

# A DIVERSITY OF FAILURES: A CRITICAL EVALUATION OF SUBORDINATIONIST INTERPRETATIONS OF HEBREWS 1:10-12

by Michael R. Burgos\*

Ph.D., Forge Theological Seminary; D.Min. candidate; The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

Pastor of Northwest Hills Community Church, Torrington, CT, USA

**Abstract:** *The application of Psalm 102:25-27 at Hebrews 1:10-12 has historically been viewed as conclusively proof of trinitarian Christology as it attributes the name of God (i.e., Lord/Yahweh), the acts of creation and consummation, eternity, and divine immutability to the Son of God and this according to the testimony of the Father. Non-trinitarian writers have construed a variety of interpretations that comport with subordinationism. This study identifies these various interpretations and demonstrates through consistent biblical exegesis, that the subordinationist explanations rely upon erroneous methods, assumptions, and conclusions.*

**Keywords:** *Hebrews 1, Psalm 102, Christology, Subordinationism, Non-trinitarianism, Biblical Studies, New Testament*

## Introduction

Psalm 102 contrasts the fleeting nature of the psalmist's life (v. 3, 11) and circumstances (vv. 6-9) and the unchanging and eternal nature of Israel's covenant God (vv. 12, 24-27). Whereas the psalmist endures the physical afflictions of this life (vv. 3-5) and the sufferings brought about by his enemies (v. 8), Yahweh remains upon his throne forever (v. 12). The psalmist attributes his circumstances to the sovereign providence of God (v. 10) and places his trust in Yahweh who will graciously restore his people and become the object of worship for all generations (vv. 12, 18).

The only direct NT quotation of Psalm 102 occurs within the prologue of the Epistle of Hebrews (1:1-14). There, an argument is presented by the writer for the preeminence of the Son of God over and against OT prophets (v. 1-2), angels (vv. 5-14), and the entire creation itself (10-12). The prologue has been long understood by the Christian church to present an uncompromising assertion of the full deity of the Lord Jesus Christ.<sup>1</sup> This is especially true of the utilization of Psalm 102:25-27 (101:26-28 LXX) at

---

\* Michael R. Burgos (

<sup>1</sup> E.g., John Chrysostom, *Hom. Heb.*, 3 (NPNF<sup>1</sup> 14:376). Athanasius, *Four Disc.*, 4 (NPNF<sup>1</sup> 4:327, 340); Cyril of Jer., *Cat. Lec.*, 15 (NPNF<sup>2</sup> 7:113); Ambrose *Fid.*, 2 (NPNF<sup>2</sup> 10:288).

Hebrews 1:10-12. There, the author of Hebrews has applied a text which refers to Yahweh, the eternal immutable Creator, to the Son of God, presenting this as something that is said by the Father to the Son.

Luther's interpretation is typical:

The King whose servants have favored the stones of Zion, who is proclaimed worldwide and commands the fear of the heathen and all kings of the earth, is the God who created the earth and is in himself unchangeable...Christ then is true God and true man.<sup>2</sup>

Hebrews 1:10 illuminates the various Christological passages that describe the Son of God as the means by which the Father created all things (John 1:3; 1 Cor. 8:6; Col. 1:16). Indeed, the Son is the one "through whom God made the worlds" (Heb. 1:2),<sup>3</sup> and what that creative work entailed is explicitly described in Hebrews 1:10: "You, Lord, laid the foundation of the earth in the beginning, and the heavens are the work of your hands."<sup>4</sup> Thus the prologue of Hebrews, especially vv. 10-12, stands as one of the most significant Christology pericopes in the entire canon. Few texts impart both the true humanity and true deity of the Son of God with as much clarity and, for that matter, beauty.

Subordinationist interpreters have proposed several different understandings of this passage that comport with Socinian or Arian Christology. In this study, these explanations will be identified, and it will be shown that the various attempts at harmonizing subordinationism with Hebrews 1:10-12 fall short

---

<sup>2</sup> Martin Luther, "The Divinity of Christ" in *Sermons of Martin Luther*, Vol. 6, ed. J. N. Lenker (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1983), 193. Cf. Calvin who concluded "He is the eternal God, the Creator of heaven and earth, everlasting and changeless." John Calvin, *Commentaries*, eds. Joseph Haroutunian and Louise Pettibone Smith (Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, 1958), 158; Gouge wrote: "Wherefore the title Lord doth here intend Jehovah, and being applied to Christ, setteth out his divine nature, and declareth him to be true God, even that God who hath his being of himself, and ever continueth of and by himself, the eternal and immutable God." William Gouge, *A Commentary on the Whole Epistle to the Hebrews*, Vol. 1, Nichol's Series of Commentaries (Edinburgh; London; Dublin: James Nichol; J. Nisbet & Co.; G. Herbert, 1866), 71; And Aquinas who, drawing upon the wisdom motif, concludes that the Son is the Father's eternal creative agent. Thomas Aquinas, *Commentary on the Letter of Saint Paul to the Hebrews* (Lander, WY: The Aquinas Inst., 2012), 34.

<sup>3</sup> Contra Buzzard who translates αἰῶνας "ages" when αἰὼν is often a classic synonym for κόσμος, or in the case of the plural, "worlds" (i.e., the "universe" as in the *English Standard Version*; cf. Heb. 11:3; Wis. 13:9; 14:6; 18:4. ). William Arndt et al., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 33; Hermann Sasse, "Αἰὼν, Αἰώνιος," in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, Vol. 1, ed. Gerhard Kittel, Geoffrey W. Bromiley, and Gerhard Friedrich (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1964), 203. Anthony Buzzard, Charles Hunting, *The Doctrine of the Trinity: Christianity's Self-Inflicted Wound* (Lanham: International Scholars Pub., 1998), 75. Ironically, in his own trans. of Heb. 1:2 Buzzard translates αἰὼν "ages," but in non-Christological texts he sometimes translates it "world." (e.g., 2 Cor. 4:4). Anthony Buzzard, *The One God, the Father, One Man Messiah Translation*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Morrow, GA: Restoration Fellowship, 2020).

<sup>4</sup> Unless otherwise indicated, all English biblical citations are from *The Holy Bible, English Standard Version* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2016).

of consistent exegesis.<sup>5</sup> I have titled the various interpretations “The Argument from the Septuagint and for a Future Creation,” “The Argument for a Bifurcated Reading,” and “The Argument From Wisdom and Exaltation.”

### **The Argument from the Septuagint and for a Future Creation**

Beginning with Buzzard,<sup>6</sup> Socinians have decried the classical reading of Hebrews 1:10-12, insisting that a Yahweh text is not being applied to the Son of God and that the creation which is in view is not that of the Genesis creation. The subordinationist argument is predicated upon the fact that the author of Hebrews derived his citation of the Psalm from the Septuagint. Whereas the Masoretic text states in Psalm 102:23, “He has broken my strength in midcourse; he has shortened my days,” the Septuagint renders the text, “He answered him in the way of his strength, ‘of the fewness of my days’ he proclaimed to me.”<sup>7</sup> The Septuagint understands the Masoretic  $\text{הַיְיָ}$  as  $\text{הַיֵּשׁוּעַ}$  and subsequently renders the verb ἀπεκρίθη.<sup>8</sup> As Bruce has observed, the distinction “is formally one of vocalization.”<sup>9</sup> Buzzard, following Bruce, has argued that the balance of the Psalm consists of Yahweh’s response to the supplicant, including vv. 25-29 (24-28 MT).

The claim that Psalm 101:23 (LXX) marks the transition from the words of the supplicant to those of Yahweh is one of two main arguments utilized by subordinationists seeking to deny that the Son

---

<sup>5</sup> Notably, a variety of subordinationist writers completely omit any treatment of Heb. 1:10-12. E.g., In his enormous study on Christology (565 pp.), Kermit Zarely devoted thirteen pages to the prologue of Hebrews and never even mentioned 1:10-12. *The Restitution of Jesus Christ* (n.p., 2008), 477-89. See also J. Dan Gil, *The One: In Defense of One God* (Nashville, TN: 21st Century Reformation Publishing).

<sup>6</sup> As far as I can tell, this response to the trinitarian appeal to Heb. 1:10-12 began in a footnote in Anthony Buzzard & Charles Hunting’s *The Doctrine of the Trinity*, 337, n. 38 and was later fully articulated in Anthony Buzzard, *Jesus Was Not a Trinitarian: A Call to Return to the Creed of Jesus* (Morrow, GA: Restoration Fellowship, 2007), 418-24. It has since been picked up by a variety of subordinationist writers. E.g., Kegan A. Chandler, *The God of Jesus in Light of Christian Dogma: The Recovery of New Testament Theology* (McDonough, GA: Restoration Fellowship, 2016), Kindle, loc. 9472; Patrick Navas, *Divine Truth or Human Tradition: A Reconsideration of the Orthodox Doctrine of the Trinity in Light of the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures* (Bloomington, IN: AuthorHouse, 2011), 417-18

<sup>7</sup> Author’s translation. Cf. Albert Pietersma, Benjamin G. Wright eds., *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 2007), 597.

<sup>8</sup> Philip Church, “Hebrews 1:10-12 and the Renewal of the Cosmos,” *Tyndale Bulletin* 67, no. 2 (2016): 277-8.

<sup>9</sup> F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, The New International Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids, MI: W. B. Eerdmans, 1990), 62.

is being identified as *Kurios*/Yahweh the Creator God, in Hebrews 1:10-12.<sup>10</sup> The second argument is the assertion that heavens and earth mentioned in Hebrew 1:10-12 are not that of the Genesis creation, but that of the future restored state. Support for this claim is marshaled by an appeal to Isaiah 51:15-16 which states,

I am the LORD your God, who stirs up the sea so that its waves roar— the LORD of hosts is his name. And I have put my words in your mouth and covered you in the shadow of my hand, establishing the heavens and laying the foundations of the earth, and saying to Zion, “You are my people.” (Isaiah 51:15-16, ESV)

Of this text, it is claimed that Yahweh has placed his words in the mouth of Zion, who is typologically portraying the Messiah, and it is the Messiah who establishes the heavens and earth. It is claimed that this text “Speaks of an agent of God in whom God puts His words and whom He uses ‘to plant the heavens and earth.’”<sup>11</sup>

The difficulty with these arguments is a deficient reading of the relevant passages. It is wholly incorrect to suppose that the entirety of Psalm 101:23b-29 (LXX) constitutes Yahweh speaking to the supplicant. While it is clear that v. 24b (LXX) contains Yahweh’s response, there is absolutely no reason whatsoever to suppose that vv. 25-29 (LXX) are the words of Yahweh to the supplicant. Asserting as much places a very unusual set of theological claims in the mouth of the Almighty God. If v. 24 is Yahweh speaking, then Yahweh is finite and the supplicant is eternal: “Do not lead me away at the middle of my days, your years are in generations of generations” (Ps. 101:25 LXX, author’s trans.).

Evidently, subordinationists believe that the supplicant, who in the application of Hebrews 1:10-12 is identified as the Son of God, is eternal, while Yahweh is concerned that his days might end in the middle of his life. Clearly, such an interpretation places the actual meaning of the text on its head. A better reading recognizes that while Psalm 101:24 LXX identifies Yahweh’s answer to the supplicant, v. 25 marks a return to the supplicant pleading to Yahweh. Thus, like v. 24, vv. 26-29 also refer to Yahweh.

---

<sup>10</sup> Buzzard wrote, “Thus the LXX introduces a second lord who is addressed by God...” *Jesus Was Not a Trinitarian*, 420.

<sup>11</sup> Buzzard, *Jesus Was Not a Trinitarian*, 423.

This reading accords best since it contrasts the finitude of the life of the supplicant with the immutable and eternal life of Yahweh.

A similar observation is necessary regarding Isaiah 51:16. Buzzard et al. argue that this text indicates that Zion/the Messiah is the one whom God will use to establish the heavens and earth; a specious claim that is merely asserted and never substantiated. Isaiah 51:15-16 indicates things done by Yahweh which includes the placement of his words in the mouth of Zion *and* his “establishing the heavens...” That is, Isaiah 51:16 in no way attributes the creation of heaven and earth to Zion/the Messiah. Rather, that act, like the placement of words in the mouth of Zion, is an action of God *alone*. Like Psalm 102:25-27 in the Hebrew Bible, it is Yahweh *alone* who creates the heavens and the earth. There is no biblical category for a creature who is also a Creator (Isa. 44:24).

The question remains, does Hebrews 1:10-12/Psalm 101:25-26 LXX and Isaiah 51:16 refer to the future creation of the new heavens and earth or to the Genesis creation? There are two lines of reasoning which thoroughly disprove the notion that the creation mentioned in the relevant passages is the new creation. First, the utilization of Hebrews 1:10-12/Psalm 101:25-26 results in a comparison of heavens and earth and the Son of God. While the creation will wear out like a garment and be changed, the Lord Jesus Christ does not change and his life does not end. Christ will roll up the creation like a robe, thereby ending the created order as it was. If this were a reference to the new heavens and earth as unitarians assert, this would necessarily mean that the “future kingdom”<sup>12</sup> will wear out and come to an end. That is, if Hebrews 1:10-12 is referring to “the coming age of the Kingdom,”<sup>13</sup> then the kingdom of God will come to an end. Many unitarians believe that the new heavens and earth will wear out, and its creatures will die, and there will be yet a third new heavens and earth. Schoenheit, Graeser, and Lynn state this clearly:

Both the Old Testament and New Testament tell us that there will be a new heavens and earth after this one we are currently inhabiting. In fact, there will be two more. First, the heaven and earth of the Millennium, the 1000 years Christ rules the earth, which will perish (Isa. 65:17; Rev.

---

<sup>12</sup> Buzzard, *Jesus Was Not a Trinitarian*, 422.

<sup>13</sup> Buzzard, *Jesus Was Not a Trinitarian*, 423.

20:1-10), and then the heaven and earth of Revelation 21:1ff, which will exist forever. The context reveals clearly that Hebrews 1:10 is speaking of these future heavens and earth. If we simply continue to read in Hebrews, remembering that the original texts had no chapter breaks, Scripture tells us, “It is not to angels that He has subjected the world to come, about which we are speaking” (Heb. 2:5). This verse is very clear. The subject of this section of Scripture is not the current heavens and earth, but the future heavens and earth.<sup>14</sup>

The eschatology outlined above is unbiblical on its face since the very passage cited, Revelation 21:1, states that there are only two earths—one old and one new: “Then I saw a new heaven and a new earth, for the first heaven and the first earth had passed away.” The unitarian appeal to Hebrews 2:5, “For it was not to angels that God subjected the world to come, of which we are speaking,” only serves to demonstrate the consistency of the orthodox reading. The wearing out and rolling up of this current creation is the event that inaugurates the arrival of the next world.

Second, the grammar and syntax of Hebrews 1:10 makes it clear that the Genesis creation is in view. Ellingworth has noted that the phrase κατ’ ἀρχάς “is a classical synonym, rare in the Greek Bible... for ἐν ἀρχῇ.”<sup>15</sup> Κατ’ ἀρχάς is, therefore, an obvious reference to the Septuagint’s account of the Genesis creation. The verb which refers to the creative act in Hebrews 1:10/Psalm 101:25, ἐθεμελίωσας is indicative of a past completed action. Buzzard has asserted a proleptical reading, saying “Hebrews 1:10 is a prophecy, written in the past tense (as customarily prophecies are), but referring to the ‘inhabited earth of the future about which we are speaking’ (Heb. 2:5).”<sup>16</sup> Buzzard’s claim is spurious since Hebrews 1:11-12 is not in the past tense. That is, if Hebrews 1:10-12 is a prophecy, and Hebrews 1:10 is given in the past tense as prolepsis, then it would necessarily follow that the balance of the prophecy would also be given in the same tense. But alas, the relevant verb of Hebrews 1:10 is given in the aorist, and those of Hebrews 1:11-12 are in the future. Subsequently, Buzzard’s reading of Hebrews 1:10-12 divulges significant question-begging.

---

<sup>14</sup> John W. Schoenheit, Mark H. Graeser, and John A Lynn, *One God & One Lord: Reconsidering the Cornerstone of the Christian Faith* (Indianapolis, IN: The Living Truth Fellowship, 2011), Kindle, loc. 14902-14908.

<sup>15</sup> Paul Ellingworth, *Commentary on Hebrews*, New International Greek Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1993), 127.

<sup>16</sup> Buzzard, *Jesus Was Not a Trinitarian*, 423.

## The Argument for a Bifurcated Reading

Jason Kerrigan has proposed a simplistic variation of Buzzard’s argument. Appealing to Psalm 101:24 LXX (“Do not lead me away at the middle of my days...”), Kerrigan then asserted “This does not show the Father pleading to the Son ‘take me not away in the midst of my days’...Hence the quotation in Hebrews 1:10-12 that is taken from this text does not show the Father speaking to the Son.”<sup>17</sup> Kerrigan has merely assumed that the words of the supplicant must be the words of the Father for Hebrews 1:10-12 to consist of the Father addressing the Son. Not only has Kerrigan ignored the vocative κύριε, he completely jettisoned the context of Hebrews 1:10-12, the argument of the prologue, and the messianic character of Psalm 102 to arrive at this conclusion.<sup>18</sup> The author of Hebrews has cited a new application of Psalm 101LXX just as he has with Psalm 2:7; 104:4 (103:4 LXX), 2 Samuel 7:14; Deuteronomy 32:34; and Psalm 45:6-7 (44:6-7 LXX).<sup>19</sup> If Kerrigan held his hermeneutic consistently, he would necessarily claim that since Deuteronomy 32:34 was originally directed to God by Moses “this text does not show the Father speaking to the Son.”

He argued further:

The quote from Psalm 102 (101 LXX) is not introduced within Hebrews 1:10-12 in such a way that would make it applicable to the addressee of Hebrews 1:8-9. In the New Testament, whenever two or more Old Testament quotations are applied successively to the same subject matter, they never simply have the word kai... joining them. Usually... you will find the word πάλιν...between the two.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> Jason W. Kerrigan, *Restoring the Biblical Christ* (Scotts Valley, CA: Createspace, 2020), 251.

<sup>18</sup> See Bacon: “Thus instead of the application of these verses of Ps 102 to Messiah being an audacious innovation on the part of the author of Hebrews, we find evidence (1) that the psalm itself was a favorite resort of those who sought in even pre-Christian times for proof-texts of messianic eschatology.” Benjamin W. Bacon, “Heb 1, 10-12 and the Septuagint Rendering of Ps 102, 23,” *Zeitschrift Für Die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft Und Die Kunde Der Älteren Kirche* 23, no. 3. (1902): 284.

<sup>19</sup> Rinker observed: “In the context of Heb 1:8–12, the author pairs two messianic psalms to emphasize the royal Son’s eternal rule in contrast to what he created. Thus, taking the contexts of Pss. 45 and 102 into view, the author states that God said to the Son the words addressed to the Davidic king in Ps 45, and he also said to the Son the words addressed to the messianic Lord in Ps. 102. These are rightly considered speech to the royal Son, because as messianic King, these words are about him.” Jonathan A. Rinker, “Creation, Consummation, and Perseverance: The Use of Psalm 102:25-27 in Hebrews 1:10-12” (PhD. diss., Baptist Bible Seminary, 2017), 200.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 252. Cf. David A. Kroll who makes precisely the same assertion: *The God of Jesus: A Comprehensive Examination of the Nature of the Father, Son, and Spirit* (Bloomington, IN: Westbow Press, 2012), 243.

Kerrigan's claim that καὶ is never used to join successive quotations of the OT is indefensible as that is what the author of Hebrews did in 2:12-13; 4:5 (cf. Matt. 15:4). So too, even if it were true that Hebrews 1:10-12 is the only place in the NT wherein successive quotations are joined by καὶ, it would still not follow that such a construction is impossible. Hebrews 5:6 is the only place wherein καθὼς καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ λέγει is employed applying two OT quotations to the same subject. Holding Kerrigan's view consistently, the quotations of Psalm 2:7 and 110:4 are directed at two subjects and thus there is one individual who is God's Son and another who is the High Priest. Rather, as Owen concluded, the natural reading of this pericope requires that "One person is here certainly and only spoken unto."<sup>21</sup>

### **The Argument from Hebrews 1:2 and Exaltation**

Greg Stafford began his consideration of Hebrews 1:10-12 by assuming subordinationism from the outset. He claimed that the phrase "the exact representation of his being" in Hebrews 1:2 "makes a clear temporal distinction between God and his Son."<sup>22</sup> Stafford has imported a verbal connotation to the noun χαρακτήρ while ignoring the present active participle verb of being ὄν. This verb implies the Son's eternity as it stands in contrast with γενόμενος in v. 4.<sup>23</sup> Consequently, the Son always possessed the Father's nature<sup>24</sup> in the same manner in which he is always the "radiance" of the Father's glory. Stafford neglected to deal with the repercussion of his claim (i.e., polytheism). If the Son is an ontologically separate being as Stafford contends, and if he is an "exact copy of God's being"<sup>25</sup> Stafford has affirmed two Gods who are exactly alike. Moreover, he has asserted the deification of a human being and thus has imported a theological category that is more in keeping with ancient Grecian heroes than biblical Christianity.

---

<sup>21</sup> John Owen, *An Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews*, ed. W. H. Goold, Vol. 20, Works of John Owen (Edinburgh, UK: Johnstone and Hunter, 1854), 206.

<sup>22</sup> Greg Stafford, *Jehovah's Witnesses Defended: An Answer to Scholars and Critics*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (Murrieta, CA: Elihu Books, 2012) 398, cf. 395.

<sup>23</sup> A. T. Robertson, *Word Pictures in the New Testament*, Vol. 5 (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1960), 335.

<sup>24</sup> Ellingworth and Nida note: "Is the exact likeness of God's own being' may be expressed most satisfactorily in a number of languages as 'is just like God,' or 'is the same as God,' or 'what God is like is what he is like,' or 'what is true about God is true about his Son.'" Paul Ellingworth and Eugene Albert Nida, *A Handbook on the Letter to the Hebrews*, UBS Handbook Series (New York: United Bible Societies, 1994), 9.

<sup>25</sup> Stafford, *Jehovah's Witnesses Defended*, 364.

Stafford then explained Hebrews 1:10-12 as exaltation language wherein resurrected Christ is said to have become like God:

By considering closely all of the descriptions given in the quotation of Psalm 102:25-27 in Hebrews 1:10-12, it becomes clear that the things made “through” the Son are ‘perishable,’ whereas since his resurrection the Son now ‘remains continually’ and his “years will never run out.” Therefore, he is now like Jah God of Psalm 102:25-27, for the Father has “granted also to the Son to have life in himself” which life is now “indestructible” by contrast with creations which “perish....” In this way, too, Jesus is now “better than the angels.” Yet, his role in creation is not changed by the use of OT texts that help establish the Son’s immortality in ways that show his superiority to both angels and to those creations made “through him.”<sup>26</sup>

Stafford’s claim, that Hebrews 1:10-12 can be attributed to Jesus because the Father granted that the Son “is now like Jah God of Psalm 102:25-27,” is entirely circular as it assumes his Arian Christology.<sup>27</sup>

Stafford’s approach echoes the *Racovian Catechism* which explains the application of the Psalm as an honorific attribution as Christ has inherited a status higher than angels.<sup>28</sup> This conclusion is similarly derived not from the text but from a presupposed doctrinal commitment that is imposed upon the text. There are numerous ways in which God assigns cosmic Lordship to his Son; anachronistically attributing the act of creation to him is not one of those.

## Conclusion

According to the author of Hebrews, the Son of God created all things, and he will consummate the end of the world as we know it; for “all things were created through him and for him” (Col. 1:16). The Son is Yahweh, the one who changes not, as the application of Psalm 101:25-26 LXX by the writer of Hebrews demonstrates. The subordinationist claims regarding this pericope rely upon dubious assertions which result in incorrect exegetical and theological conclusions. The argument from the Septuagint

---

<sup>26</sup> Stafford, *Jehovah’s Witnesses Defended*, 398.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Chang’s study. Whereas he recognized that “‘Lord’ in Ps. 102.25 and Hebrews 1.10 can only refer to Yahweh,” he explains Heb. 1:10-12 in terms of the “Word/Memra of Yahweh” that was “embodied” in Jesus. This too is a case of *petitio principii*. Eric H. H. Chang, *The Only True God: A Study of Biblical Monotheism* (n.p., 2017), 319. Dunn makes the same argument only in terms of Christ “embodying the very power of God.” James D. G. Dunn, *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry Into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: W. B. Eerdmans, 1996), 289, n. 216.

<sup>28</sup> Thomas Rees, *The Racovian Catechism with Notes and Illustrations* (London, UK: Longman et al., 1818; repr. Whitefish, MT: Literary Licensing Llc., 2014), 95-6.

asserts a God who is finite, while his agent is eternal and immutable. The argument for future creation results in an eschatology that posits three heavens and earth, two of which are the “new” heavens and earth. That interpretation also requires a division of grammatical tense in the middle of a prophecy wherein Hebrews 1:10 is proleptic, while the balance of the text is future. The argument for bifurcation results in a quagmire of exegetical inconsistencies and the argument from exaltation rests upon a logical fallacy. Lastly, the argument from Hebrews 1:2 and the exaltation of the Son assumes subordinationism from the outset and then reads that conclusion into 1:10-12. Despite subordinationist claims, Hebrews 1:10-12 remains a powerful witness to the deity, immutability, and Creatorship of the Lord Jesus Christ.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ambrose of Milan. *Exposition of the Christian Faith*. Ed. by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. In *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*. Vol. 10. Series Two. *St. Ambrose: Select Works and Letters*, 287-89. New York: Christian Literature Company, 1896.
- Aquinas, Thomas. *Commentary on the Letter of Saint Paul to the Hebrews*. Lander, WY: The Aquinas Inst., 2012.
- Arndt, W. F., Bauer, W., Danker, F. W., Gingrich, F. W. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed. Chicago, IL: Univ. of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Athanasius of Alexandria. *Four Discourses against the Arians: Discourse IV*. Trans. by John Henry Newman and Archibald T. Robertson.. In *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*. Ed. by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. Series Two. Vol. 4. *St. Athanasius: Select Works and Letters*, 433-47. New York: Christian Literature Company, 1892.
- Bacon, Benjamin W. "Heb 1, 10-12 and the Septuagint Rendering of Ps 102, 23." *Zeitschrift Für Die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft Und Die Kunde Der Älteren Kirche* 23, no. 3. (1902): 280-5.
- Bruce, F. F. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. The New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: W. B. Eerdmans, 1990.
- Buzzard, Anthony. *Jesus Was Not a Trinitarian: A Call to Return to the Creed of Jesus*. Morrow, GA: Restoration Fellowship, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The One God, the Father, One Man Messiah Translation*. 2nd ed. Morrow, GA: Restoration Fellowship, 2020.
- Buzzard, Anthony, Hunting, Charles. *The Doctrine of the Trinity: Christianity's Self-Inflicted Wound*. Lanham: International Scholars Pub., 1998.
- Calvin, John. *Commentaries*. Joseph Haroutunian and Louise Pettibone Smith eds. Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, 1958.
- Chandler, Kegan A. *The God of Jesus in Light of Christian Dogma: The Recovery of New Testament Theology*. McDonough, GA: Restoration Fellowship, 2016. Kindle.

- Chang, Eric H. H. *The Only True God: A Study of Biblical Monotheism*. N.p., 2017.
- Church, Philip. "Hebrews 1:10-12 and the Renewal of the Cosmos." *Tyndale Bulletin* 67, no. 2 (2016): 269-86.
- Cyril of Jerusalem. *The Catechetical Lectures of St. Cyril, Archbishop of Jerusalem*. Trans. by R. W. Church and Edwin Hamilton Gifford. In *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church S. Cyril of Jerusalem, S. Gregory Nazianzen*, ed. by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. Vol. 7. Series Two. *St. Cyril of Jerusalem, St. Gregory Nazianzen*, 104-14. New York: Christian Literature Company, 1894.
- Dunn, James D. G. *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry Into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, MI: W. B. Eerdmans, 1996.
- Ellingworth, Paul. *Commentary on Hebrews. New International Greek Testament Commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1993.
- Ellingworth, Paul, Nida, Eugene Albert. *A Handbook on the Letter to the Hebrews*. UBS Handbook Series. New York: United Bible Societies, 1994.
- Gil, J. Dan. *The One: In Defense of One God*. Nashville, TN: 21st Century Reformation Publishing.
- Gouge, William. *A Commentary on the Whole Epistle to the Hebrews*. Vol. 1. Nichol's Series of Commentaries. Edinburgh; London; Dublin: James Nichol; J. Nisbet & Co.; G. Herbert, 1866.
- John Chrysostom. *Homily III*. Trans. by T. Keble and Frederic Gardiner. In *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, ed. by Philip Schaff. Series One. Vol. 14. *St. Chrysostom: Homilies on the Gospel of St. John and Epistle to the Hebrews*, 375-81. New York: Christian Literature Company, 1889.
- Kittel, Gerhard, Bromiley, Geoffrey W., Friedrich, Gerhard. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Vol. 1. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1964
- Kroll, David A. *The God of Jesus: A Comprehensive Examination of the Nature of the Father, Son, and Spirit*. Bloomington, IN: Westbow Press, 2012.
- Luther, Martin. *Sermons of Martin Luther*. Vol. 6. J. N. Lenker ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1983.

- Navas, Patrick. *Divine Truth or Human Tradition: A Reconsideration of the Orthodox Doctrine of the Trinity in Light of the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures*. Bloomington, IN: AuthorHouse, 2011.
- Owen, John. *An Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews*. ed. W. H. Goold. Vol. 20. Works of John Owen. Edinburgh, UK: Johnstone and Hunter, 1854.
- Pietersma, Albert, Wright, Benjamin G. Wright eds. *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 2007.
- Rees, Thomas. *The Racovian Catechism with Notes and Illustrations*. London, UK: Longman et al., 1818; repr. Whitefish, MT: Literary Licensing Llc., 2014.
- Rinker, Jonathan A. "Creation, Consummation, and Perseverance: The Use of Psalm 102:25-27 in Hebrews 1:10-12." PhD. diss., Baptist Bible Seminary, 2017.
- Robertson, A. T. *Word Pictures in the New Testament*. Vol. 5. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1960.
- Schoenheit, John W., Graeser, Mark H., Lynn, John A. *One God & One Lord: Reconsidering the Cornerstone of the Christian Faith*. Indianapolis, IN: The Living Truth Fellowship, 2011. Kindle.
- Stafford, Greg. *Jehovah's Witnesses Defended: An Answer to Scholars and Critics*. 3rd ed. Murrieta, CA: Elihu Books, 2012.
- The Holy Bible, English Standard Version*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2016.
- Zarely, Kermit. *The Restitution of Jesus Christ*. N.p., 2008.