

Dr. Robert A. Peterson, Christology, Session 15, Systematics, Deity of Christ, Hebrews 1, 5 Proofs and Other Texts, Worship, Extra Calvinisticum

© 2024 Robert Peterson and Ted Hildebrandt

This is Dr. Robert Peterson in his teaching on Christology. This is session 15, Systematics, Deity of Christ, Hebrews 1, 5 Proofs and Other Texts, Worship, Extra Calvinisticum.

We continue our study on the doctrine of Christ, on Christology.

We're still working with his deity, and we're on the fifth of five historic proofs for the deity of Christ. We've said he's of the very nature of God. Scripture ascribes divine titles to him, divine attributes to him, and works that only God performs.

The fifth proof of the five is that Jesus receives the worship of God. The context in terms of the biblical story is that good men refuse worship. We see it in Acts 14, with Paul and Barnabas in the second missionary, first missionary journey, excuse me, and in Lystra, Acts 14:8. Now at Lystra, there was a man sitting who could not use his feet.

He was crippled from birth and had never walked. He listened to Paul speaking. And Paul, looking intently at him and seeing that he had faith to be made well, said in a loud voice, stand upright on your feet.

And he sprang up and began walking. When the crowd saw what Paul had done, they lifted up their voices, saying in Lyconian that a little background was needed. Paul could communicate to these people and they and vice versa because they had common or koine Greek in common.

Okay. But it's been my experience that when people worship, they use it in their own native language. And for the Lystrans, that was Lyconian, and Paul and Barnabas didn't know that language.

So, the crowds, amazed at this miracle, said in Lyconian, the gods have come down to us in the likeness of men. Barnabas, they called Zeus. He's older than Paul.

I can picture him with a nice, big, manly beard. And Paul Hermes, Hermes or Mercury in the other pantheon, is the messenger God. Paul's the big preacher because he was the chief speaker.

Luke actually says it. And the priest of Zeus, whose temple was at the entrance of the city, brought oxen and garlands to the gates and wanted to offer sacrifice with the crowds. Paul and Barnabas didn't understand Lyconian, but they got the body language from the priestess, who was ready to make sacrifices for them.

Now Paul has a problem. When he went to Tarsus Seminary and took his missions courses, he learned a lot, but he never had a course in what you do if you're invited to a worship service and you're the God. Well, they knew what to do.

In revulsion as Jews, Jewish Christians, that is, the apostles Barnabas and Paul, heard of it. And they tore their garments and rushed out into the crowd saying, men, why are you doing these things? We also are men of like nature with you. And we bring you good news that you should turn from these vain things to a living God who made heaven and the earth and the sea and all that is in them.

In past generations, he allowed all the nations to walk in their own ways. Yet he did not leave himself without witness, for he did good by giving you rains from heaven and fruitful seasons, satisfying your hearts with food and gladness. Even with these words, they scarcely restrain the people from offering sacrifice to them.

Here's the point I'm drawing from this beautiful story, which has a lot number of good things going on in it, including God's general revelation in providence or history, in this case, and giving rain and fruitful crops and vegetables and fruits to bring joy to people around the dinner table. But that's not our point. Our point is that Paul and Barnabas refused the worship of God toward them.

It's absurd. Twice in the book of Revelation, John, the receiver of that revelation, is overcome by the visions. There's such intensity.

There's such epical significance. It's incredible. And in 19:10, in the midst of this, the angel said to me, 19:9, write this blessed are those who are invited to the marriage supper of the lamb.

And he said to me, these are the true words of God. Then I fell down at his feet to worship him. But he said to me, you must not do that.

I am a fellow servant with you and your brothers who hold to the testimony of Jesus. Worship God for the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy. Good men refuse to worship.

Good human beings. Good angels do the same. In the very last chapter of Revelation, there goes John again.

Behold, I am coming soon, Jesus says in verse seven of chapter 22. Blessed is the one who keeps the words of the prophecy of this book. I don't know why it's immediately after a beatitude that we have this response, but it is true.

I, John, am the one who heard and saw these things. And when I heard and saw them, I fell down to worship at the feet of the angel who showed them to me. But he said to me, you must not do that.

I'm a fellow servant with you and your brothers, the prophets, with those who keep the words of this book. Worship God. That should be Revelation 22:8 and 9.

In this context of the biblical faith, good human beings refuse worship, as exemplified in Paul and Barnabas in Lystra. Good angels refuse worship, as we saw in Revelation 19 and 22. However, Christ receives worship.

The angels worshipped him. Yep, back to Hebrews 1 again. Hebrews 1 has all five historic proofs of the deity of the Son of God in one chapter.

It's loaded. Hebrews 1:6, and again, when he brings the firstborn into the world, he says, let all God's angels worship him. I said before that when it said brings the firstborn into, when God brings the firstborn into the world, I used to think it was the world of human beings.

This was a reference to Bethlehem. And there was some angelic stuff going on there. Glory to God in the highest and on earth, peace, goodwill to men, and so forth.

Peace to men with whom God is well pleased, I should say. But that's not right because the world of Hebrews 1 is not the earth at Jesus' birth in Bethlehem. It's the heavenly world.

The heavenly world is ascending to heaven and sitting down at the right hand, verse 3, of the majesty on high. When Jesus ascended and returned to the Father and sat down with the Father on his throne, the Father said to the angels of the Son, let all God's angels worship him. Christ receives worship.

It is part of the will of God. John 9:38, most people prostrating themselves before Jesus are not engaging in Christian worship. They're desperate people; they love their child who is in terrible straits or their servant who is in the same condition, and in desperation, they fall at his feet, pleading, please, heal her.

If you can, help my daughter, help my servant. This is not worship. But in John 9, we have something akin to Christian worship.

Oh, my word. The Jewish leaders are finally fed up with him, trying to teach them. They cast him out.

John 9:34, at the end. Verse 35, Jesus heard that they had cast him out. And having found him, he said, do you believe in the Son of Man? And he answered I love this response.

This guy is putty in the hands of Jesus. I mean, it's incredible. He says, who is he, sir, that I may believe in him? Whatever Jesus says is good enough for this guy.

Jesus said to him, you have seen him. That's quite a nice statement. You have seen him.

The blind man sees, and it is he who is speaking to you. He said, Lord, I believe. And he worshipped him.

I take this, and it's unusual, I take it as an act of worship. Jesus said, for judgment, I've come into the world, that those who do not see may see, and that those who see may become blind. It's one of his opaque spiritual statements.

He means that those who, in the light of Jesus, the light of the world shining on them, see their spiritual blindness and believe in him. To them, he gives spiritual sight, and he forgives them. To those who claim to see while rejecting the light of Jesus, the light of the world that comes upon them in words and deeds, he blinds them.

The fact that this is the right interpretation is confirmed by the words that follow. Some of the Pharisees near him heard these things and said, are we also blind? Oh, they have a different meaning. Are we spiritually inferior? Jesus used blind to mean, do we really see the depth of our spiritual blindness, poverty, and need in your light, in your revelation? Jesus said, if you are blind, in his sense of the word, if you saw your spiritual blindness, you would have no guilt.

But now you say, we see, your guilt remains. If you claim to know the will of God, contrary to my father's revelation through me, you're lost. You're still in your sins.

Your guilt remains. The blind man worshipped Jesus. I don't say it quickly.

I mean, as a hasty conclusion. I think it is speaking. It's John's way.

Good grief. End of chapter two. John says Jesus didn't need anybody to tell him about man, for he knew what was in a man.

Chapter three. Now, there was a man of the Pharisees that is Nicodemus is a specimen. He's a specimen.

I should go back a little bit further. Jesus did many miracles at the feast in Cana of Galilee. And many believed in him.

But then a shocking statement is now when he was in Jerusalem at the feast of the Passover feast, many believed in his name when they saw the signs he was doing. John 2:23. But Jesus in his own, his part did not entrust himself to them.

Wait a minute. People believe in Jesus, but he doesn't reciprocate by committing himself to them. That's right.

What's going on? It's the first indication in John's gospel of these half dozen occasions of the notion of believing that are deficient that speak of deficient faith. We know that because of what follows Jesus and his part did not entrust himself to them because he knew all people and needed no one to bear witness about him, for he himself knew what was in a man. Apparently, they believed in him as merely a miracle worker.

And he would not enter into a covenant with them. He wouldn't commit himself to them because he knew their faith was inadequate. He knew it was in man.

Now, there was a man, the Pharisees in Chapter three. We have Nicodemus, who has every advantage. He's a male.

He's a member of the covenant people, Israel. He's a member of the Sanhedrin. He's a Pharisee, part of this Jewish lay group that bound themselves to fast, pray and give more than the law even required and who were esteemed in the eyes of the people.

More than that, Jesus indicates he was a special teacher in Israel. And so Chapter three certainly shows him coming to Jesus in all his glory, right? No, it shows him being in spiritual kindergarten and Jesus telling him he knows nothing, not in a nasty way, but Jesus knew what he needed and he put him in his place. And then, of course, in chapter seven, I believe, near the end, Nicodemus comes on the situation again.

Yes, that is correct. And he defends Jesus to the other Jewish leaders. That's remarkable in chapter 19, I take it as his confession to Christ, whom he didn't even fully understand, but he asks for his own hurt.

Along with Joseph of Arimathea for the crucified body of Jesus. That's remarkable. So, Jesus knows what's in a man, including Nicodemus.

He knows what's in a woman, too, the Samaritan woman. Man, she's got every debit on her ledger. She's a female.

She's a Samaritan. And even as far as Samaritan females went, she's not a very good moral example. You've had five husbands, and the man you're with now is in your husband.

Oh, my word. But in God's providence, she ends up being a female evangelist who tells the man, come meet a man who told me everything I ever did. And they come storming out of the city.

It is really good to see. They talk him into staying with them for a while. And then they say, now we believe, not just because of what you said.

God used her to connect them to Jesus. But now we heard from ourselves for him. We heard him for ourselves.

And now we know and believe that he is the savior of the world. It is just God's way. John doesn't repeat the, for example, the good Samaritan story, but he shows it with this kind of language, showing that a Samaritan woman is blessed of God.

And Samaritans confess that Jesus is the savior of the world when most of the Jews have no idea. They hate him. They oppose him.

But in John 9, to return to the threat of the thought here, a former blind man who knows very little, no Helen Keller, no Braille, no guide dogs, but he knows what Jesus did for him. And Jesus points him to Jesus himself to believe. And he does.

And he worships him. And Jesus does not correct him for faulty worship. He blesses him instead.

Thomas, as we said previously in chapter 20, looks a fellow Jew in the face and says to him, my Lord and my God. And Jesus pronounces blessed, not only Thomas but those who believe without seeing. Of course, he understood they would benefit from Thomas's doubting and then seeing and then confessing.

He worships, as it were, a fellow Jew who, of course, is not only a Jew but is the God-man. As we saw at least once before, Philippians 2:10 and 11, after the state of humiliation, Paul gives this famous presentation of the state of exaltation. Therefore, is an important Greek conjunction.

Therefore, that is because the son did not count equality with God, something to be reached out and claimed, but rather humbled himself and took the form of a slave instead of the form of God and became obedient to the Father, even to the point of

death. Therefore, God has highly exalted him and bestowed on him the name that is above every name, so that at the name of Jesus, every knee should bow in heaven and earth and under the earth and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father. We'll do this passage in detail when we discuss the two states at the end of our course.

But for now, Isaiah 45 is the background. It is literally every knee and every tongue, but it is that they're not all coming in worship. Some are coming, Isaiah says, and are ashamed of him because they hate him.

Nevertheless, they bow. So technically, all bowing in the eschaton, according to Philippians 2:10 and 11, is not all worship. On behalf of the redeemed, it is.

On behalf of the other people, the lost, it's not worship. It is a constraint to acknowledge the one who is indeed worthy of all glory and honor and to all should submit, submission that he deserves from all. Only in the Lord, it shall be said of me, Yahweh says in Isaiah 45, 24, only in the Lord are righteousness and strength.

To him shall come and be ashamed all who are incensed against him. In the Lord, all the offspring of Israel, from a New Testament perspective, including spiritual Israel, the church, shall be justified and show glory. So not technically worship on the part of all, but veneration, acknowledgement of his lordship on the part of all.

Would that lost persons and cultists who are entangled in denials of the deity of Christ would bow the knee and confess now, that they would make that primitive Christian confession that Jesus is Lord and trust him as Lord and Savior. Two further issues as we round out our study of the deity of Christ. One is the extra calvinisticum, the other is Kenoticism.

I'm going to take them in that order for the reasons of pedagogy. For pedagogical reasons, the extra calvinisticum, this is a Latin expression that means the outside extra or without calvinistic. Calvinisticum is Latin, the Latin adjective calvinistic.

Hence, the extra calvinisticum is the calvinistic extra, the calvinistic outside of or without. It basically was a Lutheran curse word, a Lutheran smear or slur against the reformed. As a matter of fact, both the kenosis doctrine and the extra calvinisticum arose in Lutheran reform debates.

Both are reformational Christians. Both knew the gospel and loved it. Calvin had an enormous debt to Luther.

It wasn't customary to acknowledge your contemporaries that way. So, he praises Augustine for theology. He praises other early fathers for exegesis.

John Chrysostom especially, and he gives Luther some credit but not nearly as much as he deserved because Luther greatly influenced Calvin. Nevertheless, their heirs, as they further developed the theological systems of Lutheran Calvin, fought with each other. It's a sad thing indeed.

The extra calvinisticum is the Lutheran criticism of post-reformation Calvinistic orthodoxy. It's the period of Protestant orthodoxy that said Jesus was not fully incarnate to the reformed. It's not fair.

It is wrong. Yet I could understand that because people could react in that way today. What's going on with this? Already the church fathers, for example, Athanasius taught this doctrine.

Hence E. David Willis, Roman Catholic scholar who taught at Princeton University. Don't know. That was some time ago.

I don't even know if he's alive or what he's doing now but E. David Willis. The extra calvinisticum. Calvin's catholic theology.

The title was something like that. Willis argues that indeed the extra calvinisticum was the teaching of some in the early church. Athanasius, for example, plainly taught it.

So, Willis argues it should be called the extra patristicum, the patristic outside or without or the extra catholicum, the catholic extra or without. What is this teaching? The teaching is that the second person of the trinity, this Christology certainly starts absolutely from above. The word, the light, the second person of the trinity, God the son became fully incarnate in Jesus of Nazareth.

But if you think about a little more deeply in terms of trinitarianism, does that mean the trinity became the binity? Could a person of the Godhead no longer be in the Godhead? That's absurd. I'm going to give some biblical justification for this but for now I'm just trying to explain it. So the extra catholicum, the extra patristicum, the extra calvinisticum maintains, yes, the second person became fully incarnate in Jesus.

But since he's the second person of the trinity, he also remained fully outside of the incarnation. He remained without the incarnation. Fully incarnate, fully outside.

If you deny this, either you're going to explode the trinity or end up with some kind of a kenosis doctrine that diminishes the full deity of the incarnate son. Neither one is acceptable. Fully incarnate, fully outside.

Where's anything like this in the Bible? Well, the very words or teaching are in the bible, but here's a question. We saw that Colossians 1 and Hebrews 1 both affirmed that the incarnate son performed the work of providence. Or the eternal son did.

The question is, did the incarnate son stop doing the work of providence? If so, it doesn't sound like he's God to me. Or if he kept doing the work of providence, did he do it in the body? Certainly, the pre-incarnate son was everywhere present. He was ubiquitous or omnipresent.

Did he give that up? That he's less than God. But if he retained it, he surely didn't retain it in the body. His body was localized.

It was at one place at one time in Galilee or Judea, for example. Colossians 1, he's before all things, verse 17. He's eternal, and in him, all things hold together.

Whether it's a statement of the pre-incarnate son or a statement of the incarnate son, it's telling us that he did or still performs the work of providence. I think it's rather the latter. Surely, whether the Bible says it explicitly or not, in that providence is the work of God, in that God is three in one, then the Trinity does the work of providence.

One of the ramifications of the doctrine of the Trinity is that the works of the Trinity are the works of all three persons. Oh, here I go with systematic theological distinctions. While we say that, emphasizing the unity of the Godhead, at the same time we acknowledge the distinction between the persons.

We don't confuse them. We don't put the Father or the Holy Spirit on the cross. So, but still, even the cross where the son alone died is the work of the Trinity.

The scripture itself says it. 2 Corinthians 5, around verse 19, God was in Christ, reconciling the world to himself. In the context, the Father.

And Hebrews, a verse I often lose, Hebrews speaks of Christ, not Revelation, Robert, but Hebrews, speaks of Christ through the eternal spirit, offering himself to God. Got it. Hebrews 9:14.

I should have that tattooed on my arm. How much more will the blood of Christ, who through the eternal spirit, offered himself without blemish to God, purify our consciences? If Old Testament sacrifices provided purification, how much more will Christ's sacrificial death purify our consciences from dead works to serve a living God? And it qualifies as the only place in the scripture that connects the Holy Spirit with the death of Christ, with the atonement of Christ. The blood of Christ, who, through the eternal spirit, offered himself without blemish to God.

Only Christ became incarnate. Only Christ died. But God was in Christ, reconciling the world to himself.

2 Corinthians 5:19. I Had that one right, too. And Christ offered himself up to God, Hebrews 9, 14, through the eternal spirit.

What's the point? The acts of the Trinity are shared. There's no such thing as a person of the Trinity acting without the other members. That's true, emphasizing the unity of the Trinity, but we don't confuse the persons, we distinguish them.

So only the son died on the cross, but nevertheless, when he did so, God acted in him, and Christ offered himself through the eternal spirit. In a similar way, all three persons of the Godhead did the work of providence in the Old Testament. The question is, did the incarnate son cease performing his work of providence? If you say he did, is he really God? Well, some of the canonic theologians said, well, he ceased it for those 33 years, then he took it up again in his resurrection and ascension.

Boy, I think that is really problematic. Only God can save us. He does not relinquish divine functions.

And when Colossians 1 tells us that Christ, that in Christ, 1:17, all things hold together, or Hebrews 1:3 says, he upholds all things by his powerful word, that ascribe, both of them ascribe to the incarnate son the work of providence. Now, the incarnate son did not do the work of providence in his body, and he wasn't everywhere present in his body. Thus, I confess belief in a sort of second-order doctrine, alright? I've got some Bible, but it's a deduction based upon the Bible and based upon theological principles.

Is the Trinity sound? Sure. Is the fact that the works of the Trinity are the works of the whole Trinity? Yeah, and all that is true, and yet I acknowledge that, okay? I think that's important to do it. So, I confess the second person of the Trinity became fully incarnate in Jesus of Nazareth, no kenosis, Nazareth, no kenosis.

He has all divine powers. He only uses them in the Father's will. So, sometimes he acts, the person acts as the God-man.

Other times he acts as the God-man, and we certainly cannot sort all that out with every verse in the Bible. That's Nestorian to do that kind of thing, but we emphasize the person. That's all there is, never a separate humanity, and not the sun in heaven, but now the sun on earth does those actions we learn of in the Gospels.

Still, he remained God and remained outside of the incarnation. Is this not mysterious? Oh, it's mysterious. As a matter of fact, the extra Calvinisticum touches on both of the two gigantic historic mysteries of the Christian faith.

The Trinity, unless you want to say it was diminished by one-third in a true incarnation, is one person with two natures, that is, Trinitarianism and Christology, affected by this doctrine. The Lutherans didn't buy it. Unlike the Reformed, who said the finite has no capacity for the infinite, they taught the opposite.

And Luther, who loved, he loved mysteries. The more mysterious, the better, and so his theology has all kinds of mysteries and paradoxes and so forth. Calvin, with great respect, called Luther the apostle of the Reformation, but there was distinctly a different tone.

So, Luther distinguished between Deus absconditus and Deus revelatus, the hidden God and the revealed God. And you know what? As he explained, Calvin would agree perfectly, but he's not going to talk about two gods. Did Luther really believe it? No, he didn't believe in two gods.

But the hidden God is the God of the decrees, the God of his glory, the God of predestination. And concerning that stuff, we don't know a whole lot. The revealed God is the theology of the cross.

It is God meeting us in suffering on the cross of Jesus. Again, Calvin reproduced much of Luther's teaching, but he couldn't abide by some of that kind of terminology. And so Calvin, in effect, agreed with Luther that believers were at the same time simul justus et peccator, at the same time justified, righteous in Christ, and sinners.

But he couldn't say it as crassly. Luther seemed to rejoice in the paradoxes. My Reformation professor said, here is a diagram, a visual of Luther's theology.

Like that. Simul justus et peccator, at the same time just, same time a sinner, like that. Or hidden God, revealed God, hidden God.

And here's Calvin's theology. Calvin was a Renaissance humanist and Christian. Here's his theology.

It's a polished stone. Oh, he has mysteries, but he doesn't present the truth in those kind of paradoxical ways where he thinks it's not necessary. I am totally respectful and appreciative of the apostle of the Reformation, but a different one, and I'm trying to say that one is more intelligent than the other.

I can't even measure that. They both were geniuses. Oh, my word.

But they had different styles. Luther was much more the medieval monk. Calvin was much more the Renaissance humanist.

Calvin's temptation was the study. He would like to do anything but to return to Geneva and those nasty people. But Lutheran was the preacher.

So was Calvin. But how can I say it? They both believed in the devil, but Calvin didn't throw inkwells at him. And in fairness to Luther, Calvin didn't suffer from some kind of mental thing going on, some kind of great depression that Luther did all his life.

And that makes it all the more remarkable how he overcame that stuff and served God in the way ways he did. So, the extra Calvinisticum is a corollary to the deity of Christ. The second person becomes fully incarnate of the Trinity, becomes fully incarnate, and the divine son remains fully outside.

Do I understand fully what I just said? No, no. As I said before, it takes part in both mysteries. But I think it's necessary to preserve an intact full-orbed Trinitarianism and a robust one-person with two nature doctrines at the same time.

Kenoticism, kenosis, Christologies. Philippians 2, when it says Christ emptied himself, uses the Greek word keno, emptied himself. The noun corresponding is kenosis, which means emptying.

This is a quite a elaborate and detailed history. I'll give you the high points. I'm quoting from David Wells, the person of Christ, who really goes into this.

Kenoticism. The historical origins of kenoticism lie mainly within the debates generated by post-Reformation Lutheranism and Calvinism. Luther and Calvin fought for their lives for the gospel.

Their descendants, after the Thirty Years' War, in which Protestants and Catholics killed tens of thousands of each other. What a sad, what a travesty. The Lutheran and Reformed pastors and scholars had more time to think and develop elaborate systems.

Lutheranism moved within the word flesh Christology, while the Reformed advocated much more a word man approach. Word flesh, the second person of the Trinity took to himself a human body, and in heretical form, no human soul, Polynarianism. In an orthodox form, say Athanasius, he's got a human body and soul, but he hardly acts out of that soul.

Apollinarius, the Logos takes the part of the soul. Greek psychology states that human beings are made up of body and soul. The soul is the leading principle, the guiding principle for the whole human being.

And in Apollinarius, the word, the Logos, took the place of that human soul. That is not a complete humanity, and Apollinarianism is rightly condemned at Chalcedon in 451. Athanasius confessed that Christ took to himself full humanity, but his theology was still word flesh rather than word man because it's questionable how much Jesus acted out of his human soul.

The Logos dominated the person. He has a human soul, so Athanasius, the great defender of Christ's deity, is within the bounds of orthodoxy, right? But it's a problem. Full-blown word man Christology says the eternal word took to himself a true humanity.

That is a human body and soul, and sometimes, he acted out of his human soul. Lutheranism preferred the word flesh schema. Calvinism, Reformed Theology, the word man schema.

Martin Luther's interest in Christ's omnipresence or ubiquity seems to have been limited to its sacramental context. He didn't develop a kenosis doctrine, thankfully, all right? What was Luther's concern? Luther strongly rejected the Roman Catholic doctrine of the mass. Oh, he retained the word, and so Luther's one way of referring to the Lord's Supper was the Deutsche Messe, the German mass, but the content was very different in some ways.

Luther said that the Lord's Supper is not a sacrifice. Maybe a sacrifice of praise, as the Anglicans would later say, but no sacrifice of the Son of God. Oh my word, no.

It is not something we give to God. It is rather something God gives to us. It's a gift from God, and the priest does not offer Christ in a non-bloody sacrifice to God.

He hated transubstantiation because, for him, it was a human attempt to explain a miracle. It was a miracle to him, and Christ's flesh was as present in the Lord's Supper for Luther as it was for any Roman Catholic theologian, including Thomas Aquinas, whose work using the philosophy of Aristotle had bequeathed to Luther and all Catholics. Remember, Luther was a Catholic monk and theologian, priest and theologian, that outwardly the elements remained physical elements, bread, and wine, but inwardly, supernaturally, the outer form stayed the same, but the inner essence or substance changed, hence trans change of substance, transubstantial, transubstantiation.

A inward supernatural miracle where the outer, outwardly the elements retain their physical characteristics, but inwardly, no, Luther says, ridiculous, blasphemy, but as he read the Lord's words, as he wrote in the table, wrote into the table, defacing the table, where he met with Zwingli, and they agreed on, I don't know how many points it was, 13 out of 14 points, something like that. He wrote, hoc est meum corpus, this

is my body, and Zwingli said, surely, he was there in the body, but didn't mean this was his physical body. Luther was, wouldn't give the right hand of fellowship to Zwingli and rejected him utterly; this is the character of a man who has the courage to start a reformation.

At Worms, the interrogator said, monk Martin, are you alone right, and all the fathers and doctors of the wrong? Give me time to think about it. He came back and said, so help me God, the best I understand, yes. In between, he read in the library that Jan Hus, and John Hus, had very similar theology, well, Hus was also burned at the stake by Rome, who lied to him, they gave him safe conduct, and then they killed, burned him alive, but so he's a strong customer, and you get the bad with the good.

As a matter of fact, Luther lived a very long life. I commend you, Martin Luther Reformer by James Kittleson, a professor at Ohio State University. It's so good in many ways: it's academic without being overly technical, it is in plain speech, and it covers, which is very unusual, the whole of Luther's life, including when he was a crotchety old man, a curmudgeonly old fellow, who was guilty of anti-semitism his whole life, for example, so he's got strengths and weaknesses big time.

Anyway, he would not yield. Amazingly, toward the end of his life, finally, he acknowledged that his fellow Reformers were Christians, and the younger men that surrounded him at that point, who revered him, who regarded him correctly as their father in the faith, wept, but not at Marburg, where the Marburg colloquy was held with Zwingli, no Zwingli, you're no Christian. What did Luther hold? Christ is as present in that supper as Thomas Aquinas or any Roman Catholic ever said.

How do you explain it? You don't explain it. It's a miracle. He was in, with, and under the elements.

How could that be? Luther began this kenosis business, not that he taught that, but he did teach the communication of attributes. We've mentioned this in our patristic survey. We'll deal with it later under the unity of the person of Christ, but the Reformed and the Lutheran greatly disagree with this.

Luther himself taught that in the resurrection, the Son of God, God the Son raised, shared his divine attributes with his human nature so that, miraculously, the body of Christ could be ubiquitous. This omnipresent body of Christ thus has a Eucharistic motivation so that Christ could be present in the supper in a supernatural manner and not ask him to explain it in, with, and under the elements.

I think he uses the old fire and light imagery or whatever, as the fire is with the light, and the fire burns and that kind of thing. So, in that sense, Christ is in with, and what does that explain? It doesn't really explain. It sort of illustrates it's a miracle.

No sacrifice, no priestly offering, no transubstantiation. I'm surprised that my Lutheran brothers and sisters talk about consubstantiation. I can't believe Luther would ever countenance that word because it's, again, trying to put a name on a mystery, but anyway, some of them do.

I was happy to see David Wells say that not all of them do. Anyway, enough background, perhaps. Martin Luther's interest in Christ's ubiquity or omnipresence seems to have been limited to its sacramental context.

It was important to Luther to affirm this because of his belief in consubstantiation, although the term itself was not always appreciated. When Jesus said, this is my body, he believed it should be understood with a degree of literalness that neither Calvin nor Zwingli would allow. In the next generation, however, ubiquity became a matter of Christological importance too.

So, Luther didn't teach the kenosis, but his Lutherans, his descendants, theologically did. These were great scholars and thinkers, giants of the faith, if you will. They employed the communication of natures by which the human in Christ took on characteristics of divinity, thus breaking continuity with the human race, David Wells writes as a biased reform theologian.

To be fair to the Lutherans, and I don't even understand this all really well, but they divided into two camps over this. Some followed John Brentz, other followed Martin Chemnitz. The Brentzians and the Chemnitzians.

Brentz taught Christ's two natures were not merely joined in a common person but were forged into a common person. This being the case, what was later to be called the relative attributes also extended to his humanity. Brentz argued, for example, that there were different forms of the omnipresence of Christ's humanity.

Thus, in Christ, there was little, if anything, to distinguish his self-emptying from his exaltation. Rather, two modes of existence coincided in him from the beginning, from the incarnation. Martin Chemnitz's work was far more moderate and cautious.

Nevertheless, he asserted that Christ's humanity is permanent and will always be localized. That's a good move. The *communicatio idiomatum*, the transfer of qualities, according to Chemnitz, does not so much mean the permanent transfer of qualities from the divine to the human as it means the use of the human by the divine in ways that went outside of normal human limitation.

Thus, the exchange of attributes appears in Chemnitz thought to have been intermittent, whereas in Brentz it was constant and a necessary result of the personal union of the incarnation. The formula of concord, a very important symbol,

doctrinal symbol, attempted to reconcile the schools of thought on this and a number of other matters on which Lutheran divines, theologians, had parted doctrinal company. It was a document of compromise, trying to embrace both.

I'm not going to go into the great details of this, but rather to say the canonic outline flourished in Germany during the middle quarters of the 19th century. And then, as it started to die out in Germany, guess what? It was revived in the end of the 19th century in Great Britain. In general, the canonicists maintained, quote, that the divine logos, in order to take our nature upon him and submit in reality to its earthly conditions and limitations, abandoned somewhat, at least, what he was before he became incarnate.

The logos reduced himself to human dimensions and accommodated himself to human nature for the purpose of incarnation. Most commonly, it was argued that this denuding process led to the loss of the relative attributes, omniscience, omnipotence, omnipresence. There were differences of opinion.

Some said the divinity was stripped of its relative attributes permanently. Others said temporarily. I could give you more extreme examples, but I won't.

I should mention Gottfried Thomasius, who offered a moderate kenosis as a way of reconciling genuine humanity with the idea that the divine was indeed incarnate. In Great Britain, Charles Gore was an important name, along with H. R. Macintosh, A. M. Fairbairn, and P. T. Forsythe. In the incarnation, therefore, the attributes of the eternal divine word contracted from a condition of being actual to one of being potential.

This is Forsythe's version. This self-divestiture, Forsythe went on to insist, must be complemented by an understanding of Christ's emergence into the full potentiality of Godness in the cross and resurrection. The human and divine did not meet in a person.

He rejected that terminology. They met rather in saving action. Kenosis theories have had several notable and praiseworthy features.

David Wells is a fair man. First, they all began with a divine pre-existent word. Second, canonic theory sought to ascribe full reality to the historical Jesus.

Third, kenonic theories invest divine love with significant moral content. There were, however, some troubling dimensions to this theory, which we will discuss in our next lecture.

This is Dr. Robert Peterson in his teaching on Christology. This is session 15,

Systematics, Deity of Christ, Hebrews 1, 5 Proofs and Other Texts, Worship, Extra Calvinisticum