |
|---|---|
| Rom 10:13 | Joel 2:32 |
| 1 Cor 1:31 | Jer 9:24 (= 1 Kdms 2:10) |
| 1 Cor 2:16 | Isa 40:13 |
| 1 Cor 10:26[9] | Ps 23(24):1 |
| 2 Cor 10:17 | Jer 9:24 (= 1 Kdms 2:10) |

(1b) One quotation to which Paul adds levgei kuvrio"

| | |
|---|---|
| Rom 14:11 | Isa 45:23 |

(1c) One quotation not including kuvrio"[10]

| | |
|---|---|
| Rom 9:33 | Isa 8:14[11] |

(1d) Nine allusions including kuvrio"[12]

| | |
|---|---|
| 1 Cor 8:6 | Deut 6:4 |
| 1 Cor 10:22 | Deut 32:21 (kuvrio" not in LXX) |
| 2 Cor 8:21 | Prov 3:4 (kuvrio" in LXX, µyhla in MT) |
| Phil 2:10-11 | Isa 45:23 |

---

[7]In compiling these lists I am indebted especially to the work of D. B. Capes, *Old Testament Yahweh Texts in Paul's Christology* (WUNT 2/47; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1992) chapter III, but I have significantly extended the data and I have sometimes differed from his judgments. L. J. Kreitzer, *Jesus and God in Paul's Eschatology* (JSNTSS 19; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987) 112-128, speaks of a 'referential shift of "Lord" from God to Christ' (113), but only discusses texts relating to the future 'day of the Lord'. The phrase 'referential shift of "Lord" from God to Christ' rather begs the question whether Paul thought he was transferring the reference of these texts from God to Christ or discerning the reference to Christ that was divinely intended in these texts. N. Richardson, *Paul's Language about God* (JSNTSS 99; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994) 283-284, evidently did not have Capes' work available to him, and grossly underestimates the extent of the phenomenon of YHWH texts applied to Christ in Paul.

[8]For the purposes of this paper I am including evidence only from the undisputed Pauline letters and 2 Thessalonians. As it happens, Colossians would not provide any significant additions to the evidence.

[9]I am persuaded by the argument of Capes, *Old Testament Yahweh Texts*, 140-145, that the referent of kuvrio" here is Christ.

[10]In Rom 8:36 Paul quotes Ps 43(44):23, probably as addressed to Christ. In LXX the following verses use the address kuvrie (43:24, 27), but this translates ynda (MT 44:24; there is no equivalent to kuvrie in MT 44:27) not hwhy. So I have not included this quotation.

[11]In Isa 8:14 the stone (LXX livqou poskovmmati ... pevtra" ptwvmati; cf. Rom 9:33: livqon poskovmma" kai; pevtran skandvlou) is YHWH (8:13).

[12]Many scholars, including Capes, put 2 Cor 3:16 in this category, but in my view 3:17 means that in this case, uniquely, Paul took the kuvrio" of the text (Exod 34:34) to be the Spirit, not Christ.

1 Thes 3:13 Zech 14:5[13]
2 Thes 1:7 Isa 66:15
2 Thes 1:9 Isa 2:10, 19, 21
2 Thes 1:12 Isa 66:5
2 Thes 3:16 Num 6:26

(1e) Six stereotyped OT phrases including kuvrio"
'to call on the name of the Lord'[14]
1 Cor 1:2 (cf. Rom 10:13)
Joel 2:23; Zeph 3:9; Zech 13:9; Jer 10:25 etc.
'the day of the Lord'[15]
1 Cor 1:8; 5:5; 2 Cor 1:14; 1 Thes 5:2; 2 Thes 2:2
Joel 1:15; 2:1, 11, 31; Amos 5:18; Isa 13:6, 9 etc.
'to serve the Lord'
Rom 12:11; 16:18
1 Kdms 12:20; Pss 2:11; 99(100):2; 101(102):22 etc.
'the word of the Lord'
1 Thes 1:8; 2 Thes 3:1
Isa 2:3 etc.
'the Lord be with you'
2 Thes 3:16 Ruth 2:4; 1 Kdms 17:37; 20:13 etc.
'the fear of the Lord'
2 Cor 5:11 Isa 2:10, 19, 21 etc.

(2) YHWH texts with God as referent:

(2a) Nine quotations including kuvrio"
Rom 4:7-8 Ps 31(32):1-2
Rom 9:27-28 Hos 2:1 + Isa 10:22-23[16]
Rom 9:29 Isa 1:9 (kuvrio" sabawvq)
Rom 10:16 Isa 53:1 (kuvrio" in LXX, no equivalent in MT)[17]
Rom 11:3 3 Kdms 19:10 (kuvrio" not in LXX, no equivalent in MT)[18]
Rom 11:34 Isa 40:13
Rom 15:11 Ps 116(117):1
1 Cor 3:20 Ps 93(94):11
2 Cor 6:18 2 Kdms 7:14, 8 (kuvrio" pantokravtwr)

(2b) Three quotations to which Paul adds levgei kuvrio"
Rom 12:19[19] Deut 32:35
1 Cor 14:21 Isa 28:11-12
2 Cor 6:17 Isa 52:11 + Ezek 20:34

---

[13]There may also be an allusion to Zech 14:5 in 2 Thes 1:7.
[14]See C. J. Davis, *The Name and the Way of the Lord* (JSNTSS 129; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996) 129-133, 159-160.
[15]See Kreitzer, *Jesus and God*, 112-113, 161-163.
[16]Isa 10:22-23 LXX has oJ qeov", but for the strong probability that Paul did not change oJ qeov" to kuvrio" but found kuvrio" in his *Vorlage*, see C. D. Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture* (SNTSMS 74; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992) 118.
[17]Readers of Isa 53:1LXX would surely take kuvrie to stand for YHWH.
[18]I include this case because Paul's addition of kuvrie to the text presumably imitates Elijah's address to God in other places, where LXX has kuvrie for MT's YHWH (3 Kdms 17:20, 21; 18:36, 37; 19:4).
[19]It is possible that the referent here is Christ; cf. 1 Thes 4:6; 2 Thes 1:8.

(2c) Twelve quotations in which the speaker ('I') is identified as YHWH in the OT context

| | |
|---|---|
| Rom 4:17 | Gen 17:5 |
| Rom 9:9 | Gen 18:14 |
| Rom 9:13 | Mal 1:2-3 |
| Rom 9:14 | Exod 33:19 |
| Rom 9:17 | Exod 9:16 |
| Rom 9:25 | Hos 2:25 |
| Rom 9:33 | Isa 28:16 |
| Rom 10:19 | Deut 32:21[20] |
| Rom 10:20 | Isa 65:1 |
| Rom 10:21 | Isa 65:2 |
| Rom 11:26-27 | Isa 59:20-21 |
| 2 Cor 6:2 | Isa 49:8 |

How are these phenomena of Paul's usage to be understood? We may quickly discount two possible interpretations: (1) It is not plausible that where Paul takes the kuvrio" of the LXX to refer to Jesus he is not aware that kuvrio" is functioning as a reverential substitute[21] for the divine name. Paul certainly knew the Hebrew text as well as the Greek, but in fact even a Greek-speaking Jewish Christian who knew the Jewish Scriptures only in Greek could not have been unaware of the function of kuvrio" as representing the tetragrammaton. In many manuscripts of the LXX what appeared in the written text was not kuvrio" but the Hebrew letters of the tetragrammaton or a Greek equivalent (PIPI) or a Greek transliteration (IAW). Readers substituted kuvrio" in reading (whether to themselves, since ancient readers usually pronounced the words when reading alone, or in public reading). When kuvrio" was written in manuscripts as the substitute for YHWH, it was usually differentiated from other uses of kuvrio" by its lack of the article, indicating that it was being used as a proper name. In a phrase such as 'the name of the Lord' this is particularly clear, since its Greek form in the Septuagint (to; o[noma kurivou) breaks the normal rule that in such a construction either both nouns should have the article or both nouns should lack it.[22]

We can also discount (2) the notion that Paul read the Jewish Scriptures in a 'ditheistic' way, distinguishing between the high God (la, µyhla, oJ qeov") and YHWH as a 'second god.'[23] It is clear from our summary of the evidence that more often than not Paul took the referent of YHWH to be God and less frequently took it to be Christ. It is indeed noteworthy that Paul seems never to take 'God' (la, µyhla, oJ qeov") in the text to refer to Christ,[24] and we shall return to this point. But it is equally significant that he clearly does not simply equate YHWH with Christ, but can

---

[20]In the allusion to the first half of this verse in 1 Cor 10:22 Paul takes the divine 'I' to be Jesus, and so it is possible that he reads the second half of Deut 32:21 in the same way when he quotes it in Rom 10:19.

[21]NT scholars often speak of kuvrio" as a 'translation' of the divine name. This is inaccurate. It was not normally understood as a translation, but as a conventional *substitute* for the divine name.

[22]Cf. Davis, *The Name*, 90-92, 135.

[23]Barker, *The Great Angel*, chapter 11.

[24]Zech 14:5 is a partial exception, since LXX reads kuvrio" oJ qeov" mou. It is not clear to me why Kreitzer, *Jesus and God*, 124, speaks of a 'Referential Shift of Pronouns from God to Christ' in connexion with the mixed quotation of Isa 28:16 and Isa 8:14 in Rom 9:33. In Isa 8:13-14 the stone represents YHWH.

take the divine name to designate either God or Christ, occasionally even in the same text cited on different occasions (Rom 11:34; 1 Cor 2:16: Isa 40:13).

The texts about YHWH that Paul applies to Jesus rather than to God are quite diverse and cannot all be explained by one principle. But what has rarely been noticed is that most of these texts are (or would have been read by Paul as) expressions of eschatological monotheism. We can certainly claim that a major factor in Paul's application of texts about YHWH to Jesus is his christological reading of the eschatological monotheism of the Jewish Scriptures.

**3. Eschatological monotheism in the christological YHWH texts**

When we consider the scriptural texts about YHWH that Paul applies to Jesus within their scriptural context, it is remarkable how many of them either function as monotheistic assertions in themselves or relate to a monotheistic assertion in the fairly immediate context:[25]

Joel 2:32 [Rom 10:13; cf. 1 Cor 1:2]: A standard monotheistic formula occurs in 2:27: 'You shall know ... that I the Lord (YHWH) am your God, and that there is no other besides me.'

Isa 40:13 [1 Cor 2:15; cf. Rom 11:34]: This verse is a monotheistic denial that in the creation of the world YHWH needed or received any advice from any other being. It was the source of a standard Jewish way of claiming that God created the world alone and denying any polytheistic notion of creation as a collaborative project of several gods (Isa 40:13 is echoed in this sense in Sir 42:21; 2 Enoch 33:4aJ; Philo, *Opif.* 23; cf. also 4 Ezra 6:6; Josephus, *C. Ap.* 2.192). In its own context in Isaiah 40, verse 13 belongs to that chapter's lengthy exposition of the incomparability of YHWH, which in turn relates to the eschatological monotheism of the following chapters: the expectation that, since YHWH is the one and only Creator and Lord, YHWH will come to be acknowledged by all the nations as the incomparable one.

Jer 9:24 [1 Cor 1:31; 2 Cor 10:17]: This verse is implicitly monotheistic in the sense that it makes YHWH the only proper subject of boasting and counters the self-deification of the arrogant who boast of their own wisdom, power or wealth (9:23; cf. Isa 2, discussed below). In Jeremiah 9:23-24 there is no indication of an eschatological context, but this passage also occurs, inserted into the song of Hannah, in 1 Kingdoms 2:10 in connexion with words that would certainly have been read as messianic in early Judaism ('he will judge the ends of the earth ... and will exalt the horn of his Messiah').

Isa 45:23 [Rom 14:11; Phil 2:10-11]: The accumulation of monotheistic assertions in Isaiah 45:18-25 ('I am the Lord and there is none besides'; 'I am God and there is no other besides me'; 'there is none but me'; 'I am God and there is no other') make it the most insistently monotheistic passage in Isaiah 40-55. Moreover, verses 22-23 are the most explicit assertion of eschatological monotheism in these chapters. The accumulation of monotheistic rhetoric climaxes in YHWH's oath that all will in the end acknowledge him as the only righteous and saving God.

[25]The translations that follow are from LXX.

Deut 32:21a [1 Cor 10:22]: This half-verse is itself a monotheistic assertion that the idols are 'no gods' (appropriately to the context in which Paul alludes to it; cf. 1 Cor 8:4), but it also belongs to a passage that leads up to the solemn divine self-declaration: 'Behold, behold, I am he, and there is no god besides me' (32:39). The whole Song of Moses (Deut 32) was read in early Judaism as an eschatological prophecy of God's coming deliverance of his people from pagan oppression. Paul's several quotations and allusions (Rom 10:19 [Deut 32:21b]; Rom 12:19 [Deut 32:35]; Rom 15:10 [Deut 32:43]; 1 Cor 10:19 [Deut 32:21a]) show that he also read it holisticly and understood it as eschatological prophecy.[26]

Zech 14:5b [1 Thes 3:13; cf. 2 Thes 1:7]: The coming of YWH of which this verse speaks leads to the following result: 'And the Lord (YHWH) will become king over all the earth; and in that day the Lord (YHWH) will be one, and his name one' (14:9). This puts the Shema‘ into eschatological form: YHWH will be one - the only God in the eyes not just of Israel, but of all - when his rule is acknowledged by all.

Isa 2:10, 19, 21 [2 Thes 1:9]: Alongside this repeated refrain ('from the presence of the terror of the Lord [YHWH] and from the glory of his might'), referring to the fate of the arrogant when the Lord comes in judgment in the last days, there is another repeated refrain: 'and the Lord (YHWH) alone will be exalted in that day' (2:11, 17).

Isa 66:5, 15 [2 Thes 1:7, 12]: These references to eschatological judgment by YHWH on his enemies occur in a prophetic sequence that climaxes in the recognition and worship of YHWH by all (66:18, 23).

By contrast, only a relatively small proportion of the scriptural texts in which Paul takes YHWH to be God can arguably be related to eschatological monotheism (Isa 10:22-23; Isa 40:13; Deut 32:35; Isa 52:11; Deut 32:21b; Isa 59:20-21), and few of these have a clear monotheistic assertion in their context (Isa 40:13; Deut 32:35; Deut 32:21b), whereas almost all of the texts just discussed, in which YHWH is taken to be Jesus, do have such a monotheistic assertion in their context.

Eschatological monotheism is not explicit in all of the contexts in which Paul places his quotations of and allusions to these passages, but it is prominent in some of those contexts and it may be assumed to lie behind Paul's christological reading of most or all of these passages. This means that it is very often in scriptural texts that refer to the final and universal manifestation of the unique identity of the one God that Paul understands Jesus to be YHWH. Jesus himself is the eschatological manifestation of YHWH's unique identity to the whole world, so that those who call on *Jesus'* name and confess *Jesus* as Lord are acknowledging YHWH the God of Israel to be the one and only true God. It becomes clear that Paul's purpose is to include Jesus in the unique identity of the one God, not to add Jesus to the one God as a non-divine agent of God, for Jesus can manifest the unique identity of the one God and receive the universal acknowledgement of that God's sole lordship only if he himself belongs to the unique identity of God. (We should also note, without having space to develop the point here, that many of the scriptural texts we have discussed in this section refer not only to the eschatological manifestation of YHWH's sole lordship but also to eschatological salvation by YHWH. Not only as the one who manifests YHWH's

[26]R. B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1989) 163-164; R. H. Bell, *Provoked to Jealousy: The Origin and Purpose of the Jealousy Motif in Romans 9-11* (WUNT 2/63; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994) chapter 7.

lordship but also as the one who enacts YHWH's role as Saviour, Jesus belongs to the unique identity of God.)

**4. Creational monotheism in the christological YHWH texts**

In early Jewish theology eschatological monotheism was closely connected with creational monotheism. That YHWH alone created all things is the basis for his sole lordship over all things, which must finally be fulfilled in the universal acknowledgement of him as only Creator and Lord. Among the biblical sources of early Jewish monotheism, this is especially clear in Isaiah 40-55 and appears in the context of the two passages from these chapters that were discussed in the last section. Isaiah 40:13 is most immediately a statement of creational monotheism, declaring YHWH to be unique in that he created the world without any collaborators or assistants. This incomparability as the sole Creator of all things is closely related, in the rest of Isaiah 40-55, to the eschatological monotheism that expects him to make his unique deity known to all the nations. The passage of divine speech to which Isaiah 45:23 belongs (45:18-25) is probably the best example of this close relationship between creational and eschatological monotheism. While verse 23 is a strong assertion of exchatological monotheism, the passage begins with a statement creational monotheism ('Thus says the Lord [YHWH] who made the heaven, this God who set forth the earth and made it... I am the Lord and there is none besides') on which all the monotheistic rhetoric of the following verses is based. Thus it was no great step, exegetically at least, from the inclusion of Jesus in the identity of God as sole eschatological Ruler to the inclusion of Jesus in the identity of God as sole Creator. These two aspects of the unique divine identity were inseparable.

In view of the creation context of both these Isaianic texts in which Paul clearly takes YHWH to be Jesus, there is no difficulty in supposing that he also takes YHWH in Psalm 23(24):1 (1 Cor 10:26: 'the earth and its fullness are the Lord's') to be Jesus. Paul here returns to the creational monotheism with which he began his discussion of meat offered to idols (1 Cor 8:5-6). By virtue of his role in God's creation of all things, not only do 'the cup of the Lord' and 'the table of the Lord' (10:20) belong to the Lord Jesus, but also the whole realm of created things.

We shall now proceed by looking more closely at several Pauline passages in which a monotheistic concern is especially evident and in which Paul also interprets Jewish monotheism christologically: Rom 10:13; Phil 2:5-11 (with reference also to Rom 14:10-12); 1 Cor 8:5-6. These texts will be much better understood if we treat them not merely individually, but in the context of the broader christological phenomenon of Paul's identification of Jesus with YHWH in scriptural texts, especially in relation to creational and eschatological monotheism.

**5. Romans 10:13**

C. Kavin Rowe has recently published a fine study of Romans 10:13 in its context which coheres closely with the argument of this paper.[27] He argues that 10:13 is the climax of Paul's argument in Romans 10:1-13, and that the use of Joel 2:32 there, 'if taken at all as instructive for the way in which Paul conceives of God's relation to Christ, eliminates the possibility of thinking of the God of Israel, YHWH, as apart

[27]C. K. Rowe, 'Romans 10:13: What is the Name of the Lord?,' *HBT* 22 (2000) 135-173. I do not think that his disagreement with me (166-169) is a point of real difference between us.

from the human being Jesus. This unitive relationship is dialectical and hinges in fact on unreserved identification of one with the other as well on clear differentiation.'[28]

I cannot here repeat all of his important observations. For our present purposes the relationship between Paul's application of this YHWH text to Christ and eschatological monotheism is especially significant. The relationship is clear in the context in Romans, where verse 12 is an emphatically monotheistic assertion: 'For there is no distinction between Jew and Greek; the same Lord is Lord of all and is generous to all who call on him.' The 'Lord' here must be Jesus. This is clear from the relationship of the last clause ('all who call on him') to the quotation from Joel that follows in the next verse ('Everyone who calls on the name of the Lord shall be saved'), as well as from the wider context of reference to confession of Jesus as Lord (v 9), belief in Jesus (v 11), and calling on the one in whom they have believed (v 14).

It is instructive to compare the monotheistic statement of 10:12 with that of Romans 3:29-20. In both cases Paul bases the salvation of Jew and Gentile alike on the Jewish belief that there is only one God. In 3:29-30 an explicit allusion to the *Shema'* ('God is one') grounds Paul's claim that the same *God* is *God* of both Jews and Gentiles and therefore will justify both Jews and Gentiles alike through faith. In 10:12 the claim that the same *Lord* is *Lord* of all entails that 'there is no distinction' between Jews and Gentiles and that all who call on his name will be saved. The argument is the same in each case except that in one case there is only one God of both Jews and Gentiles, while in the other case the one Lord of both Jews and Gentiles is Jesus. The relationship between these two parallel arguments is similar to the way, as we shall see, Paul divides up the *Shema'* in 1 Corinthians 8:6, finding in it both one God, the Father, and one Lord, Jesus. In Romans 10:9-13 Paul propounds a christological version of Jewish eschatological monotheism, such that confessing Jesus as Lord or calling on the name of the Lord Jesus is tantamount to acknowledging YHWH as the one and only God. In this context there is nothing incidental or unconsidered about Paul's identification of 'the name of YHWH' in Joel 2:32 as the name of Jesus. It is the climax of a clear statement of christological monotheism, which makes a very serious *identification* of Jesus with YHWH. The identifying name YHWH names Jesus as well as God his Father and in such a way that they are certainly not two gods. As Rowe puts it well, 'Paul's God and the God of Israel are the same God only if YHWH is so identified with Jesus and Jesus with YHWH that the first two commandments are not violated.'[29]

It is typical of the early Jewish mode in which early Christians, including Paul, developed their theology that this remarkable conclusion is reached *exegetically*. We have already noticed that Joel 2:32 itself occurs in a context of formulaic monotheistic reference: 'You shall know that I am in the midst of Israel, and that I the Lord (YHWH) am your God and that there is no other besides me' (2:27). Paul was aware of this monotheistic context in Joel (understanding it as a context of eschatological monotheism) and his awareness of it is reflected in the way in which he uses Joel 2:32 as the climax of his argument. We can be sure of this because of the other scriptural quotation that he makes in this immediate context: 'No one who believes in him will be put to shame (kataiscunhvsetai)' (Isa 28:16, quoted in Rom 10:11). This is linked to the quotation from Joel by the Jewish exegetical principle of

[28]Rowe, 'Romans 10:13,' 136-137.
[29]Rowe, 'Romans 10:13,' 171.

*gezera shewa*, according to which passages including identical words of phrases may be used to interpret each other. The connexion here is with the repeated promise in Joel: 'my people shall never again be put to shame' (2:26, 27: kataiscunqh'/, kataiscunqw'sin), the two occurrences of which frame the monotheistic formula: 'You shall know that ... I the Lord (YHWH) am your God and that there is no other besides me' (2:27). It follows that Paul knew and attended to the monotheistic context of his quotation from Joel.

**6. Philippians 2:5-11**

Obviously it is quite impossible to do justice here to this extraordinarily rich and also very much debated passage. Without being able to argue this general point here, it is nevertheless important to state that in my view the scriptural and Jewish background to the passage is not to be sought in the story of Adam but in Deutero-Isaiah, especially the passage 45:18-25 (to which Phil 2:10-11 alludes) and the passage about the Suffering Servant (to which there are allusions throughout Phil 2:7-9). The context in which the whole passage should be read is that of the eschatological monotheism of Deutero-Isaiah. This has been given a christological interpretation, not merely by incorporating Jesus Christ into it but by a Christian reading of these chapters of Isaiah that understood the universal acknowledgement of YHWH's unique deity to result from the revelation of YHWH's identity in the person and fate of his Servant. So the Philippians passage depicts Jesus, as a result of his obedience as far as death, exalted to the position of pre-eminence and sovereignty over all things that belongs to the unique divine identity, given the divine name itself (the Tetragrammaton) which names the unique divine identity, and receiving the eschatological submission and worship of the whole creation. While the act of *proskynesis* (2:10) is not in itself necessarily indicative of the worship due to the one God alone (Isa 45:14 is a very relevant proof of this), when it is performed by every creature in the universe and in the context established by verse 9 (exaltation to the highest degree and bearing the divine name) it unquestionably expresses the monolatry that was a defining feature of Jewish monotheism. It is recognition by all of God's creation of his unique identity as Lord of all creation. It is given to Jesus in recognition of his identity as Lord of all creation, but at the same time it redounds to the glory of God the Father (2:11) because Jesus is not an alternative object of worship in competition with the one God but himself belongs to the unique identity of that one God. Thus the passage very carefully integrates Jesus into the identity of the one God as understood by Deutero-Isaiah. The latter part of the passage (vv 9-11), to which we have so far confined our comments, refers to the incarnate and risen Christ exercising the divine sovereignty not simply as such, but as the eschatological role of achieving and receiving the recognition of that unique sovereignty by all creation. Therefore it does not mean that Christ only begins to belong to the divine identity at his exaltation. Rather only one who already belonged to the divine identity could occupy this position of eschatological supremacy. It is part of the function of the opening words of the passage (2:6), which I understand, with the majority of scholars, as depicting the pre-existence of Christ, to make clear his identity with the one God from the beginning.

I have already pointed out how very significant is the allusion to Isaiah 45:23 and its context, since this is the most insistently monotheistic passage in Deutero-Isaiah and the most explicit assertion of the eschatological monotheistic expectation that all will in the end acknowledge YHWH as the only true, righteous and saving God. I will

confine further detailed comments now to two other expressions in the Philippians passage which have strong monotheistic resonances: (1) the phrase to; ei\nai i[sa qew'/ ('being equal with God,' 'equality with God') (Phil 2:6). In my view, the best linguistic argument suggests that the debated clause within which this phrase occurs is best understood: 'he did not think equality with God something to be used for his own advantage.'[30] There is no question here either of gaining or of losing equality with God. The pre-existent Christ has equality with God; the issue is his attitude to it. He elects to express it, not by continuing to enjoy the 'form of God' (morfh'/ qeou'), which is the visible splendour of divine status in heaven,[31] but by exchanging this glorious form for the humble status of the human form (morfh;n douvlou) on earth (2:7). What has been given surprisingly inadequate attention in the complex discussion of this opening section of the passage is the phrase to; ei\nai i[sa qew'/ itself. Scholars have been distracted by its alleged contribution to an Adam Christology. But, even if there were an Adam Christology at work here, it would not be enough to refer to Genesis 3:5 to explain the phrase to; ei\nai i[sa qew, since, while this could give it the sense of the blasphemous ambition which Adam attempted to snatch, it does not explain the phrase in its positive application to Christ. Whatever reading of the verse is offered, 'equality with God' has to be something Christ had, has or will have,[32] but which it is not blasphemous to ascribe to him.

The phrase does not mean simply 'like God' in a sense that would be unexceptionable when applied human beings created 'in the image of God.' There is no good evidence that the adverb i[sa used with ei\nai has a weaker force than the adjective i[so".[33] It does not denote mere similarity (in Dunn's curious phrase, 'the degree of equality with God which [Adam] already enjoyed'[34]) but equivalence, being on a level with.[35] Even if i[sa itself could be used on occasion somewhat loosely, a loose use of to; ei\nai i[sa qew'/ in a Jewish monotheistic context is intrinsically unlikely. We can appreciate this when we notice that the phrase has a close parallel in the New Testament itself: in John 5:18 (to;n qeovn i[son eJauto;n poiw'n tw'/ qew'/), where it constitutes an accusation of blasphemy against Jesus. Equality with God was something which pagan kings claimed[36] - blasphemously in Jewish eyes. In Philippians 2:6-12, with its strong evocation of Deutero-Isaianic monotheism, to; ei\nai i[sa qew'/ cannot fail to have strongly monotheistic resonances. In the light of the God who asks, 'To whom do you compare me?' (Isa 40:25, cf. 18 LXX), declares, 'I will not give my glory to another' (Isa 42:8; 48:11 LXX), and insists, 'I am God and there is no other besides me' (Isa 45:21 LXX), 'equality with God' is conceivable only for one who is not 'another' besides God but actually belongs to the identity of this unique God.

---

[30]N. T. Wright, *The Climax of the Covenant* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1991) 62-90.

[31]C. A. Wanamaker, 'Philippians 2:6-11: Son of God or Adam Christology?,' *NTS* 33 (1987) 183-187.

[32]It would hardly do justice to the passage to see 'equality with God' as something Christ never had and was never to have, but only something he refused to attempt to have.

[33]L. D. Hurst, 'Christ, Adam and Preexistence,' in Martin and Dodd ed., *Where Christology Began*, 91-92 n. 17. For the usage, see BDF §434 (1).

[34]J. D. G. Dunn, *Christology in the Making* (London: SCM Press, 1980) 116. The examples Dunn quotes from LXX (*The Theology of Paul the Apostle* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998] 285 n. 89), where Hebrew k is translated i[sa, are all in similes (e.g. Job 5:14: 'let them grope in the noon-day just as [i[sa] in the night') (there are ten such instances of use in similes in LXX Job). This is a kind of usage that cannot be compared directly with to; ei\nai i[sa qew'/. The phrase to;n i[son aujtw'/ [i.e. God] (Job 41:3) is an attempt at literal translation of wkr[.

[35]See the abundant evidence in LSJ and Lampe.

[36]Examples (i[sa qew'/, ijsovqeo" etc.) in BDAG 431.

(2) oJ qeo;" aujto;n uJperuvywsen ('God has highly exalted him,' 'God has raised him to the position of highest honour') (Phil 2:9). The verb does not indicate that God has exalted Jesus to a higher status than he had previously occupied (whether in pre-existence or in mortal life), but that God has exalted him to a higher status than that of anyone or anything else, i.e. to the pre-eminent position in the whole cosmos. This sense coheres so well with the following phrase ('and bestowed on him the name that is above [uJpe;r] every name') that this coherence is surely sufficient to establish the meaning of uJperuvywsen. God gives him the name that is 'higher' than any other, his own uniquely divine name, because he exalts him to the status that is higher than any other, his own uniquely divine status. In my view, this statement echoes Isaiah 52:13: 'Behold, my servant shall understand and shall be exalted (uJywqhvsetai) and shall be glorified greatly' (LXX). This verse, connected by *gezera shawa* with passages which speak of God himself as exalted on his heavenly throne (Isa 6:1 [LXX: uJyhlou']; 57:15 [LXX: u{yisto", ejn uJyhloi'"]), has been understood to mean that the Servant is exalted to God's own position of pre-eminence on his heavenly throne.

Although I consider Isaiah 52:13 the principal scriptural background to Philippians 2:9, it is also instructive to observe the Septuagint's use of the verb uJperuyovw. It is used once of the arrogant wicked person who exalts himself in competition with God (Ps 36[37]:35; similarly also Dan 12:11 v.l.) and once in the Psalms of YHWH:

> For you are the Lord [kuvrio" for YHWH] the Most High [u{yisto"] over all the earth;
> you are greatly exalted [sfovdra uJperuywvqh"] above all the gods
> (Ps 96[97]:9).

Elsewhere it occurs only in the Song of the Three (in the Greek additions to Daniel), where it occurs thirty-five times in the refrains: 'to be praised and highly exalted forever'; and 'sing praise to him and highly exalt him forever' (uJmnei'te kai; uJperuyou'te eij" tou;" aijw'na"). It is worth noticing that this latter refrain is used to call on all created beings to praise God and to acknowledge him as Lord - which is what occurs with reference to Jesus in Philippians 2:11-12.

As a final comment on Philippians 2:6-11, it is worth noting the possibility that the exegesis of Isaiah 45:23 that lies behind it distinguished two divine subjects in that verse. In the Septuagint (MT is different) it reads: 'By myself I swear, righteousness shall go out from my mouth, my words will not be frustrated: that to me every knee shall bow and every tongue shall confess to God (ejxomologhvsetai ... tw'/ qew'/, v.l. ojmei'tai ... to;n qeovn).' The speaker is YHWH (v 18), but in this verse he speaks not only of himself ('to me every knee shall bow') but also in the third person of 'God' ('every tongue shall confess to God'). When he quotes this verse in Romans 14:11, Paul seems to take advantage of this possibility of distinguishing two divine subjects, identfying 'the Lord' (YHWH) as Jesus and 'God' as the Father. He makes this clear by inserting 'says the Lord' into the first part of his quotation:

> As I live, says the Lord, every knee shall bow to me,
> and every tongue shall confess to God (ejxomologhvsetai tw'/ qew'/).

The same interpretation could lie behind Philippians 2:10-11, where the first part of this quotation is interpreted as 'at the name of Jesus every knee should bow,' while the interpretation of the second part also refers to Jesus but goes on to make clear that the confession of Jesus as Lord redounds to the praise of God the Father: 'every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.'

Such a reading of Isaiah 45:23 could have been encouraged also by the fact that verse 25 LXX has two parallel statements, one about the Lord (kuvrio" for YHWH), the other about God (tw'/ qew'/). But we must also note that in this passage it is unambiguously YHWH (kuvrio") who makes the emphatic series of monotheistic claims: 'I am the Lord and there is none besides'; I am God and there is no other besides me'; 'there is none but me'; 'I am God and there is no other' (vv 18-22 LXX). If the Christian exegesis has distinguished two divine subjects and identified YHWH as Jesus, then the implication is clearly that Jesus is not added alongside the one God of Israel but included in the unique identity of that God. Maurice Casey, who suggests that an exegesis that found two figures in Isaiah 45:23-25 lies behind Philippians 2:10-11, entirely misses this implication, asserting that, for the author of this passage, 'Jesus was not fully divine.'[37]

**7. 1 Corinthians 8:5-6**

The context of this passage in Paul's discussion of the issue of eating meat offered to idols and participation in temple banquets supplies its clear monotheistic concern. The issue is the highly traditional Jewish monotheistic one of loyalty to the only true God in a context of pagan polytheistic worship. What Paul does is to maintain the Jewish monotheistic concern in a Christian interpretation for which loyalty to the only true God entails loyalty to the Lord Jesus Christ.

In the first place we should note the statement which Paul takes up in verse 4, in order to explain it in the following verses: 'we know that there is no idol in the world and that there is no God except one (oujdei;" qeo;" eij mh; ei|").' No doubt, the statement comes from the Corinthians' letter, but they may be citing back to Paul what he himself had taught them, and in any case the statement is a typically Jewish monotheistic one. The designation of other gods as 'idols' can, of course, only be Jewish.[38] The statement is reminiscent of the very common Jewish monotheistic formula which claims that there is no other God besides YHWH,[39] especially those versions of this formula which give it an explicitly cosmic context, like the ejn kovsmw/ ('in the world') of 1 Corinthians 8:4, which Paul echoes in the ei[te ejn oujranw'/ ei[te ejpi; gh'" ('in heaven or on earth') of the following verse, and especially also those versions of the formula which link it with an allusion to the *Shema'*s assertion of the uniqueness of God. For example:

> YHWH is God; there is no other besides him.... YHWH is God in heaven above and on the earth beneath; there is no other (Deut 4:35, 39).
>
> For there is no other besides the Lord, neither in heaven, nor on the earth, nor in the deepest places, nor in the one foundation (2 Enoch 47:3J).
>
> There is an ancient saying about him: 'He is one.... And there is no other' (Pseudo-Orphica, lines 9-10, 17).

---

[37]Casey, *From Jewish Prophet* , 114.

[38]ejn kovsmw/ shows that ei[dwlon here does not mean the physical object as such (which, of course, undeniably exists) but the pagan god Jews frequently regarded *as* the idol.

[39]Deut 4:35, 39; 32:39; 1 Sam 2:2; 2 Sam 7:22; 1 Kgs 8:60; 1 Chron 17:20; Isa 44:6; 45:5, 6, 14 (*bis*), 18, 21 (*bis*), 22; 46:9; Joel 2:27; Wis 12:13; Jdt 8:20; 9:14; Bel 41; Sir 18:2; 24:24; 36:5; 1QH 15:32; 18:9; 20:11, 31; 1Q35 1:6; 4Q377 frag. 1$^{r}$ 2:8; 4Q504 [4QDibHam$^{a}$] frag. 1-2 5:9; 2 Enoch 33:8; 36:1; 47:3; SibOr 3:629, 760; 8:377; ApAbr 19:3-4; TAbr A8:7; Orphica 16; Philo, *Opif.* 23, 46; *Leg. All.* 3.4, 82; cf. also Dan 3:29; AddEst 13:14.

> He is one, and besides him there is no other (Mark 12:32).[40]

This sets the context of strict Jewish monotheistic belief within which Paul works in his discussion with the Corinthians that follows. He fully accepts the statement in verse 4 (though not, as becomes clear, the implications for behaviour which the Corinthians draw from it). But he goes on to give in verse 6 a fuller monotheistic formulation, which is remarkable in that, while it follows the structure of Jewish monotheistic assertions, it also incorporates Jesus Christ into the unique divine identity. This is probably Paul's most explicit formulation of what we have called christological monotheism. That Paul has here produced a Christian version of the *Shema'* has now rightly been recognized quite widely,[41] but the fully decisive way in which he has here included Jesus in the Jewish definition of the unique identity of the one God can be appreciated only in the light of the account of Jewish monotheism that we offered in the first section of this paper.

In verse 5 Paul acknowledges the context of pagan polytheism against which the Jewish monotheism he continues to maintain is polemically opposed. His point is not to affirm the existence of many gods and many lords, and certainly not to affirm their existence *as* gods and lords, but to introduce the contrast between the *allegiance* of pagans to the many whom they call gods and lords and the exclusive, monotheistic loyalty of Christians, which is specified in verse 6 ('but for us...'). He is, in fact, shifting the emphasis from the mere existence or otherwise of gods (which the Corinthians' use of the statement quoted in verse 4 stressed) to the question of allegiance, devotion and worship. There is nothing alien to Jewish monotheism in this shift. The monotheism expressed in the *Shema'* is precisely a matter not merely of believing that only one God exists, but of according this God ('YHWH our God') the exclusive and whole-hearted devotion that his uniqueness requires. Hence it is entirely appropriate that it should be by means of a version of the *Shema'* that Paul in verse 6 formulates Christian monotheism. However, verse 5 prepares for this version of the *Shema'* also in another way. When Paul moves in this verse from calling the pagan deities 'gods' to calling them not only 'gods' but also 'lords' (kuvrioi), he introduces a term which was in fact used in many pagan cults, but he introduces it in order to provide a more complete contrast to the version of the *Shema'* which is to come in verse 6. Whereas pagans profess allegiance to many gods and many lords, Christians owe exclusive allegiance to one God *and* one Lord.

The carefully structured formulation of verse 6 reads:

> ajllΔ hJmi'n ei|" qeo;" oJ path;r
> ejx ou| ta; pavnta kai; hJmei'" eij" aujtovn,
> kai; ei|" kuvrio" ΔIhsou'" Cristov"
> diΔ ou| ta; pavnta kai; hJmei'" diΔ aujtou'.

---

[40]This is given as the scribe's interpretation of Jesus' literal quotation of the *Shema'* in v 29.

[41]E.g. F. F. Bruce, *1 and 2 Corinthians* (NCB; London: Oliphants, 1971) 80; D. R. de Lacey, '"One Lord" in Pauline Christology,' in H. H. Rowdon, *Christ the Lord* (D. Guthrie FS; Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1982) 191-203 (a significant and pioneering study which has gone surprisingly unnoticed or unacknowledged by the other authors); Dunn, *Christology,* 180; Hurtado, *One God,* 97; Wright, *Climax,* 128-129; D. A. Hagner, 'Paul's Christology and Jewish Monotheism,' in M. Shuster and R. Muller ed., *Perspectives on Christology* (P. K. Jewett FS; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1991) 28-29; Richardson, *Paul's Language,* 300; B. Witherington, *Jesus the Sage* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1994) 316; A. C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans/Carlisle: Paternoster, 2000) 636-637.

> but for us [there is] one God, the Father,
> from whom [are] all things and we for him,
> and one Lord, Jesus Christ,
> through whom [are] all things and we through him.

In stating that there is one God and one Lord, Paul is unmistakably echoing the monotheistic statement of the *Shema'* ('YHWH our God, YHWH, is one'),[42] whose Greek version in the Septuagint reads: kuvrio" oJ qeo;" hJmw'n kuvrio" ei|" ejstin. He has in fact taken over all of the words of this statement,[43] but rearranged them in such a way as to produce an affirmation of both one God, the Father, and one Lord, Jesus Christ. If he were understood as *adding* the one Lord to the one God of whom the *Shema'* speaks, then, from the perspective of Jewish monotheism, he would certainly be producing, not christological monotheism, but outright ditheism. Jewish understanding of the *Shema'* in this period certainly saw it as a profession of the absolute uniqueness of YHWH, besides whom there is no other. Over against the many gods and many lords (verse 5) whom pagans worshipped, the *Shema'* demands exclusive allegiance to the unique God alone. Even if 'Lord' in verse 6 means no more than 'lords' in verse 5 - and it must mean at least this - there can be no doubt that the *addition* of a unique Lord to the unique God of the *Shema'* would flatly *contradict* the uniqueness of the latter. Paul would be, not reasserting Jewish monotheism in a Christian way, nor modifying or expanding[44] the *Shema'*, but repudiating Judaism and radically subverting the *Shema'*. The only possible way to understand Paul as maintaining monotheism is to understand him to be including Jesus in the unique identity of the one God affirmed in the *Shema'*. But this is in any case clear from the fact that the term 'Lord,' applied here to Jesus as the 'one Lord,' is taken from the *Shema'* itself. Paul is not adding to the one God of the *Shema'* a 'Lord' the *Shema'* does not mention. He is identifying Jesus as the 'Lord' (YHWH) whom the *Shema'* affirms to be one. Thus, in Paul's quite unprecedented reformulation of the *Shema'*, the unique identity of the one God *consists of* the one God, the Father, *and* the one Lord, his Messiah (who is implicitly regarded as the Son of the Father). Contrary to what many exegetes who have not sufficiently understood the way in which the unique identity of God was understood in Second Temple Judaism seem to suppose, by including Jesus in this unique identity Paul is precisely *not* repudiating Jewish monotheism, whereas were he merely associating Jesus with the unique God he certainly *would* be repudiating monotheism.

Paul rewrites the *Shema'* to include both God and Jesus in the unique divine identity. But the point might not have been sufficiently clear had he not combined with the *Shema'* itself another way of characterizing the unique identity of YHWH. Of the Jewish ways of characterizing the divine uniqueness, the most unequivocal was by reference to creation. In the uniquely divine role of creating all things it was for Jewish monotheism unthinkable that any being other than God could even assist God (Isa 44:24; Sir 42:21; 4 Ezra 3:4; 6:6; Josephus, *C. Ap.* 2.192; Philo. *Opif.* 23).[45] But to Paul's unparalleled inclusion of Jesus in the *Shema'* he adds the equally

---

[42]The many allusions to the *Shema'* in Second Temple Jewish literature which have the form 'God is one' suggest that this is the way the *Shema'* was normally understood (rather than 'YHWH our God is one YHWH' or 'YHWH is our God, YHWH alone').

[43]The hJmw'n appears as the hJmi'n and repeated hJmei'" of Paul's formulation.

[44]Richardson, *Paul's Language,* 300.

[45]Even Philo's exegesis of Gen 1:26 in *Opif.* 72-75 is only a minor qualification of this conviction: he insists that God acted alone in the creation of all things *except* humanity.

unparalleled inclusion of Jesus in the creative activity of God. No more unequivocal way of including Jesus in the unique divine identity is conceivable, within the framework of Second Temple Jewish monotheism.

It has not been sufficiently clearly recognized that, as well as dividing the wording of the *Shema'* between God and Jesus, Paul divides a description of God as the Creator of all things between God and Jesus. The description in its undivided, unmodified form is used elsewhere by Paul - in Romans 11: 36a: 'from him and through him and to him [are] all things' (ejx aujtou' kai; di jaujtou' kai; eij" aujto;n ta; pavnta).

It is true that there are some non-Jewish hellenistic parallels to the formulation which relates 'all things' (ta; pavnta) to God by a variety of prepositions. The best examples are in Pseudo-Aristotle, *De Mundo* 6 (ejk qeou' pavnta kai; dia; qeou' sunevsthke); Marcus Aurelius, *Medit.* 4.3 (ejk sou' pavnta, ejn soi; pavnta, eij" se; pavnta); and *Asclepius* 34 (*omnia enim ab eo et in ipso et per ipsum*).[46] The point of such formulae is that they describe God as the cause of all things, indicating the various types of causation (as standardly recognized in ancient philosophy) which are appropriate to God's relation to the world by means of the various prepositions: i.e. efficient causation (ejk), instrumental causation (dia; or ejn), and final causation (eij").[47] But such formulae would clearly be very congenial to Jewish usage, since Jews were in any case very much in the habit of describing God as the Creator of 'all things.'[48] Josephus (*BJ* 5.218), without the use of the prepositions, says much the same as the non-Jewish hellenistic formulations: 'all things are from God and for God (tou' qeou' pavnta kai; tw'/ qew'/).' Philo explicitly takes up the standard philosophical set of types of causation, and applies to God's relation to the world the three which can be so applied: God himself is the efficient cause ('by whom [uJfΔ ou|] it was made'), his Word is the instrumental cause ('by means of which [diΔ ou|] it was made'), and the final cause ('on account of which [diΔ o{]') is 'the display of the goodness of the Creator' (*Cher.* 127).[49] In Hebrews 2:10, God is final and instrumental cause of his creation: the one 'on account of whom (diΔ o{n) are all things and through whom (diΔ ou|) are all things.'[50]

We can therefore be confident that Paul's formulation - 'from him and through him and to him [are] all things' - is neither original to Paul nor borrowed directly from

---

[46]The quotation from Seneca, *Ep.* 65.8, given by Dunn, *Christology*, 329; idem, *Romans 9-16* (WBC 38; Dallas, Word, 1988) 701, is relevant only in the sense that it shows that the four or five types of causation could be indicated by difference prepositions, while the reference to Philo, *Spec. leg.* 1.208 is scarcely relevant at all.

[47]Material and formal causation could not appropriately describe the relationship between God and the universe. Ephesians 4:6 uses a different kind of formula, which also relates God to all things by means of three different prepositions, but has the prepositions governing pavnta: 'one God and Father of all, who is above (ejpi;) all and through (dia;) all and in (ejn) all.'

[48]E.g. Isa 44:24; Jer 10:16; 51:19; Jdt 16:14; 2 Macc 1:24; 7:23; 3 Macc 2:3, 21; 4 Macc 11:5; Sir 18:1; 24:8; 43:33; 51:12 iv; Wisd 1:14; 9:1; 1QS 11:18; 1QH 8:16; Jub 2:31; 11:17; 12:4, 19; 17:3, 26; 22:4; 23:27; Sib Or 3:20; 8:376; 1 Enoch 9:5; 84:3; 2 Enoch 33:8; 66:4; ApAbr 7:10; Aristeas 16; JosAsen 12:1; PrJac 1-2; Aristobulus frag. 4 13:4; frag. 5 12:12; Josephus, *Ant.* 8.280; *BJ* 5:218; *C. Ap.* 2.190; Philo, *Opif.* 28, 88, 135; *Dec.* 64; *Spec. leg.* 1. 20, 30, 62.

[49]The citation of *Cher.* 125, by Dunn, *Christology*, 329; idem, *Romans 9-16* (WBC 38; Dallas, Word, 1988) 701, to illustrate the use of the prepositions in Rom 11:36; 1 Cor 8:6, is somewhat misleading, since Philo here uses ejk for material, not efficient, causation: with reference to creation, it refers to the four elements of which the world was composed (*Cher.* 127).

[50]It is very surprising that this parallel to Rom 11:36 is missing from those displayed in Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 701.

non-Jewish sources, but was known to him as a Jewish description precisely of God's unique relationship to all other reality. That God is the instrumental cause (dia;) as well as the agent or efficient cause (ejk) of all things well expresses the Jewish monotheistic insistence that God used noone else to carry out his creative work, but accomplished it solely by means of his own Word and/or Wisdom.

When Paul uses this formulation in Romans 11:36 there is no christological reference, but when he incorporates it into his christianized version of the *Shema'* in 1 Corinthians 8:6, he divides it between God and Christ, just as he divides the wording of the *Shema'* between God and Christ. The relationship to God expressed by the first and the last of the three prepositions (ejk and eij") is attributed to the one God, the Father ('from whom [are] all things and we for him'), while the relationship expressed by the second of the three prepositions (dia;) is attributed to the one Lord, Jesus Christ ('through whom [are] all things and we through him'). The fact that in Romans 11:36 all three prepositions apply to God, whereas in 1 Corinthians 8:6 one of them applies to Christ, does not mean[51] that they no longer all describe the Creator's relationship to the whole of creation. On the contrary, it means precisely that Christ is included in this relationship as the instrumental cause of creation.[52]

The variation between 'all things' and 'we' in 1 Corinthians 8:6 results from Paul's desire to situate himself and his readers within the 'all things' who are thus related to their Creator. In this way Paul is continuing the emphasis of the hJmi'n ('for us') with which he began his adaptation of the *Shema'*, and reflecting the *Shema'*'s own reference to 'the Lord *our* God.' He wishes it to be clear that the God whose unique identity is characterized by being the Creator of all things has that identity not only for all things in general, but specifically *for us,* who therefore owe exclusive allegiance to this God. The fact that Paul associates 'all things' with one preposition ('from whom all things'), 'we' with another ('we for him'), and both 'all things' and 'we' with the last preposition ('through whom all things and we through him'), is a rhetorical variation adapted to the needs of verbal symmetry. Paul does not mean that 'we' are not also 'from God' or that 'all things' are not also 'for God.' The whole is a condensed form of what would otherwise have been the more cumbersome and less symmetrical formulation:

one God, the Father,
from whom [are] all things and we from him,
for whom [are] all things and we for him,
and one Lord, Jesus Christ,
through whom [are] all things and we through him.

The rather extensive scholarly discussion as to whether all or part of the formulation in 1 Corinthians 8:6 refers to the work of salvation rather than to the work of creation is redundant. All three prepositions, as in Romans 11:36, describe the unique divine relationship to the whole of created reality. Since they designate God as the final cause or goal of creation (eij") as well as its origin (ejk) and instrumental cause (dia;), the whole formulation encompasses not only God's bringing of all things into being but also his bringing of all things to final fulfilment in himself, in new creation. In this sense, salvation as well as creation is envisaged, but in no less cosmic a sense and scope than in the case of creation. This point is missed when, in support of a soteriological rather than a creational reference in 1 Corinthians 8:6, it is claimed that

---

[51]*Contra* Richardson, *Paul's Language,* 297.

[52]Col 1:16 goes further and sees Christ as both the instrumental and the final cause of creation.

Paul uses the phrase ta; de; pavnta ejk tou' qeou' *either* with reference to God's creative work (1 Cor 11:12) *or* with reference to God's salvific work (2 Cor 5:18).[53] In fact, 2 Corinthians 5:18 refers to God's work of salvation precisely as *new creation* (cf. 5:17). There is no evidence that, when Paul says ta; pavnta, he means anything less than Jewish writers normally meant by this phrase: the whole of reality created by God, all things other than God their Creator.

The purpose of what is said about Jesus Christ in 1 Corinthians 8:6 is not primarily to designate him the 'mediator' (a not strictly appropriate term in this context, but frequently used) of God's creative work or of God's salvific work, but rather to include Jesus in the unique identity of the one God. Jesus is included in God's absolutely unique relationship to all things as their Creator. The purpose of the whole verse in its context is strictly monotheistic. Its point is to distinguish the God to whom Christians owe exclusive allegiance from the many gods and many lords served by pagans. Just as in all Second Temple Jewish monotheistic assertions of this kind, what is said about God is said as a means of *identifying God as unique.* What is said about Jesus Christ only serves this purpose if it *includes Jesus in the unique identity of God*. Paul apportions the words of the *Shema'* between Jesus and God in order to include Jesus in the unique identity of the one God YHWH confessed in the *Shema'*. Similarly he apportions between Jesus and God the threefold description of God's unique identifying relationship as Creator to all things, in order to include Jesus in the unique identity of the one Creator.

That of the three prepositions that characterize the Creator's unique relationship to all things Paul chooses 'through' (dia;) for Jesus Christ's relationship to all things is a secondary issue, but the choice is certainly not arbitrary. Paul knew that Jewish language about creation did customarily distinguish between God as the agent of creation and that through which or by which God created - the instrumental cause of creation. This instrumental cause - God's Word and/or God's Wisdom - was not other than God, but was included in God's unique identity, as his own Word or his own Wisdom. For example

> The Lord made the earth by (ejn) his power,
> prepared the world by (ejn) his wisdom,
> and by (ejn) his understanding stretched out the heaven
> (Jer 28:15 LXX [= 51:19 Heb]).
>
> ... who have made all things by (ejn) your word,
> And by your wisdom have formed humankind (Wisd 9:1-2).
>
> You have made all things by (ejn) wisdom (Ps 103:24 LXX [= 104:24 Heb]).
>
> ... all the inhabited world and all the created things which you established, Master, through (dia;) one word (TAbr A9:6).
>
> ... you devised and spoke by means of your word (2 Bar 14:17).

There are also other texts, some undoubtedly known to Paul, which develop this language by means of a personification of God's Word or God's Wisdom, portrayed as acting as a personal subject. Whether Paul, in formulating 1 Corinthians 8:6, had in mind the Word of God or the Wisdom of God or both it is hardly possible to say. Nor in the last resort is it of decisive importance whether the texts he knew employed

---

[53]Richardson, *Paul's Language*, 297-298.

the personification of either or both concepts as a mere literary device or as indicating some degree of real hypostatization of these aspects of God. Paul's thinking did not *start* from a distinction in God with which Jewish accounts of creation provided him. His purpose was to include Jesus Christ in the Jewish characterization of the unique identity of God, which entailed including him as participant in God's creative activity. He came to the texts with this theological-christological purpose. What he certainly found in the Jewish descriptions of creation was a distinction within the divine *relationship* to creation. He found a distinction between, on the one hand, God as the agent of creation, and, on the other hand, God's own Wisdom devising the creation or God's own Word accomplishing the work of creation. It was this distinction which facilitated his apportionment of the language of creation between God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ, without introducing an associate other than God into the uniquely divine work of creation. The Jewish language and conceptuality of creation, we may say, left room for Paul to include Jesus Christ as the instrumental cause of creation within the unique divine identity as it was characterized by the relationship of Creator to creation.

Neil Richardson uses the apt term 'theological *inclusio*' for a chiastic pattern which he finds widely in Paul's writings and which comes to a particular grammatical expression in the use of the prepositions in 1 Corinthians 8:6. The pattern is: God › Christ › Christ › God. This 'corresponds with the observation made by many commentators that God is the source and goal, Christ the mediator and instrument.'[54] But it also forms a literary pattern in which Paul's 'thinking begins and ends with God. Yet between the "movement" from God and back to God there is Christ. Thus Paul's language about God has been opened up, amplified, explicated, justified by language about Christ.'[55] Richardson's observation of and observations about this pattern are illuminating and important. He does not, however, quite see its full significance, which is that Paul is not just including language about Christ *between* his language about God, but including Christ *in* the identity of God. The literary *inclusio* reflects Paul's theological *inclusion* of Jesus Christ in the unique identity of the one God of Jewish monotheism. This is the theological basis for what Richardson calls the 'interplay between Paul's language about God and his language about Christ,' which means not only that Paul 'uses God-language in order to interpret and "define" Christ,' but also 'that language about Christ in turn redefines the identity of God.'[56] In our terms, if Jesus Christ is included in the identity of God, that inclusion must itself affect the way the identity of God is understood. This last point is of very considerable significance, but our task in the present paper stops short of developing it.

**8. Jewish precedents for Paul's christology of divine identity?**

Two of the so-called intermediary figures most often cited as resembling some of the Pauline christological material we have discussed are Melchizedek in 11QMelchizedek and the angel Yahoel in the Apocalypse of Abraham. For example, Carl Davis suggests that 11QMelchizedek 'gives a parallel to the New Testament applications of texts about God to Jesus,' though he rather strongly qualifies this: 'the nature of the second figure here [i.e. Melchizedek] is so unclear that one may not with any confidence use it as an explanation of the New Testament application of

[54]Richardson, *Paul's Language,* 301
[55]Richardson, *Paul's Language,* 304.
[56]Richardson, *Paul's Language,* 307.

passages about God to Jesus.'[57] Maurice Casey is one of many scholars who have referred to the angel Yahoel, who has the name of God in him, in connection with Philippians 2:10-11: 'this ... parallel shows quite how exalted a being could be perceived to be without being thought of as a deity.'[58]

(1) *Melchizedek:* In 11QMelchizedek Melchizedek is the name of a principal angel, probably to be regarded as another name for Michael, who is the angelic patron of Israel elsewhere in the Qumran texts. The text proceeds by quoting and interpreting a series of scriptural texts, which are understood to refer to the coming eschatological events in which Melchizedek will act on God's behalf in salvation and judgment. He is the agent of the eschatological salvation of God's elect by delivering them, with the help of the other good angels (called µyla in 2:14, as frequently in the Qumran literature), from the power of Belial and his evil angels. In this way he fulfils the prophecy of Isaiah 61:1-2, delivering the captives and executing God's vengeance. For our purposes, the interest is in the application to Melchizedek of biblical texts in which the µyhla of the text is taken to refer to Melchizedek.

The first of these is Psalm 82:1:

> *Elohim* will stand up in the assembly of *El,*
> in the midst of the *elohim* he judges (quoted in 11QMelch 2:10).

The exegete who composed our text saw that *elohim* could not have the same meaning in both of its occurrences, since in the first it is treated as singular and in the second as plural. He therefore took the second occurrence to refer to the angels who compose the assembly. But he also, quite understandably, supposed that in the first statement ('*Elohim* will stand up in the assembly of *El*') *Elohim* must be a different person from *El.* Since the assembly - the heavenly council of judgment - is said to be *El*'s, he naturally supposed that *El* is YHWH, while *Elohim* is the angel Melchizedek, who stands up in the divine council to condemn Belial and his evil angels (Ps 82:2, as interpreted in 11QMelch 2:11-12). The reason, therefore, for the unusual exegesis of a singular use of µyhla as referring to an angelic being is a strictly exegetical one. Since the word here cannot, for exegetical reasons, refer to YHWH, it must refer to a principal angel.

The next text quoted, as a reference also to Melchizedek, is Psalm 7:8b-9a:

> Above it [the assembly] on high return;
> *El* will judge the peoples (quoted in 11QMelch 2:10-11).

This text is quoted because it too refers to the heavenly council[59] in a context of judgment, and also because it too is understood as distinguishing between YHWH and a figure who takes an exalted position in the assembly. *El* is here the scribal substitute for the Tetragrammaton, a standard practice in Qumran texts, and (especially in view of the fact that our exegete has taken *El* in Ps 82:1 to be YHWH) it must be understood to refer here not to Melchizedek but to YHWH. However, since the first line quoted (Ps 7:8b) is an imperative, whereas the second line (Ps 8:9a) speaks of YHWH in the third person, our exegete has supposed that the person addressed in the first line must be someone other than YHWH, and takes him to be Melchizedek. Thus the quotation and implied interpretation of this biblical text make very clear that there is no confusion between Melchizedek and YHWH. Melchizedek

---

[57]Davis, *The Name and the Way,* 47.
[58]Casey, *From Jewish Prophet,* 113.
[59]The use of hd[ in both Ps 82:1 and Ps 7:8a provides an exegetical link (the principle of *gezera shawa)* between the two texts.

is found by our exegete in these two texts only because he reads both texts as referring not only to YHWH but also to a member of his council, distinguished from YHWH, who plays an important role in the process of judgment. In both texts Melchizedek is understood to be this prominent angelic member of YHWH's council. In the second text it is clear that it is YHWH who actually judges, though Melchizedek executes his judgment.

Finally, Isaiah 52:7 (concluding: '... saying to Zion, "Your god reigns"') is quoted (11QMelch 2:15-16, 23), and, although the text is fragmentary and the name has to be restored, it seems likely that 'your God' (˚yhla) in the text is interpreted as another reference to Melchizedek. This exegesis is presumably possible because it has already been established, from Psalm 82:1, that Melchizedek can be called *Elohim* and also because his name ('king of righteousness'), indicating that he rules, makes this particular text appropriate to him. Once again, the point is not that Melchizedek is in some way identified with YHWH or included in his identity, but that in this particular text the term 'your god' does not refer to YHWH, but to Melchizedek, the angelic king of Israel.

These interpretations of scriptural occurrences of µyhla as referring to Melchizedek highlight the significance of the fact (which we observed) that Paul does *not* provide christological applications of scriptural texts about 'God' (la, µyhla, oJ qeov") but only of texts about YHWH.[60] Although the use of 'divine' terms (gods, sons of the gods, sons of God) for heavenly beings other than the one God YHWH almost disappeared in Second Temple Jewish literature other than the Qumran writings and (for different reasons) Philo, exegetes were well aware that the words µyla and µyhla were sometimes used in Scripture to refer to beings other than the one God (some clear cases were Exod 7:1; 15:11; Pss 82:1, 6; 86:8; 97:9). They did not think this terminology made such angelic beings semi-divine beings who straddled the otherwise clear distinction between the one God and all other reality, but simply that these words could be used for heavenly beings created by and subject to the unique Creator and Lord YHWH. This is also true of the Qumran community where much more use of this scriptural terminology was made with reference to angels. For late Second Temple Judaism, it is not that occasional use of the word 'god' for angels qualifies monotheism, but simply that the decisive issue in defining monotheism is not the use of the *word* 'god' but the understanding of the absolute uniqueness of YHWH.

If Paul had applied scriptural statements about 'god' to Jesus, we could have understood him to be doing what 11QMelchizedek does with reference to Jesus, that is, interpreting the 'god' to whom the scriptural texts refer in these particular instances to be not YHWH, the unique Creator and Lord of all things, but an angelic being created and ruled by YHWH. Such an exegetical practice would not constitute what we have called a Christology of divine identity. Identifying Jesus with the YHWH of some scriptural texts is another matter altogether.[61] YHWH is the identifying Name of the unique Creator and Lord of all things. But may not the case of Yahoel - who bears the divine name - provide some kind of a precedent for the identification of Jesus with YHWH?

---

[60]I leave aside here the difficult question whether oJ w]n ejpi; pavntwn qeov" in Rom 9:5 is Jesus, but even if it is this is not a case of applying a scriptural text about God to Jesus.

[61]Capes, *Old Testament Yahweh Texts*, 167, correctly stresses this difference.

(2) *Yahoel:* The depiction of this angel in the Apocalypse of Abraham is clearly intended to represent him as the angel of Exodus 23:31, where God says, of the angel who will lead and protect the Israelites in their entry into the promised land, that 'my name is in him' (cf. ApAbr 10:8). His special characteristic is therefore that the power of the divine name is operative through him (10:3, 8). His special functions, in addition to those indicated in Exodus 23 (cf. ApAbr 10: 13-14, 16), seem to be those for which the special power of the divine Name is required (10:9-12; 18:9-11), though there are also indications that he leads or supervises the worship of God in heaven (12:4; 17:2-6; 18:11). The description of his appearance (11:2-3) is best understood if he is the heavenly high priest. He wears a turban, an article of dress nowhere else attributed to a heavenly being. The Greek word (kivdari"), which is here preserved in the Slavonic translation, occurs thirteen times in the Septuagint, on eleven of these occasions describing the headdress of the Aaronide priests (see also Aristeas 98; Philo, *Vit. Mos.* 2.116, 131). The high priest in the Jerusalem temple wore on his headdress the letters of the divine Name (cf. Sir 45:12; Aristeas 98; Wisd 18:24) and was the only person who at this period was permitted to pronounce the divine Name in blessing (Sir 50:20), just as Yahoel is sent 'to bless you [Abraham] in the name of God' (ApAbr 10:6). It seems likely that the author of the Apocalypse of Abraham has connected the angel in whom is God's Name (Exod 23:21) with the fact that the high priest wears and, alone among human beings, uses the divine Name, and so has concluded that the angel in question is the heavenly high priest.

Later traditions make Michael the high priest of the heavenly temple, but in the Apocalypse of Abraham Michael appears alongside Yahoel (10:17). Perhaps the author thinks of Michael as the commander of the heavenly armies (cf. Dan 8:11 LXX, Theod.; JosAs 14:8; 2 Enoch 22:6; 33:10; 71:28; 72:5; 3 Bar 11:6; TAbr 1:4; 2:1) who protect Israel and Yahoel as the heavenly high priest who employs the divine Name in protective blessing of Israel. So whereas Michael is depicted with a crown and a royal sceptre (JosAs 14:9), Yahoel has a turban and a golden sceptre (ApAbr 11:3), which in this case would represent not royal but high-priestly authority. There is no indication that Michael is subordinate or subject to Yahoel.

The name Yahoel (lawhy - a combination of [h]why and la) is a form of the divine Name, applied to God himself not only in the Apocalypse of Abraham itself (17:13),[62] but also elsewhere (LadJac 2:18; ApMos 29:4; 33:5). However, it is no accident that precisely this name (rather than hwhy itself or some other form of the divine Name) is given also to the angel in whom is the divine Name. It conforms to the standard pattern of angelic names, which usually end in -el. Moreover, as the name of an angel, it could readily be understood as the statement 'YHWH is God,'[63] like the human name Elijah (whyla), which also means 'YHWH is God.' The name Yahoel consists of the same two elements as the name Elijah, in reverse order, and

---

[62]Capes, *Old Testament Yahweh Texts*, 171, makes the extraordinary suggestion that this reference to Yahoel among the names and attributes of God actually refers to the angel Yahoel (even though Yahoel is said to be singing this hymn of praise to God: 17:7).

[63]That it could be understood in this way is surely shown by its occurrence in Sefer ha-Razim, where it is the name of the first of the fourteen angels who stand on the third step in the second firmament (cf. also the name lahy among those of the angels on the tenth step of the second firmament). This is a rather unimportant position among the hundreds of angels named in Sefer ha-Razim, and would surely not have been given to an angel understood to bear the same name as God. See also the angel Yehoel, correlated with Gabriel, in a magic bowl text (J. Naveh and S. Shaked, *Amulets and Magic Bowls* [Jerusalem: Magnes Press/Leiden: Brill, 1985] 161).

Jews would readily recognize them as versions of the same name.[64] In a Jewish tradition already attested in the first century CE (LAB 48:1), Elijah was identified with the high priest Phinehas (grandson of Aaron) and expected to return as the eschatological high priest of Israel.[65] So it is probably quite deliberate that the angelic high priest, Yahoel, bears another version of the same name as the ideal human high priest, Elijah.[66] This name for the heavenly high priest is thus a suitable parallel to the name of the chief angel who commands God's heavenly armies: Michael, which means 'Who is like God?' (cf. Exod 15:11).

The polyvalent character of the name Yahoel is precisely what makes it so appropriate for the angel the Apocalypse of Abraham describes. Whereas many human names contain the divine Name, Yahoel seems to be the only angelic name attested in this period[67] which contains the divine Name YHWH. This makes it appropriately the name of the angel in whom is God's Name. It is identical to a form of the divine Name as used of God, but used as an angel's name it need not be understood as actually naming the angel by God's Name. Rather it can be taken as an affirmation that 'YHWH is God.' It does not identify Yahoel with God (any more than the equivalent name Elijah identifies that prophet with God), but it designates him the angelic high priest who bears the divine Name and employs its authority in priestly blessing.

Careful investigation of this figure therefore makes wholly redundant scholarly speculations that Yahoel is some kind of embodiment of the divine glory or participant in divine nature or even a personification of the divine Name.[68] Yahoel is wholly intelligible as a principal angel (one of at least two), who exercises a delegated authority on God's behalf as the angelic high priest, the heavenly and cosmic equivalent of the Aaronide high priest in the Jerusalem temple. He is neither included in the unique identity of YHWH, as understood by Jews of this period, nor any sort of qualification of or threat to it. Throughout the work he is, as a matter of course, distinguished from God and never confused with God. He worships God (17:3), but there is no suggestion at all that he himself might be worshipped. God himself is attributed the usual characteristics of the unique divine identity: he is the Creator of all things (7:1-9:3), the Eternal One who preceded all things (9:3; 12:4, 9; 14:2, 13; 17:8 etc.), the Mighty One who is sovereign over all the events of history (9:3; 14:13; 17:8; 20-32), the one apart from whom 'there is no other' (19:3-4). Yahoel shares none of these characteristics. Against those scholars who would see him as the divine Name personified or hypostatized, it is very noteworthy that he is

---

[64]Other pairs of equivalent names (the two elements of the name in alternative orders) are even used for the same person: king Jehoiachin (e.g. 2 Kgs 24:8) is also called Jeconiah (e.g. Jer 24:1); Jehoahaz (2 Chron 21:17) is also called Ahaziah (2 Chron 22:1); Eliam (2 Sam 11:3) is also called Ammiel (1 Chron 3:5).

[65]See M. Hengel, *The Zealots* (tr. D. Smith; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1989) 162-168. Elijah as the eschatoloigcal high priest is found also in Justin, *Dial.* 8:4; 49:1; Tg Ps-Jon. Exod 6:18; 40:10; Deut 30:4; cf. Exod 4:13; Num 25:12. The idea was probably based, not only on idenitfying Elijah with Phinehas, but also on reading Mal 2:7; 3:1; 4:5 together.

[66]Although one rabbinic tradition speaks of Elijah officiating as high priest in the heavenly temple, the Apocalypse of Abraham, which has Yahoel active already in the time of Abraham, cannot intend Yahoel actually to be the exalted Phinehas-Elijah.

[67]Even among the several hundred angelic names in Sefer ha-Razim, only eleven, including Yahoel, seem to contain the divine Name.

[68]Rowland, *The Open Heaven*, 101-103; J. E. Fossum, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord* (WUNT 1/36; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 1985) 318-321. Against these arguments, see also Hurtado, *One God*, 87-89.

not associated with the creative work of God, despite the fact that Jewish literature of this period sometimes sees the Name of God as the instrument by which God created the world (Jub 36:7; 1 Enoch 69:13-26; PsMan 3; cf. 3 Enoch 13:3).[69] Moreover, once God embarks on his revelation of creation, history and eschatology to Abraham, Yahoel drops out of the book and is wholly absent for the rest of it (19-32). In God's account of how he will exercise his sovereignty over creation and history, Yahoel plays no part. The Apocalypse of Abraham portrays him as one, rather special angelic servant of God, no more.

The passage of the Apocalypse of Abraham in which Yahoel appears (10-17) is an elaboration of the vision of Abraham in Genesis 15. Comparison with the text of Genesis 15 shows that, so far from attributing to Yahoel the role of YHWH in the biblical text, the author has carefully avoided any overlap between what YHWH does in Genesis 15 and what Yahoel does in his account. The words of YHWH to Abraham in Genesis 15:8 are reproduced as words of YHWH himself in Apocalypse of Abraham 9:5. It is only when Abraham passes out as a result of this direct audition of the divine voice that YHWH sends Yahoel to strengthen Abraham by the power of the divine Name and bring him up to the seventh heaven (ApAbr 10). He gives Abraham further instructions as to how to make his sacrifice (ApAbr 12:8), which correspond to what Abraham is said to do in Genesis 15:10. But these are precisely further instructions introduced by the author to explain how Abraham, according to Genesis 15:10, knew what to do in addition to what YHWH had expressly commanded him. YHWH's revelation of the future to Abraham, as developed at length by the Apocalypse of Abraham from the text of Genesis 15:13-21, is once again given directly by God to Abraham (ApAbr 19-32), after Yahoel has dropped entirely out of the narrative. All this shows how far the author of this apocalypse is from applying scriptural texts about YHWH to Yahoel in the way that Paul does to Christ.

It has to be admitted that the alleged precedents of Melchizedek and Yahoel offer no help at all in understanding how Paul acquired and developed his Christology of divine identity.

[69]Cf. Fossum, *The Name* , 245-256.