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ABSTRACT
Scholars have long debated the christological processes that brought about the deification of Jesus, as well as whether the very earliest Christians viewed Jesus as a divine being. This present study attempts to answer these questions by examining how the earliest Christians used the name of Jesus, especially in ritual contexts, and then comparing this usage with how Jews utilized the name of God and divine mediator figures, as well as how the larger Greco-Roman world used the names of their deities. By comparing these various religious traditions in terms of how they used the names of divine beings a catalog of phenomenological categories can be produced and used to compare how the earliest Christians used the name of Jesus. Comparison of these phenomenological categories suggests that Jesus was believed to be divine being by the earliest Christians.
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PREFACE

In my first semester under Prof. Larry Hurtado I was introduced to the work of Wilhelm Heitmüller. The points of view, and the methods employed by Heitmüller, were stimulating. By the end of my first year a class paper was produced which served as the backbone for my thesis. It was clear from the beginning that the views and methods of the History-of-Religions school had been too long overlooked in recent studies. Along with encouragement and insight from Prof. Hurtado my interest in Heitmüller's work grew. This present study is an outgrowth of that initial introduction to Heitmüller's work.

In terms of my references for this study, all Bible passages are taken from the New American Standard translation, unless otherwise noted. In addition, all passages on the Apostolic Fathers come from the work, Ante-Nicene Fathers, eds. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1986), unless otherwise stated. Furthermore, unless otherwise noted, all citations from the Dead Sea Scrolls come from Discoveries in the Judean Desert, edited by Florentino García Martínez, Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar and Adam S. van der Woude. Texts not yet published in the DJD, were taken from the The Dead Sea Scrolls study edition by Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar. In addition, all classical citations, unless otherwise noted, come from the Loeb Classical Library. Also, unless otherwise noted, all quotations from the Pseudepigrapha come from The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Vol. I & II, James H. Charlesworth ed., Garden City, New York, 1985. Finally, all abbreviations of classical works follow the convention outlined in The Oxford Classical Dictionary, 3rd ed.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

Überschaut man die Wirkungen des Jesus-Namens...so kommt man zu demselben Schluss wie bei dem jüdischen Schem...: der Jesus-Name, bzw. Der Gebrauch, das Nennen des Jesus-Namens, ist für die alten Christen von früh an ein Sakrament oder Sakramentale gewesen.  

Around 150 C.E. Justin Martyr wrote, "...to the Father of all, who is unbegotten, there is no name given...but Jesus his name as man and savior, has significance." Justin continues his name-speculation when he later maintains that the name of God was actually Jesus. Justin defended this claim by pointing to the mysterious Angel of the Lord spoken of in Exodus 23, who, it was claimed had the divine name implanted, so to speak, in him. Because the Angel of the Lord led the people of Israel he was viewed as a type of Joshua figure who had likewise led Israel into the Holy Land, and in Justin’s chain of logic the fact that Jesus=Joshua was an indispensable piece of the puzzle. From this Justin deduced that the name of God and the name Jesus were one and the same for he states, “for if you shall understand this, you shall likewise perceive that the name of him who said to Moses, ‘for my name is in him,’ was Jesus.”

These two citations illustrate that with the advent of the Christian faith the curtain did not ring down on the interest and theological speculation over the names of divine figures. These passages display the enormous significance which the Early Church placed upon the name of Jesus. When we trace the roots of this phenomenon we do not have to wait long before we find


3 Dialogue with Trypho 75. Several new reviews of Second Temple Judaism have reinforced the notion that intermediate figures, such as the Angel of the Lord, were readily accommodated within the broader Jewish monotheistic framework. Klaus Koch’s article, “Monotheismus und Angelologie,” goes into some depth concerning the scope of this accommodation, while L. Hurtado discusses the rationale and religious significance of this accommodation. For further reading see Klaus Koch, “Monotheismus und Angelologie,” in Ein Gott allein? JHW-Verehrung und biblischer Monotheismus im Kontext der Israelitischen und altorientalischen Religionsgeschichte, eds. Walter Dirrich and Martin A. Klopfenstein (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994), 565-582 and Larry W. Hurtado, One God One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Christian Monotheism (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988). It is of some interest to observe that some scholars, such as Fossum, see this Angel of the Lord=Jesus equation as standing behind some New Testament passages. For further details see Jarl Fossum, “Kyrios Jesus as the Angel of the Lord in Jude 3-7,” NTS 33 (1987): 226-243; and Jarl E. Fossum, “In the Beginning Was the Name: Onomatology As the Key to Johannine Christology,” in The Image of the Invisible God: Essays on the Influence of Jewish Mysticism on Early Christology, (Freiburg/Göttingen: Universitätsverlag Freiburg/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995), 109-134.
that we have hit solid Semitic bedrock. This speculation, as we will see, was also no less indebted to Greco-Roman conceptions of divine names. Of course, the notion that a religious group should place great emphasis on the name of a divine being elicits no surprise, for the Greco-Roman world had done likewise, as is shown both in first century prayers and incantations, as well as in the slightly later philosophical musings of intellectuals such as the members of the Neo-Platonic school (e.g., lamblichus, Plotinus, and Porphyry\(^4\) to name a few).\(^5\) Judaism too, was not immune from this type of belief, and Christians, no less children of their time, also incorporated this theologoumenon into the fabric of their doctrines and practices, although in the case of Christianity one aspect separated it from its contemporaries; here I refer to the startling fact that Christians had elevated the name of the historical person to a position equivalent to the place which the name ‘YHWH’ had come to occupy in Judaism. And this remarkable estimation of the import of the name Jesus occurred significantly earlier than the quotations from Justin would suggest. Quite remarkably, the lineaments of this name conception reach into the earliest strata of New Testament tradition. A number of texts illustrate this amply.

For example, within the New Testament we find the claim that the name of Jesus was purportedly used in exorcisms during the ministry of Jesus, by both his disciples (e.g., Mt. 7:22; Lk. 10:17; cf. Mk. 16:17), as well as by those who at first blush appear not to be enfranchised to utilize his name (e.g., Mk. 9:38f. and Lk. 9:49). In the post-Easter era the name of Jesus was the putative source of power by which the apostles accomplished healings and exorcised demons (e.g., Acts 3:6,16: 4:7,10,30: 16:18; cf. 9:34, 19:13), and it was the source of exousia and dynamis by which some Jewish exorcists (apparently ex opere operato) attempted to control demonic powers (Acts 19:13 ff.). And most importantly, in the cultic setting of baptism, the Christian was instructed to invoke the name of Jesus over Christian initiates (James 2:7; cf. I Cor. 1:13,15).

Beyond the strictly numinous qualities that the name of Jesus displays in the New Testament there is also found profound reflection over its significance. For example, in Mt. 1:21

\(^4\)Indeed, Porphyry even wrote a work entitled Προβολή Πορφύριος. Hirsch speculates that the work entertained the notion that a divine name could etymologically reveal the nature of the god who bore the name. See Maurus Hirsch, Sprachphilosophie und Namenmagie im Neuplatonismus: Mit einem Exkurs zu ‘Demokrit’ B 142 (Meisenheim am Glan: Anton Hain, 1979), 43.

\(^5\) It is not without passing interest to note that lamblichus was of Syrian extraction, while Porphyry was Phoenician and Proclus was a Lycian by origin. All of this suggests an ‘Orientalism’ of Greek philosophical thought. For further details see R.T. Wallis, Neoplatonism (London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., 1972), 13.
we read, “And you shall call His name Jesus, for it is He who will save His people from their sins.” And speculation concerning the significance of the name of Jesus is also found in Revelation 19:13, where the author states that Jesus’ name is “The Word of God.”

This emphasis upon the name of Jesus raises several important questions: First, what prompted this sort of belief and where do its roots lie? Second, how did this development progress and can we speak of a ‘vector’ of progression in its development within Early Christianity? And finally, can this name-speculation shed light on christological belief and development?

Given the prominence that the name of Jesus received in early Christian circles it is surely unfortunate that the topic has received insufficient attention since the seminal treatment of the subject by Wilhelm Heitmüller in his In Namen Jesu: Eine sprach- und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum Neuen Testament, speziell zur altchristlichen Taufe. Indeed, Heitmüller’s seminal study still casts a lengthy shadow in all discussions on this topic.

This lack of attention is rendered all the more grievous by the fact that Heitmüller’s original enterprise was hamstrung due to a paucity of original source material. Subsequent to his publication we have recovered so much new material that we now have an embarrassment of riches. In retrospect, we can appreciate that the paucity of Heitmüller’s database was matched only by his brilliance in utilizing such scant material in carrying out his impressive scholarly work; thus, from both methodological and source critical concerns, the time is ripe to revisit Heitmüller’s original study.

Now whatever the shortcomings of Heitmüller’s study he did demonstrate two important facts: first, that the use of the name of Jesus in the New Testament was conditioned in some measure by magical theologoumena such as those found in Hellenistic magical circles, and

6 A rapid inventory of these additional materials will illustrate the voluminous nature of our potential database. We now have the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Nag Hammadi codices, a fuller corpus of Old Testament Pseudepigraphal works in translation, over 8,000 authors and 30,000 extant pieces of Greek literature from Classical times until the end of the Late Antique Era in the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae, and numerous additions to Preisendanz’s Papyri Graecae Magicae, to name just some of these new resources.

7 “In Wirklichkeit steht der christliche Namenglaube prinzipiell auf derselben Linie mit dem jüdischen und heidnischen [emphasis mine].” INJ. 253. Heitmüller also maintained that from the inception of the statements about the name of Jesus in our earliest sources, until the time of Origen, the view of the name of Jesus was basically magical in nature. I shall challenge this view as it pertains to the New Testament, and if I might be allowed to anticipate my conclusions, the name of Jesus was attached to a form of name-mysticism, but rarely, strictly speaking, to name-magic. I shall unpack this claim later in my study. It should be noted though that Aune accepts
second, we can obtain a greater measure of understanding concerning the significance of the use of the name of Jesus with the help of the estimation granted divine names in the milieu of Early Christianity: that is, by examining Judaism and Greco-Roman perceptions and practices in this area.8 Beyond this, one finds another secure postulate which proposed that this usage dates from the very incipit of the Christian movement ‘full blown from the brow of Zeus’ as it were. Somewhat more dubious however were some of his other conclusions. To cite but one example, Heitmüller was convinced that the all-important baptismal phrase ‘in the name of (someone)’ was of Hellenistic pedigree, and accordingly, was derived from the argot of Greek commerce.9 True to his purpose, Heitmüller drew the inevitable corollary that the phrase arose in a Hellenistic Christian setting far removed from Palestinian Jewish Christianity.

Whatever one makes of Heitmüller’s work, the significance of how, and in what fashion, Christians utilized the name of Jesus has potentially far reaching consequences for how we view early christology and the processes which shaped its development. Certainly careful re-examination of how Christians utilized the name of Jesus promises to repay dividends. Now, while it seems certain that such an analysis will show that some of Heitmüller’s conclusions will have to be amended, it must be said that his basic grasp of the christological importance of the name of Jesus was as penetrating as it is enduring. However, before I proceed in outlining the parameters that shall govern this study it is appropriate at this point to introduce a little more thoroughly those scholars who began the type of History-of-Religions investigations which Heitmüller’s work symbolizes.

THE HISTORY-OF-RELIGIONS SCHOOL

Heitmüller himself was just one of a small group of scholars centered at Göttingen (the so-called ‘kleinen Göttinger Facultät’) around the turn of the century who developed both a new

---


9Heitmüller, INJ, 106.
emphasis, as well as new critical tools, in the study of religion. These scholars formed what was to become known as the History-of-Religions School. Among the names which have graced the mantle of this school are Wilhelm Bousset, William Wrede, Ernst Troeltsch, H. Gunkel, and Albert Eichhorn, to name but a few. This is an impressive array of scholars, but what exactly were the guiding principles of the History-of-Religions School?10

Generally speaking their foundation stone was radical historical investigation of both Judaism and Christianity. This emphasis arose from a new era of scholarship in Germany that brought various resources to bear upon the ferreting out of the facts concerning these religions--without concern for their religious implications. This era in German scholarship has been termed by some as 'Wirklichkeitswissenschaft' and entailed not only the recovery of historical facts, but inevitably led to a partitioning and flourishing of numerous disciplines (e.g., archeology, philology, and the like), which were used to serve the ends of the School. The School's methodology purported to investigate every aspect of religion without prejudice towards any belief in its claimed supernatural origins; indeed, this pre-supposition was often called into question.

The chief tool of the School was the use of a historical approach whereby one religion was illuminated by comparing it to the developmental processes and patterns as found in another religion, hopefully one roughly coterminal with the religion under study.11 Their primary emphasis did not lie in the study of comparative religion per se, but rather in laying bare the historical events and milieu of their subject in order to better comprehend the meaning of ritual actions and popular belief.

Another characteristic of the school was its emphasis upon fleshing out the common piety of the people, especially the functional role which cultic acts played in popular religion.12 This

---


11 Lüdemann, *Der Religionsgeschichtlichen Schule*, 10.

12 M. Dibelius, a second generation advocate of the School’s methodology, sums up this emphasis in the following manner, “Zugrunde liegt der k[ultgeschichtliche]n M[ethode] ebenso wie der formgeschichtlichen die
emphasis focused not so much around the concern to systematize each and every act carried out in the cultus, but more generally was aimed at identifying characteristics and properties of the cultus of both Judaism and Christianity.

Furthermore, among cultic rituals, special emphasis was laid upon sacramental acts. These acts were described by Pfister as any "...magische(r) oder kultische(r) Akt, der den Menschen in eine innige Beziehung und Verbindung mit dem Göttlichen setzen, der auf irgendeine Weise die heilige Substanz auf den Menschen übertragen, ihn heiligen soll." As Pfister’s quote demonstrates, the proponents of the School chose to classify magic and cultus together for both were considered part of folk tradition and customs. Now let us look at the School’s most important member, in terms of christological thought.

Unquestionably the most significant member of the School, with respect to the study of christology, was Wilhelm Bousset. Bousset is rightly credited as having instituted the first programmatic approach in the modern pursuit of christological inquiry. Bousset advanced a diachronic, phenomenological, and geographically orientated model, which utilized religious and historically comparative materials in order to situate properly christological development within its wider context.

Bousset clearly came to rely upon ritual practices as a primary tool in helping to explicate the contours of the process that brought about the deification of Jesus. In keeping with other members of the School, Bousset saw these practices as a potent generator of christological innovation.

By careful use of these principles Bousset believed that he was able to place the epicenter of christological development in Antioch. In Bousset’s view there was a christological fault line which separated Palestinian Judaism from Diaspora Judaism and it cut right across Antiochian

---


14 Lehmkühler correctly notes that the School subdivided religion into holy men, holy texts or words, and holy traditions and customs. It is in this last group that both cultus and magic were placed. See Lehmkühler, *Kultus u. Theologie*, 39.

soil. According to Bousset each new christological wave that swelled from Antioch became increasing more paganized in terms of the pristine monotheism, which Bousset maintained, was normative for Palestinian Judaism. According to Bousset these christological innovations were carried across the Levant, and eventually the whole of the Mediterranean, through the efforts of the Apostle Paul and others like him.\textsuperscript{16}

In retrospect it is now easy to see that Bousset’s methods made for quite heady wine. His appeal to primary literature, the simplicity of his guiding principles, and most importantly, the broad framework that seemed to explain readily a host of sometimes perplexing facts, render his methods, even today both stimulating and promising.

In spite of the initial success of the School, in time, their approach largely fell out of favor among scholars. This descent was signaled with the publication of Oscar Cullmann’s widely influential 1957 study, “Die Christologie des Neuen Testaments,” which began the trend toward limiting the range of inquiry to the New Testament in isolation from other non-Christian sources of the era, denying scholars the possible insights that might have been derived from the very Greco-Roman world which provided the populace from which early Christianity drew its adherents. This new direction also eschewed any focus on ritual practices, or other phenomenological aspects of early Christian life. Since Cullmann the study of christology has been congested with inquiries which emphasize, among other aspects, the titles afforded Jesus in the New Testament,\textsuperscript{17} sketches of particular christological concepts such as preexistence, or alternatively attempt a book-by-book doctrinal study. All of these attempts seek in some fashion to delineate how various New Testament authors treated the person of Jesus. In my view this type of approach to christological inquiry has bequeathed to us a narrow methodology which does not easily allow the investigator to form a unified picture with respect to Christianity ‘on the ground’ as it were.


Frankly, this lack of a wider systematic approach has not been productive enough in helping us understand that most complex of mutations, viz. how a crucified religious deviant came to be viewed as the preeminent representative and revealer of the divine reality and intent. While no one doubts that these sorts of studies have contributed greatly to our knowledge about certain authors, and their respective beliefs, they have not done enough in adding to our knowledge about how early Christians came to deify Jesus. Unfortunately we now stand before the prospect that by continuing to adhere to this methodology we face ever diminishing returns.

Fortunately recent stirrings in the field have again called for a return to the approach of the older School. Modifications and refinements of the History-of-Religion School’s methods have come in recent years primarily from Larry W. Hurtado and Gerd Lüdemann.

In Lüdemann’s case he concludes first and foremost that students, as well as teachers, must understand the Umwelt of early Christianity, not only as the primary component of their research, but he also advocates that they beg off understanding this Umwelt as mere background material because it will tend to give the false impression that Christianity does not belong with this background. As such Lüdemann advocates that students chiefly concentrate upon learning about religions of the Hellenistic Era, as well as concentrating upon the literature generated during this time span.

The second direction suggested by Lüdemann is that a greater consideration of political, social, and economic conditions be taken into account with reference to the New Testament, as well as its impact upon early Christianity. It is worth noting however that Lüdemann does part company with the prior History-of-Religion School in that he sees a peril in situating the Sitz-im-Leben for early Christian literature creation exclusively within the cultus. Lüdemann prefers as a source the rather more comprehensive area of the cultural-political life that then prevailed.

Lüdemann's third consideration is to point out the need to return to investigating the influence of religious experiences and practices in the Early Church, and connected with that, the religious-psychological aspects that such experiences may have produced.

18Lüdemann, Die Religionsgeschichtliche Schule, 19.
19Ibid.
20Ibid., 20.
Lüdemann also contends that Christianity should be seen as a religion which is to be understood in psychological terms, indeed, its birth and growth explained within these terms, instead of appealing to supernatural forces.21

The final position that Lüdemann stakes out is that he also sees the need for a wider approach that occupies itself with the history of early Christianity, in its broader terms, rather than restricting the investigation by focusing in on New Testament authors alone.

The other noteworthy call for change comes from Larry Hurtado. In Hurtado’s research one of his main concerns was to understand and appreciate how religious experiences might have contributed to christological development. For Hurtado religious experiences played an early formative role in helping to shape christological development. Hurtado states that:

This explanation of the Christian mutation, as based upon religious experiences that had creative effects upon the interpretation of the inherited tradition, is usually not offered in much scholarly writing on Christian origins. But such an explanation, I suggest, not only accords with the information we have about the nature of early Christian groups but also helps to account for the sudden and rapid development of christological beliefs and Christ-orientated devotional practices within the first decades of the Christian movement.22

In nuce. Hurtado’s thesis posits that religious experiences were a potent seminal force which helped propel christological development. In this respect Hurtado has drawn a contiguous line between his approach and that of the History-of-Religions School. Beyond this, Hurtado also sees the need to return to the methods of the old School, with the caveat though that such work is attended by our improved understanding of Judaism and its relationship to Greco-Roman religious thought.

With respect to my own views let me briefly say that in terms of methodology I welcome the following aspects of the History-of-Religions School approach. First, their emphasis upon a historical-critical approach, which attempts to come to grips with Christian development by recourse to a diachronic investigation, although I still retain many reservations about many of their conclusions. On similar grounds I endorse the History-of-Religions School’s attempts at situating the development of christology within the matrix of the larger Greco-Roman milieu.

---

21 Ibid, 11.

22 Hurtado, One God One Lord, 122.
although at the same time I object to their over-emphasis upon mystery cults and other Greco-Roman religious movements to the relative neglect of Jewish elements and Jewish traditions.23

Third, I commend their emphasis upon taking into account the wider phenomena that characterized early Christian piety and religious life, especially cultic activities such as worship, prayer, and rituals. It was this emphasis which allowed the adherents of the History-of-Religions School to propose various factors which would explain the development of Christ-devotion.

In my judgment, in our attempts to understand the origins and development of emergent Christ-devotion we must cast our net beyond investigation of christological doctrine, or individual New Testament authors alone, and instead widen our inquiry so as to encompass the religious life of early Christians. Only by recourse to this broader line of inquiry will it be possible to ascertain all of the causal factors that fueled christological development.

Accordingly, my investigation shall be governed by the principles of the History-of-Religions School, but with the necessary modifications which I hope will allow me to avoid the errors into which they fell, viz. over reliance upon Greco-Roman parallels, uncritical use of late parallels to illuminate early developments, and the belief that Judaism had been so Hellenized as to have lost its more profound spiritual precepts. Accordingly, in my study I shall embrace the major pillars of the old School, viz. a diachronic approach, an attention to comparative religious materials and their provenance, and a focus on phenomenology.

Moreover I shall assume the following four dictums put forth by Hurtado concerning the development of Christ-Devotion in the first two centuries.24

1) There were the Biblical and Jewish religious traditions, which supplied major religious ideas and categories for early Christian religious life and thought.

2) The development of devotion to Christ in the first several centuries was “heavily fueled by the need to accommodate Christ as divine without departing from a monotheistic outlook.”25

---

23 Indeed this aspect of their methodology led the adherents of the History-of-Religions School to posit that the entire development of Christ-devotion was little more than a progressive paganization of Christianity brought about by the corrupting influences of Hellenistic thought and religious practice.

24 Larry Hurtado, “Christ-Devotion in the First Two Centuries,” 24-25.

25 Ibid., 24.
3) Investigators must allow for the influence of the general religious atmosphere, which has the capacity for providing both categories and conceptions for religious innovation, even if on occasion it was by way of reaction against these very features in pagan religious practice.

4) Aspects of religious beliefs and practice, that is to say, the powerful input of religious practices, must be taken into account in our attempts to describe the emergence and development of Christ devotion.

In order to pinpoint securely the christological significance of the early Christian use of the name of Jesus in the larger christological framework I must first seek to establish its significance in light of its historical parallels in the Greco-Roman milieu. In this pursuit I shall begin with a review of the significance of divine names in Greco-Roman magic and cultus. Secondly, I shall examine the Jewish materials for evidence of how numinous names were used in cult and magie. Furthermore, I shall canvas the Old Testament and Intertestamental materials to see how Old Testament Israel regarded the name of God. Thirdly, I shall define and categorize early Christian usage of the name of Jesus by examining New Testament texts, and then those texts, canonical and non-canonical, from early Christianity which offer some additional insights into how the earliest Christians regarded the name of Jesus.

After reviewing these texts I shall partition the various uses of the name of Jesus into their respective categories in order to bring illumination from the History-of-Religions investigation of step one to these materials. And finally, I shall attempt to ‘parse’ christologically the significance of the use of the name of Jesus in the theological understanding of early Christianity. From this foundation I shall draw my conclusions concerning the christological significance of the early Christian use of the name of Jesus. In addition, the ritual use of the name of Jesus will receive particular attention. This will help us to see what role the name-concept can play in fleshing out the details of christological development. With that said, I shall now proceed to examine the Greco-Roman materials.

26 For the interested reader I include an appendix which takes up the question of the role and function of cultic acts in religion. See Appendix Four.
CHAPTER TWO

THE USE OF NUMINOUS NAMES IN GRECO-ROMAN MAGIC AND RELIGION

Man kann sagen, die Zauberkunst ist die Wissenschaft von den göttlichen Namen.27

This section inaugurates my attempt to flesh out the name-concept utilizing a history of religions approach, as well as my attempt to anchor this material within the greater context within which the concept originated. This first subsection will deal with the name-concept as it is found in Greco-Roman religion and magic.

My first task will be to review the status quaestionis on this subject, and then proceed to sketch the contours of the name-concept as it is found in Greco-Roman society, generally speaking. After this general introduction I shall make a more detailed and specific attempt to trace the name-concept within Greco-Roman magic and religion proper.

Status Quaestionis

In the following review I aim to highlight the work of those scholars who have devoted significant attention to either the role of the name-concept in Greco-Roman magic or to some component element which can be tied into Greco-Roman name-mysticism.

It is an unfortunate fact that over the years divine names in Greco-Roman magic have received little systematic treatment. This is not due to lack of notice by scholars of Greco-Roman magic. On the contrary, all scholars that I have reviewed are in agreement concerning the importance of divine names. Still, the subject is often mentioned only in passing with very few scholars ever attempting to treat the matter systematically. However, several works which have helped to establish this consensus on the importance of divine names stand out as worthy of mention.

Unquestionably, the most exhaustive and detailed examination of the function and role of divine names was offered in 1921 (and 1924 for volume II) in the seminal and massive two-volume work of T. Hopfner.28 In his first volume Hopfner devotes a full section to the question

---


of the name-concept in Greco-Roman magic. Briefly Hopfner advances the following propositions.

First, after exhaustive review of the available evidence Hopfner concludes that the name of a divinity represents, or is a symbol of, the nature and essence of the divinity ("zwingenden inneren Sympathie des Namens mit seinem Wesen"). Secondly, Hopfner comes down on the side of the proposition that the use of the name of the divinity could coerce the divinity to execute the wishes of the supplicant. Beyond this, Hopfner held to the view that the petitioner must have possession of the 'true' name of the divinity in order to have power over it. A correlative of this concept is that since only the true name carries the actual numinous force the name must be kept secret, both by the hierophant and the tradents of the magical arts as well. To do anything less was to invite disaster for if the true name were to fall into the hands of a rival theurgist, or a political enemy, the name could be employed to the detriment of the devotee. Interestingly, Hopfner explains the origin of this conception by recourse to simple human psychology. In brief, Hopfner thought that since many people at one time or the other had experienced unanswered prayer (or invocation) then this failure was deemed to signify that the name which they were using must not be the correct 'true' name of the god. Conversely, if any name were valid then all prayer would go heeded and that clearly was not the case. Accordingly, successful invocation was predicated upon knowing the true name of the divinity.


29 Ibid., § 688.

30 Ibid., § 690. Hopfner further observes that this control can operate either with the consent of the god, or against its will. Still, Hopfner avers that in the cultic setting the gods do not come out of compulsion but rather the petitioner is prepared to receive the god and draws attention to themselves through the κληρεία. See § 794.

31 Ibid., § 687.


33 Hopfner, GAOZ § 682. The dilemma which arose in such occasions was whether the petitioner must be compelled to believe on the strength of the evidence of unanswered prayer either that their deity did not exist, or that they had simply erred in the use of the name(s) of the god. As already noted, Hopfner's clever proposal was that people who had experienced these episodes resorted to reliance upon the notion that the reason the god(s) had not answered was simply because the petitioner had not utilized the correct 'true' name of the deity.
Furthermore, Hopfner concluded that in general terms the more powerful the god was conceived to be, then the more powerful its name was believed to be.\textsuperscript{34} Hopfner also maintained that the name of a deity was widely believed to carry an apotropaic force which was effective against both illness and evil spirits.\textsuperscript{35} Hopfner also observed that the name was widely assumed to have numinous qualities and was held by some to have an independent existence apart from the bearer of the name (i.e., a ‘true’ hypostasis).\textsuperscript{36}

Hopfner further notes that it was rather common in Greco-Roman antiquity to substitute one name for another name if the substitute was of an equal numerical equivalence as demonstrated by onomatomatic procedures.\textsuperscript{37}

Finally, Hopfner notes that review of the magical papyri, gems, \textit{tabulae execrationum} and the like deliver justifiable warrants for the establishment of the belief that the names of the gods were revealed by the gods themselves for only they were privy to their own ‘true’ names.\textsuperscript{38}

The other great work in this area was that of Heitmüller. Insofar as I shall have a chance to delve into Heitmüller at depth a little later on I shall bypass a more involved inspection at this point.

Another contribution of particular note is Bietenhard’s detailed article on the use of religiously significant names in Greek, Jewish and Christian circles.\textsuperscript{39} Although his work breaks no new ground it is nevertheless useful to take into account Bietenhard’s evaluation of the evidence with respect to the magical use of names.

Bietenhard maintained that the magical papyri yields evidence for the existence of the theologoumenon that invoking the name of a deity could force the deity into pliancy with the

\begin{footnotes}
\item\textsuperscript{34}Ibid., § 701.
\item\textsuperscript{35}Ibid., § 691.
\item\textsuperscript{36}Ibid., § 693.
\item\textsuperscript{37}Ibid., § 705.
\item\textsuperscript{38}Ibid., § 758, cf. Proclus \textit{In Cra.} 72.8ff. and \textit{In. Ti.} III 32.18f. Indeed, the whole ‘art’ of magic was believed to have been revealed by the gods. Graf gives a brief overview of literary documents where this notion is discussed. See Graf, \textit{Gottesnähe und Schadenzauber}, 85-89.
\end{footnotes}
wishes of the supplicant. Moreover, Bietenhard also held that only the ‘true’ name of the god had efficacy, and consequently, must be utilized by the petitioner. Finally, Bietenhard conjectures that in antiquity divine names were often viewed as a type of hypostasis of the god.

I should also mention the very interesting article of Pulleyn. Pulleyn’s article attempts to show that the belief in the ability of numinous names to compel the gods was quite alien in the Classical Greek religion of Hesiod and Homer. It is not the purpose of my work to enter into this debate, but I think that Pulleyn has demonstrated that in Classical Greek religion this belief existed at best only in incipient form. However, of some interest is Pulleyn’s assertion that the name-concept existed in fully figured form by the advent of the Hellenistic era in particular in the arena of Hellenistic magic.

Moreover, Pulleyn throws in with other scholars and concludes that the name-concept was a normative component of Egyptian religion. To this Pulleyn adds the further observation that Jewish religious scruples concerning the Tetragrammaton helped to fan into flame the Hellenistic Greek belief in the power of numinous names.

There are yet several other particulars about the name-concept in Greco-Roman magic which I must attend to as they are addressed in the odd article or chapter but deserve to be covered, for each contribution, in its own way, has informed and illuminated some aspect of magical praxis in Hellenistic times. In the following summation I shall review not authors, but rather individual aspects of name-mysticism.

With respect to the question as to whether divine names were considered numinous in Greco-Roman magic the answer is quite unequivocal. All investigators that I have examined are

40 Ibid., 250.
41 Ibid., 251.
42 Ibid.
44 Ibid., 23.
45 Ibid., 19. Perhaps by extension one might conclude that Pulleyn is implicitly endorsing the notion that the origin of name-mysticism is to be found in Egyptian religion.
46 Ibid.
agreed that certain names were in fact considered, by at least some practitioners of the magical arts, as possessing numinous qualities.47

There also appears to be a consensus regarding the question of whether the prospective supplicant must utilize the 'true' name of the god in order to receive a satisfactory response.48 From this it can be deduced that the practitioners of magical arts must keep the names of the deities shrouded in secrecy in order to safeguard the power which was resident in the name from either enemies, or unscrupulous practitioners, not to mention reckless neophytes.49

In regards to the question of whether certain names could actually coerce the gods, a consensus again appears to emerge. All investigators that I have been able to examine agree that adepts believed that they could gain traction in their bid to compel the deity by invoking the correct name.50

Furthermore, every investigator that I have examined has been moved by the data to agree that divine names were believed to be apotropaic.51 Those investigators who attempt to

---


51 Hopfner, GAOZ § 689; Schmidt, Die Bedeutung des Namens, 44 and Heitmüller, INJ, 211.
trace the origin of name-mysticism appear unified in positing ancient Eastern cultures—especially Egypt—as the source, although the influence of Babylon is also undeniable. Another area of considerable agreement occurs in the acceptance that the ancients believed that the gods and demons spoke their own language, which in some cases stemmed from the area of the origin of the divinity or demon.

One area with some contention is whether numinous divine names were thought of in hypostatic-like terms. On this score the scales are mostly weighted toward those who think that numinous names were indeed thought of as being genuine hypostatic entities.

In view of the lack of systematic treatment by all but Heitmüller and Hopfner, I will proceed by identifying the constituent elements of Greco-Roman name-magic, which are of some relevance to my overall argument. Accordingly, in this section I shall attempt to trawl the relevant primary literature in an effort to display clearly the following categories of concrete aspects of Hellenistic magic and its various modes of application.

Briefly stated, in my own perusal of Greco-Roman magical texts I have been able to delineate twelve elements of Greco-Roman magical praxis which are of some import for my analysis. These twelve points are as follows:

52 Jacob, ING, 86-90; Hopfner, GAOZ, § 720; Heitmüller, INJ, 218-222; Joshua Trachtenburg, Jewish magic and superstition; a study in folk religion, (New York, Atheneum, 1970), 87, 133; and Ludwig Blau, Das altjüdische Zaubervehen (Graz-Austria: Akademische Druck, 1974, Reprint of 1898 edition), 133. It is interesting to note that Trachtenberg even goes so far as to claim that the nominca barbara (i.e. non-Greek names of the gods) can be traced to an Egyptian provenance. Trachtenberg concludes that the nominca barbara were originally intelligible but subsequently degenerated into unintelligible form when they put down roots in Greek soil. See Jewish magic and Superstition, 82, 87.

55 I use the term 'hypostasis' in the sense of Olyan's category of "divinization." I also adopt his term "particularizing manifestation" to describe situations where metaphorical language is being employed (= ‘special figurative treatment’). For more on Olyan and the classification that I use see Appendix Three.

53 Jacob, ING, 82-83; Heitmüller, INJ, 185-190, and Trachtenberg, Jewish Magic, 87.

54 Jacob, ING, 100 and Hopfner, GAOZ § 720.


57 With the term 'magic' I refer to the belief that the gods could be coerced to answer favorably a request or demand by the adept because a certain medium was employed, or a specific formula was followed or a special name utilized. For more on the definition of magic see Appendix Two.
The names of the gods and other supernatural agents were considered to be numinous and laden with power. The names themselves were often thought to have an autonomous existence apart from the designated god or demon. The names of the gods were indissolubly intertwined with the gods themselves, so much so that to control the former was to control the latter. Foreign names and words (nomina barbara) were viewed as having more supernatural vitality than commonplace names. Pursuant to point four, the rationale for the emphasis upon foreign names was in part due to the fact that magic in general, and the name-concept in particular, were heavily indebted to Eastern (especially Semitic and Egyptian) pollination of Greek religion. The power, which was resident in the name, remained so only if the original language was utilized, or at least transliterated into the magical lingua franca of the theurgist. In part this concept is derivative. Insofar as the gods, as well as the demons, were viewed as having originated in specific geographic areas it appeared to the masses that they naturally responded to their 'native tongue'. It was imperative for the supplicant to ascertain the 'true' name of the god or demon. True names allowed for greater control over the numinous realm, per point 3. The invocation of numinous names was arguably the major means in securing apotropaic power on behalf of the petitioner. It was necessary for the god to reveal its 'true' name for only he or she was privy to it. Some theurgists believed that they could generate a state of sympatheia with, or special recognition from, the gods or demons by demonstrating their proficiency in correctly apprehending, and adroitly applying, the appropriate rituals, appurtenances, sigla, historiolae, and invocational formula in order to win approval of the deity. For many votaries a more profound apprehension of the mystery of the god or demon was often believed to be facilitated by utilizing onomatomantism (i.e., 'divining' the deity through gematria). The number of the god or demon could be seen as being tantamount to a revelation about the nature of the divine being. The most efficacious name for tradents of the magical crafts was usually thought to be those associated with the Tetragrammaton or its profane surrogates.

While I need not rigidly adhere to the order of this outline, it should be borne in mind as I proceed to review the data. For the purposes of expediency in this review I shall group both literary and non-literary sources together and treat them as a whole. Before I begin this review it would be helpful to submit a brief introduction on the general function and significance of names in the Greco-Roman world before, and concurrent with, the era of my concern. Thereafter I will undergo a more detailed analysis of the name-concept in Greco-Roman magic and religion.
GENERAL COMMENTS ABOUT POPULAR BELIEFS CONCERNING NAMES IN GREEK THOUGHT

In Greek thought a name could signify a person or thing. More importantly, the name was thought to be representative of the nature, or essence, of the person or object so named. It could be used in idioms as well as to signify the nature of an object or relationship. Even Greco-Roman society followed this line of reasoning when it named entire groups according to the founder, as for example, Christians were named after Christ. We have in view here several aspects. First, the founder was viewed as the example to which the followers were to aspire. Secondly, the founder was memorialized by the use of his or her name by their followers.

One example for my first point is found in Euripides’ Iphigenia in Tauris 905 where Pylades speaks of safe withdrawal from the land of the barbarians and he refers to this flight to safety as an ὄνομα τῆς σωτηρίας (i.e., here salvation is found in the context of safety—that is, escape from enemies is physically salvific). As the representation of the person, the name could be used as a surrogate of sorts for the person, for example in laying a charge to the account of the person (i.e. in the name of the person) who purchases an object, or solicits a service. It could also, of course, be used in simply calling on a person, or more importantly, invoking the gods.

In addition, for the Greeks names could take on many meanings depending on the context. To cite but one author, Thucydides in his Peloponnesian War (5.16), shows that a name could be used as a signifier for the reputation of a person or group, for concerning the Athenians he writes when addressing their good reputation that they possess, τὸ μέγα ὄνομα τῶν Ἀθηναίων. Conversely, as in Xenophon’s Cyropaedia 6.4.7 we find that a person or object could possess a dishonorable name (ἐν ἄτιμῳ ὄνοματι).

---

58 The Greeks and Romans assigned certain names because they believed that names were intimately connected with the nature of a person as Homer’s Odyssey 9.16-20 shows.

59 Bietenhard, 243. See also Hermann Güntert, von der Sprache der Götter und Geister, 7.

60 Some manuscript witnesses read ὄμμα instead of ὄνομα.

61 Ibid., 244-245.

62 Ibid.
Names could of course capture the essence of a person or thing. For example, when Socrates in the *Cratylus* is asked by his friend Hermogenes about the names of the gods, Socrates answers that “Names rightly given [are] the likeness and images of the things which they name...imitation of the essence is made by syllables and letters.” (439A; 424b-425A).

Other aspects of the name-concept in everyday Greco-Roman life can be seen from the Greek practice of naming their children after either the attribute that they desired for their child, or choosing a name that was intended to provide protection from the spirits. This may have as its origin the notion that the act of naming was actually synonymous with creation itself, a view widely held in Antiquity. Examples of this type of naming are Kleon and Themistokles to indicate glory, Kratinos and Polycrates to indicate power, and to signify their hope that their child will possess some good attribute parents chose names with the Eu-prefix such as Eutychos. In fact, Schmidt points out that when a child would die prematurely the parents would often ascribe the death to an unlucky name which they had chosen. Even the gods followed suit as seen in, for example, Hesiod’s *Theogony* 408-409 where the goddess Phoibe is said to bear a child with the name of Asteria “whose name brings good luck.”

In addition, theophoric names, or names which were used to represent a religious conversion, were often used to signify that a person had entered into a new relationship or position with respect to the gods.

Other aspects of the name-concept include what was arguably the most important area in the life of the ancients-warfare. It is worth noting in this context that the names of the first soldiers chosen to make contact with the enemy had inscribed upon their breast shield a *bonum nomen* (e.g. Cicero, *De divinatione* 1 §102, cf. Artemidorus’ *Oneirocritica* 38). Similarly, Livy

---

63 Nagelsbach has correctly noted that names often times signify not so much the essence of the thing named, but rather some particular characteristic. See Friedrich D. Nagelsbach, *Der Name Gottes und Jesu nach dem Verständnis und dem Sprachgebrauch der Heiligen Schrift* (München: Müller & Fröhlich, 1921), 3.


65 Ibid., 27.

66 Ibid., 10.

claims that if a general bore an unlucky name his solders would refuse to follow him into battle (Liv. 28.28.4).

Philosophers also occupied themselves in addressing the meaning and essence of names. At issue was whether names adequately reflected the true nature of an object or person. This problem was compounded by the fact that some objects bore more than one name.

Further complications arose from the fact that many bad things bore good names and vice versa-and this occurred, in the minds of some, because the gods, who had created language had themselves erred in the process of naming the various material objects. Other considerations, such as the perception that the name of something stands as the contrast, indeed the antithesis, to the true nature of the object (so Parmenides, 8.38), only served to confound philosophers. Worse yet was the perception that humans call an object one thing, while the gods utilize another name, and this only exacerbated the lack of resolution of the philosophical problem concerning the nature and function of names.

Plato in his Cratylus (435d) also took up this argument over what names really mean. In this work Plato combats the assertion of Cratylus that knowing a name is tantamount to knowing the thing, for Plato asserts that those who create names may have seriously erred in representing the object or person. For Plato, human reason could not penetrate behind the veil which hid the true recognition of names and their true meaning. Ultimately, words were nothing more than auditory representations of objects and accordingly the names of these objects received their meaning through reason and customary use.

With respect to religion it should be observed that the Greeks, in parallel with Jewish practice, utilized theophoric names to name their children (e.g., Iunius for the god Juno and Venerius for Venus, etc.). As adults the bearer of a theophoric name was thought to convey the divine presence of the divinity in religious or cultic activities.

---

68 Bietenhard, "οὐφωνα," 246.

69 This carried with it the presumption that the names used by the gods were the correct ones.

70 As quoted in Bietenhard. See, "οὐφωνα," 247.

71 Ibid., 247.

72 Ibid., 38.
What I wish also to highlight is the heretofore-unattended aspect of the name-concept with respect to the hierophant or the participants during cultic veneration of a deity. For example, Pliny records in his *Naturalis Historia* 38.22 that the person chosen to bring the offerings to the altar must bear a name rich with religiously significant meaning. Likewise Tacitus, in his *Histories* 4.53, states that the soldiers who bore the foundation stone for the construction of the Capitoline Temple bore so-called *fausta nomina*; that is, names which signified good fortune.

As for the gods, notwithstanding the report of Herodotus, speculation concerning the names of the classic pantheon of the gods originated with the *Theogony* of Hesiod. We witness, for example, in the *Theogony* (188-198) Hesiod's attempt to explain the etymology, and the significance, of the name of Aphrodite.

Other authors speculated that even the names of the gods were less than perfect for they reflect only one facet of the god. Beyond this some were convinced that the gods had reserved their true names for themselves and thus humans were bereft of any knowledge of the actual names of the gods (*Cra.* 400d-401a). Nor were matters rendered more clear when the gods received more than one name, as can be seen for example with Posidonius, who states that Zeus was named *Διός*, because all things had come into being through him, and *ζηνος*, because he was the source of life. For others, such as Plato, the only valid names of the gods were those which the gods used for themselves (*Cra.* 400d-401a).

As can be seen here the gods received many names based on their respective activities, ranks, and attributes. This is seen clearly in the later remarks of the pagan scholiast Lactantius Placidus (ca. sixth century C.E.), who comments that divine names connote the essence of the god(s) as Orpheus, Moses, and Isaiah recognized:

But perceive the true state of affairs: Is it possible to know the name of this god, who by his very nod rules and keeps everything together, to whose judgment all is subject.....But since the Magi wanted, as they thought, to grasp his virtues....and they tried to denote by the name of God the noble array of many deities, whose names were drawn from the

---

73 Other examples are noted in Schmidt, *Die Bedeutung des Namens*, 20.

74 Cited in *Diog. Laert.* 7.1.68.

75 I accept the measured assessment of Stern that Placidus was a non-Christian. See, Menahem Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism* (Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1980), 682 n. 1.
performance of many things [i.e., their attributes as seen in their actions]. Thus did Orpheus and Moyses, the priest of the Highest God, and Esaias and their like.76

Naturally, all of this led to the antithesis, ὀνόμα-φύσις, becoming a hotly discussed topic among some philosophers, especially the Sophists.77 We see this concern clearly in Euripides' optimistic assessment that ὀνόματι μετὰ τὸ νόθουν, ἡ φύσις δύσῃ.78

It is interesting to note that originally the Roman pantheon of gods did not even have proper, personal names, but rather had names that only reflected their class.79 As for the Greek gods, if we look beyond Hesiod or Homer, we find a curious lack of interest in the personal names of the gods.80 It would seem that some Greeks simply invoked "the god" or "the goddess."81 The evidence suggests that it was not until the time when eastern religious influences could percolate into Greek society that the idea of invoking the god by its 'true' name became customary.82

As for how names came to reflect the relationship between mankind and the gods it should be observed that a devotee and a divinity could exchange names, thus indicating an essential oneness between both parties. Moreover, there was also the prominent custom in antiquity of changing the name of a person when their nature or their position before God had changed.83 As we shall see in the section on the Old Testament such practices were also commonplace in the Semitic world. I shall now turn my attentions to the more specific features of Greco-Roman magic.

---

76 Ad Statius Thebais 4.516: Cum magi vellent virtutis eius, ut putabant, sese comprehendere, singulas appellationes quasi per naturarum potestates abusive modo designarunt et quasi plurimorum numinum nobilitate Deum appellare comtari sunt, quasi ab effectu causis rei ductis vocabulis, sicut Orpheus fecit et Moyses summī Dei antistes, et Esaias et his similis. The translation above is drawn from Stern, Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism, 685.


78 As quoted in Bientenhard, "ὁνόμα," 246.


80 Ibid., 22.

81 Ibid., 30.

82 Ibid., 28.

83 Examples are cited in Schmidt, Die Bedeutung des Namens, 22.
SPECIFIC FEATURES OF GRECO-ROMAN MAGIC

Despite an undeniable divergence in some details within magical praxis from the Hellenistic and Imperial eras there are in my judgment certain recognizable traits that attain such currency of usage that a remarkable consensus of utilization is obtained.\(^{84}\) I shall first introduce a representative sample from the PGM that amply demonstrates the power of numinous names in magical incantations. This will serve only as a general introduction to the non-literary material with which I will be interacting, as well help the reader to see the typical beliefs which gave birth to Greco-Roman magic. Thereafter, I will review the various magical precepts concerning numinous names in their respective categories, first in light of the literary evidence, followed by the light shed by non-literary sources. I shall be looking to establish the twelve points that I have already outlined briefly above.

Perhaps the best place to begin is with a perusal of the Hellenistic magical text known as The Eighth Book of Moses Concerning the Holy Name (PGM XIII. 1-720), for it well encapsulates many salient features of Greco-Roman magic.\(^{85}\) Its comprehensive treatment of many magical beliefs will hopefully deliver a finer-grained portrait of magical praxis. Fortuitously, almost every detail is coated in the amber of tradition. While its provenance is unknown\(^{86}\) the magical text (and its intercalated paean to the gods) instructs the initiate about the accoutrements of magical praxis. Pivotal in this text is the position placed upon the names of the gods in obtaining compliance with the supplicant’s requests. Indeed, even the incipit concerns itself with knowledge about the holy Name. The Name itself is all encompassing (345-346), and is worthy to be hymned (637), as even the Muses do (788-789). And, in a recurrent motif quite at

---

\(^{84}\)Certainly there is a conservatism or stasis at work in magic despite its well-documented tendency towards syncretism. Thus, words and names seem to have always played a central role. For a more through exposition on this matter see John M. Hull, Hellenistic Magic and the Synoptic Tradition (London: SCM Press, 1974), 20-27 and Arnold, Colossians, 19-20.

\(^{85}\)The heavily Semitic nature of this spell tempts one to assign this text to a Jewish provenance. However, as noted by both Goodenough and Nock, Semitic features are so prominent in almost all magical texts that there is no reliable criterion for determining the actual provenance of this text. Moreover, the text was preserved in a pagan collection which demonstrates that, irrespective of its original provenance, this text resonated with the non-Jewish conventicle which preserved the text. Since this is the only assured datum point that can be secured, I believe that caution mandates that this text be allotted with our section on Hellenistic magic. For further details on these particulars see John G. Gager, Moses in Greco-Roman Paganism (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1972), 135-36.

home in the *PGM*, the true name of the god is indispensable for success (622). In addition, the various other magical names in the text are described as great (53; 183; 505), holy (183; 505), glorious (183; 505), and fearsome (505).

The zenith of this commerce of the divine is the reception of the Name from the god (210-212; indeed obtaining knowledge of the name of the god was highly coveted; cf. LXXI.7-8), and the practitioner was solemnly charged to keep the Name secret (755). Furthermore, the members within the conventicle also kept the power of the Name in trust (740-742). With the Name any request is rendered possible. Whether one desires invisibility (235-237), the securing of a lover (238), the driving away of demons (243), to bring about a healing (247), or to ward off imprecations directed toward the practitioner—simply wear the Name inscribed upon papyrus around your person (253). The various names are able to fulfill these requests because they are powerful (460-462).

This text allows us to see the central role which divine names usually played in Greco-Roman magic. With this general introduction behind us, I shall now delve into the various specifics of the magical name-concept in Greco-Roman magic and religion.

Within the economy of the divine the names of the gods or their principal agents were often construed as being the principal medium of exchange between mankind and the divine, for names carried numinous, apotropaic, and even divine attributes. This is clearly demonstrated to be the commonplace reality of Hellenistic magic, and magic itself was an integral aspect of Greco-Roman society in the Hellenistic and Imperial Era. As Clement, in his *Stromata* (II.1) notes, the Greeks were quite enamored with magic:

We must also treat of what is called the curriculum of study—how far it is serviceable; and of astrology, and mathematics, and magic and sorcery. For all these the Greeks boast as the highest sciences.

---

87 This claim that spurious names are less desirable than "authentic" names is echoed in *PGM* V.115-120; IX.14; XII.92-94; *PDM* xii. 112-118.


89 An interesting statistic which underscores the prominence of the name-concept in Hellenistic magic is that the word ὄνομα occurs approximately 400 times in Preisendanz's registry of terms for the *PGM*. 25
A fitting companion statement is found in Psellus', *On Demons according to the Dogma of the Greeks*, where it states that "magic according to the Greeks is a thing of very powerful nature for they say that it forms the last part of the sacred sciences (ἱερατικὰς ἐπιστήμους)."\(^{90}\)

As the evidence stands, it appears that its reach extended into every nation and culture, irrespective of whether any nation or group had even established contacts with one another, as Pliny's comments demonstrate:

Certainly Pythagoras, Empedocles, Democritus, and Plato went overseas to learn it [magic],...taught it openly upon their return and considered it one of their most treasured secrets...So universal is the cult of magic throughout the world, although its nations disagree or are not known to one another.\(^{91}\)

Two points clearly emerge: first, those who trafficked in such elements did not acknowledge any national or geographic barriers when it came to plying their trade. And secondly, the constituent elements of magic were so readily grasped intuitively that its form, though variegated in part, was liable to convergence even in minute elements of both ritual and belief.

Foremost among these common elements is the invocation of the names of the gods to facilitate preternatural activity.\(^{92}\) This commonplace has two major facets: first, the preponderance of Hellenistic (and Late Antique) incantational texts maintain that by means of proper invocation (i.e., utilizing an often confusing pastiche of names of various gods)-that is, knowing the 'true' name of the god, the theurgist could mediate a positive response. Indeed, such incantations could even coerce the gods.\(^{93}\) Clearly, proper invocation was predicated in Hellenistic times upon the widely held premise that names were magical and numinous, not just personal signifiers of their respective bearers.

---


\(^{91}\) *NH* 30.2. 8-9; 4.13. As an indicator of the antiquity of magical arts in Greece Pliny states that Homer reports that Ulysses used an invocation to place in abeyance a hemorrhage that resulted from a blow to his thigh. Actually, it was the sons of Autolyces who performed the invocation on Odysseus, but Pliny's point remains well taken. See the *Odyssey* 19, 457.

\(^{92}\) The concept that the gods could be 'called down' by invocation has a long and storied pedigree. For examples see Livy 1.20 and Ovid *Fast*. 3.321.

\(^{93}\) Also the thrice-repeated ritual invocation of the name of a deceased person could effect this force over the gods. Several examples of this phenomenon are cited in Schmidt, *Die Bedeutung des Namens*, 36-37.
Put in other terms, the issue was as much one concerning the medium of invocation (i.e.,
the use of the correct numinous names) as it was an issue of engendering *sympathea* with the
god, or at least recognition, through strict adherence to magical rites. Another aspect was the
belief in the efficacy of *nomina barbara* (foreign and unintelligible words, as well as foreign
names of the gods),94 which were enhanced if they were employed in strictly recited formulas
(*συνθήματα*), or spells (*ἐπωδαί*).95 I shall have more to say concerning this matter at a later
stage in this survey.

In concert with my first point I should note that divine names themselves were often seen
as having power over the gods. To unveil this belief in numinous names I note the narrative of
Lucian (ca. 150), that prominent cynic of the supernatural realm, who in his *ΦΙΛΟΠΕΙΔΗΣ Η
ΑΠΙΣΤΩΝ* (otherwise known by its Latin title, *Philopseudes sive Incredulus*) plays the
protagonist for the materialistic view when he castigates Deiomachus for being mendacious and
believing the commonplace, viz., that names have supernatural power over illness. In his
narrative concerning the curing of an illness Lucian challenges Deiomachus to prove that this
accepted premise is more than simple superstition in the following manner (9):

If...you do not first convince me by logical proof that it takes place in this way naturally,
because the fever or the inflammation is afraid of a holy name [ὦνομα θεσπεστον; emphasis mine] or a foreign phrase [ῥησιν υπερβαρικην] and so takes flight from the
swelling...

Deiomachus for his part protests against such unbelieving effrontery and replies (10):

It seems to me that when you talk like that you do not believe in the gods either, since
you do not think that cures are effected through holy names (ἱερων ὄνοματων).

Lucian, in purposeful parody of what he believes the ignorant masses should be disabused of,
viz. superstition, yields another story through his fictitious interlocutor Ion (who supports the

94The origin of these foreign names is still a contested issue. Versnel suggests that they may be corruptions
of the *Ephesia Grammata* which later became construed as being foreign names. As this development progressed
other names were eventually added. See Hendrik S. Versnel “Die Poetik der Zaubersprüche,” in *Die Macht des

95The importance of accurately pronouncing the formula and names, as well as following the exact
prescript, is seen most clearly in the great demotic magical papyrus, where over the lines of the *nomina barbara* and
the *voce magicae* we find written out the phonetically exact Greek letters in order to guide the theurgist in the
correct pronunciation. I am indebted here to Kákosy’s book, which mentions this fact. See László Kákosy, *Zauberer
im alten Ägypten*, trans. from the Hungarian by Eszter Szobol and Ilidikó Derzs, (Leipzig: Kohler & Amelang,
1989), 121.
received position on these things). Ion has just finished recounting one miraculous tale and now he unravels another concerning a Babylonian who had called out all the snakes from a farm (12):

Perhaps this is nothing out of the common [supernatural events];...But the Babylonian did other things that are truly miraculous. Going to the farm in the early morning, he repeated seven sacred names (παλαιὸς δύσματα ἐπτὰ καὶ θείω) out of an old book...going about three times and called out all the reptiles that were inside the boundaries. They came as if they were being drawn in response to the spell...

Even some Christians were in agreement, as Origen, in an illuminating discourse on the divine power resident in names, tells us in his C. Cels. (I.24):

If, then we shall be able to establish...the nature of powerful names, some of which are used by the learned among the Egyptians, or by the Magi among the Persians, and by the Indian philosophers called Brahmins, or by the Samanaeans...and [we] shall be able to make out that the so-called magic is not, as followers of Epicurus and Aristotle suppose, an altogether uncertain thing, but is, as those skilled in it prove, a consistent system, having words which are known to exceedingly few; then we say that the name's Sabaoth and Adonai...are not applicable to any ordinary created thing, but belong to a secret theology which refers to the Framed & all things. These names, accordingly, when announced with that attendant train of circumstances which is appropriate to their nature, are possessed of great power [emphasis mine]; and other names, again, current in the Egyptian tongue, are efficacious against certain demons who can only do certain things; and other names in the Persian language have corresponding power over other spirits; and so on in every individual nation, for different purposes. And thus it will be found, that, of the various demons upon the earth, to whom different localities have been assigned, each one bears a name appropriate to the several dialects of place and country.

Origen takes up this same line of reasoning in order to create a more persuasive polemical argument which would deal in a more comprehensive manner with the Christian injunction which prohibited Christians from applying the names of the Greco-Roman gods to either YHWH or Jesus. Origen, in his revealing rejoinder to Celsus (C. Cels. V.45), observes concerning the numinous nature of divine names:

And now we maintain that the nature of names is not, as Aristotle supposes an enactment of those who impose them. For the languages which are prevalent among men do not derive their origin from man, as is evident to those who are able to ascertain the nature of charms which are appropriated by the inventors of the languages differently according to the various tongues, and to the varying pronunciations of the names of which we have spoken briefly in the preceding pages, remarking that when those names which in a certain language possessed of a natural power were translated into another language, they were no longer able to accomplish what they did before when uttered in their native tongue...if anyone either in an invocation or in swearing an oath, were to use the expression, 'the God of Abraham,' and 'the God of Isaac,' and, 'the God of Jacob,' he would produce certain effects, either owing to the nature of these names or to their
powers, since even the demons are vanquished and become submissive to him who pronounces these names [emphasis mine], whereas if we say, “the god of the chosen father of the echo...the mention of the name is attended with no result, as is the case with other names possessed of no power...

The non-literary evidence also abundantly supports this view of divine names as numinous agents. To begin I cite PGM XIII.735-740, where the mentor instructs his pupil to:

Take, child, for this personal vision, [a list of the gods] ...and the seven-letter name...which [name] is great and marvelous, as it is what brings alive all your books.

Further evidence of this phenomenon is found in a ca. third century C.E. defixio, unearthed near Oxyrhynchos, where there is this adjuration in the malediction:

I adjure you spirit of the dead man, Antinoos, by the Name that causes fear and trembling, the Name at whose sound the earth opens, the Name at whose terrifying sound the spirits are terrified, the Name at whose sound rivers and rocks burst asunder.96

Another notable malediction, which was exhumed near Carthage in North Africa, and dates to approximately the third century C.E. has the defigens of this imprecation state that:

I bind you AÔABAÔTH, the god of this day in which I bind you. I bind you ISOS [Jesus ?], the god who has power over this hour in which I bind you...I utter to you the true Name that shakes Tartarus, earth, the deeps, and the heaven...97

Finally, in a consecration for an Eros statue (PGM XII.84-85; Eros functions here as a πάρεδρος) the claim is made that the entire cosmos is subject to the great name which the petitioner invokes. “I conjure you by the [holy] and precious name to which all creation is subject.”98

On this showing it is now possible to take up my earlier contention that the knowledge and utilization of the names of the gods could be used to control them. My first witness comes from Eusebius, where he takes as his fount of knowledge certain statements made by Porphyry


97Ibid., 63. I cannot help but speculate whether the early practice of inscribing the name of the god on the outside of the tablet in purposeful imitation of addressed correspondence may have helped facilitate the emphasis on the role of divine names in Greco-Roman magic, especially in the development of κατάδεσμου. Faraone cites an excellent Attic example of this sort of tablet. See Christopher A. Faraone, “The Agonistic Context of Early Greek Binding Spells,” in Magika Hiera: Ancient Greek Magic & Religion, eds. Christopher A. Faraone and Dirk Obbink, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 4.

98Original text is as follows: ὀρκίζω σὲ κατὰ τοῦ (ἄγιου) καὶ καὶ ἐπίτιμου ὄνοματός, ὥ ἢ πάσα κτίσις [ὑ]ποκείται πασίχθων.
about the beliefs of Pythagoras concerning the gods. The topic at hand was the effect of incantations on the gods. Eusebius quotes Porphyry to the effect that:

This is also rightly declared by Pythagoras of Rhodes, that the gods who are invoked over the sacrifices have no pleasure therein, but come because they are dragged by a certain necessity...For as Pythagoras had made these statements, I learned by close observation of the oracles, how true his words are. For all the gods say that they have come by compulsion...For they give out answers for their own compulsion, as will be shown by Apollo’s answer as to [the] means of compelling him. It is expressed thus: “Strong to compel and weighty is this name.”

And he adds further that “…what utterly perplexes me is, how, though invoked as superiors, they [i.e., the gods] receive orders as inferiors.”

That divine names could serve as instruments in Hellenistic magic can also readily be observed in a variety of non-literary incantation texts. For the votary the knowledge of the name of the divinity granted access into the portals of the numinous realm where they could obtain the answers to their needs. For example, in PGM XII.116-120 (cf. I.205-215; PGM IV.1747-1820, 3270-71) the theurgist implores the god to:

Hear me, because I am going to say the great name, AÔTH, before whom every god prostrates himself and every demon shudders, for whom every angel completes those things which are assigned...

In addition to what has already been catalogued I add PGM VII. 691 (third century C.E.), where the supplicant reveals his confidence that his request will be heeded:

Because I call upon you with your holy names [ἐπικαλοῦμαι σε τοὺς ἁγίους σου ὁνόμασιν] at which your deity rejoices, names which you are not able to ignore...

Yet again the theme of controlling a numinous being by knowing and invoking its name is found in PGM IV. 1530-1535 (a ca. second century C.E. φίλτρον):

[incipit with instructions] While offering it over coals recite the spell....[various requests concerning a girl]. And remain in her heart and burn in her guts, breasts and liver...because I adjure you, Myrrh, by three names [invocation of the names], and by the more coercive and stronger names KORMEIOTH IAO SABAOTH ADONAI so that you may carry out my orders, Myrrh.

And PGM XIII.753 again certifies the binding power of divine names, where we read:

---

99 Praep. evang., 5.8, a, b, c.

100Praep. evang. 5.10, d. Proclus, in line with other Neo-Platonic philosophers, also held to this view. Divine names were a type of σύμβολα that could be used to call up the gods (e.g. In Cra., 31:4, 31:25). In fact Proclus preferred the so-called διάτηρα ὀνόματα—the names of demons—which were more effective in moving the gods for these beings stood in closer relationship to the gods than mankind and their names were therefore better than the common human names for the gods. See In Cra., 32.13.
There are also prefaced four other names...And for the compulsive spell you should use the great Name which is Ogdoas,¹⁰¹ the god who directs all things throughout the universe...

In addition, the supplicant believed that he or she could compel compliance of the gods by knowing not only the names of the gods but also their sigla and accoutrements (*PGM* III. 494-500):

Come to me...air traversing great god. Hear me in every ritual which [I perform], and grant all the [petitions] of my prayer completely, because I know your signs / forms, who you are each hour and what your name is.

Finally, I cite *PGM* VII. 893-894, where the adept declares,

...send forth your angel from among those who assist you...because I adjure [you] by your great names, because of which no aerial or infernal daimon can ignore you.

There can be no equivocation that these texts witness to the notion that anyone making an entreaty expected that by calling upon the ‘great and mighty names of the gods’ they were compelling the gods to become responsive.

We see here that the key phrase “because I call on your true name(s)” is indicative of the belief that the gods could not ignore the invocation for their numinous names had been invoked and consequently they were drawn to the petitioner to do his bidding. Traces of this belief are found all over the *PGM* and attest to its centrality.¹⁰² In light of this evidence I shall end this first section by drawing attention to Hopfner’s instructive assessment which merits citation:

Der Gott selbst hört entweder seinen wahren und geheimen Namen gerne und erfüllt dann gerne und freiwillig das Gebet, oder er tut das auch gegen seinen Willen, da er muß, denn dieser Name ist ein Zwangsname.¹⁰³

In addressing my second point, viz., whether divine names were considered discrete from the divinity, careful examination of non-literary materials is called for, especially given the claims of Hopfner on this matter. I shall look to answer the following question: was the name of a divine being sometimes viewed as existing apart, or acting independently from, the god or goddess and was it an instrument of supernatural activity?

---

¹⁰¹ The formal name ‘Ogdoas’ here connotes a set of eight Egyptian gods which exemplified a sort of yin-yang, male-female, primordial principle. Later, in Gnostic thought, the Ogdoas represented the final ‘perfect’ heaven (one step beyond the fabled seven heavens of the normal cosmos), a destination for enlightened Gnostics. See Betz, *Greek Magical Papyrus in Translation*, 189 fn. 112.

¹⁰² See for example IV.870-875, 1535-1540, 1810; V.3267-3272 and XXXVI.346-350.

¹⁰³ Hopfner, “Mageia,” 336. See also GAOZ § 688.
One criterion, first proposed by Hopfner, is that when a numinous name appears to have been conceived as being restricted to a specific geographical area then we must, perforce, be open to the notion that the numinous name was believed to be a discrete physical entity.

Even more compelling is Hopfner's second proposed criterion, which maintained that when a divine name is appealed to directly to carry out the petition of the practitioner, as opposed to simply using the name to call up the divinity, this then demonstrates its 'hypostatic' nature (my terminology). To answer whether such criteria apply to Greco-Roman magic I must again consult the texts of the *PGM*.

With respect to Hopfner’s second criterion I take up the two texts (*PGM* IV.1190 and VII.388, a charm for love) that Hopfner cites to support his view. Both are cited here:

I adjure you, holy names of Cypris, that, if you descend into the innermost part of her,...make her love [me].

And,

You are the holy and powerful name considered sacred by all the angels; protect me...from every excess of power and every violent act. (IV. 1180-1193)\(^\text{104}\)

In my own review of the primary sources I have been able to locate other examples of this phenomenon. For example, the adepts in *PGM* XII.132-137 and XIII.997-1003 sound similar views, where in the first example it reads:

O sacred names of the god, listen to me—you also, O Good Daimon...listen to me: go to him, NN, into his house, where he sleeps, into his bedroom, and stand beside him, causing fear and trembling, by using the great and mighty names of the gods.

And,

The great Name, that in Jerusalem, by which they bring out water when there is none in the cistern: ACHME IEOE IEOE IARABBIAO YCHRABIAOA, do the NN thing.... unutterable Name of the great god [δύναμις ἄφθεγκτον μεγάλου θεοῦ].

The catholicity of this magical belief is again demonstrated in *PGM* C1.51-3 (cf. *PGM* 1190-1193; VII 496-502), where the supplicant calls upon:

You, these holy names and these powers, confirm and carry out this perfect enchantment; immediately, immediately; quickly; quickly.

In addition, a *defixio* from the fourth century C.E. binds an adversary through this oath, “I place an oath on you by the names of the all-seeing god.... You holy names and powers, be strong and carry out this perfect spell. Now. Now. Quickly. Quickly.”\(^\text{105}\)

\(^{104}\text{Cf. VII.495-504.}\)
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Lastly, but of particular interest, is the spell from Hadrumentum (ca. third century C.E.).\textsuperscript{106} The primary interest here is that it is the Tetragrammaton itself which is directly invoked. The text reads: ὁρκίζω σε τῷ ἀγίῳ ὄνομα ὁ θεό λέγεται.\textsuperscript{107} All of these examples lend credence to Hopfner’s conjecture. In my estimation, these texts encourage our acceptance of Hopfner’s criterion for identifying a ‘true’ hypostasis from exaggerated rhetorical flourishes.

As for Hopfner’s first criterion, that at times divine names seem to be viewed as occupying specific geographic areas or space, there are several examples which seem to attest to this phenomenon. In \textit{PGM} VIII.6-10 the aspirant prays, “[come] to me NN, lord Hermes, and give me favor... beauty of face, strength of all men and women. Your names in heaven: [voce\textit{s magicae} follow]. These are the [names] in the 4 quarters of heaven.” And in \textit{PGM} XXXVI.165-169, the petitioner claims that he should receive protection, “because I glorify your sacred and honored names, which are in heaven.”\textsuperscript{108} Another example is found in the \textit{Papyri Osloenses} (1.177) where we read, “...muzzle the mouths which speak against me because I glorify your holy and glorious names which are in heaven.”\textsuperscript{109}

With respect to Hopfner’s claims what is not readily clear in these latter examples is whether we are encountering merely rhetorical flourishes in these texts or a true enshrinement of the name as a sort of discrete entity. While it is tempting to negotiate away this evidence I think we must resist any such effort. I base my own favorable judgment on this matter primarily in light of the phenomenon which we have witnessed where we see the theurgists addressing the name itself rather then utilizing the name to call down the deity. I find this criterion particularly weighty and feel that even a cautious reading of the papyri proves to be highly suggestive. The criterion of ‘discrete localization’ (for lack of a better term) is perhaps less compelling than Hopfner’s other criterion, but still suggestive. Whatever else may be said, these texts testify to

\textsuperscript{106}Ibid., 104; cf. the almost identical statement in \textit{PGM} C.5-6.

\textsuperscript{107}John G. Gagner, \textit{Curse Tablets and Binding Spells}, 112.

\textsuperscript{108}Presumably YHWH is meant in light of the incipit which invokes the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob and the fact that in the preceding line the Name is described as that ὁ θεό λέγεται. As quoted in Hopfner, \textit{GAOZ} § 704, who in turn draws from Wünsch “Antike Fluchtafeln,” 23 and the scholia for line 20.

\textsuperscript{109}There are other examples in the \textit{PGM}, such as \textit{PDM} xiv.252. Also Hopfner’s work contains several other examples. See \textit{GAOZ}, § 693.

\textsuperscript{109}As quoted in S. Eitrem, \textit{Papyri Osloenses Fasc. I, Magical Papyri} (Oslo: Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademii 1 Oslo, 1925), 27.
the belief that certain names were stronger than others and that correspondingly these names were always to be preferred, for they gave the theurgists the necessary leverage in helping to move the gods.

With respect to my fourth point given earlier in the outline I shall now revisit the claim in these texts that the supplicant could only purchase divine interaction by adjuring the divinity by its (conventionalized) magical name(s), the so-called voces magicae. These often consisted of invoking nomina barbara (foreign non-Greek names of divine beings) while implementing incantations, a practice which may, interestingly, predate Greco-Roman usage. In any case, numerous examples can be culled from Greco-Roman sources.

One example comes from Apuleius’ Apologia (38); a spirited and erudite self-defense against the charge brought by Aemilianus that he was a magician. More expressly, the objection was that he had bewitched a wealthy, older woman into marrying him. In the narrative Apuleius is called upon to defend himself against a seeming preoccupation with fishes. The fish enter into his trial because fish were believed by some to have magical properties and by extension, Apuleius’ interest in them demanded an explanation. Apuleius goes on to explain to his judge Maximus Claudius that his interest was intellectual only and that he stands in the same ichthyologic tradition of study as Aristotle, Theophrastus, and other successors of Plato, all of whom had written treaties on animal anatomy and habits. Apuleius then enters into a discussion on the various classes of fish known to him, but equally unknown to his judges and accuser.

---

110 For the interested reader I note here the work of Versnel which discusses the various functions of the voces magicae. See Versnel, “Die Poetik der Zaubsprüche.”

111 The nomina barbara first appear during Classical times. Euripides, in his Iphigenia among the Taurians (1336ff.), mentions that Iphigenia, while preparing the sacrifices of Orestes, “shouted out barbarous words, as a true witch.” It is worth noting that with the possible exception of the Ephesia Grammata, only at the advent of the Christian Era do the voces magicae and various nomina barbara appear en masse. In contrast, reliance upon divine names appears to begin just prior to the Christian era. For example, in our two oldest magical papyri (XL, third century B.C.E. and XX, ca. 200 B.C.E.) we find no use of numinous names. By the time of the production of CXXII (PGM VIII and first century B.C.E.) the recipes are already flush with divine names. On the voces magicae see William Brashear, “The Greek Magical Papyri,” 3430.

113 It may be that several passages, in an interesting presaging of the so-called nomina barbara (foreign unintelligible divine names), found in several pyramid texts already contain untranslatable words—something also found in the Book of the Dead (chapters 163-167). Brashear reports that by the second millennium foreign and bizarre terms were incorporated into both Assyrian and Egyptian magic. It may also be noteworthy that perhaps another early reference to the nomina barbara may be found within the Old Testament itself, at Isa. 8:19, where the prophet decries the claims of wizards by claiming that they “...peep and mutter...”, a possible allusion to utilization of nomina barbara. For more details see Brashear, “The Greek Magical Papyri,” 3429.
Aware that the unintelligible words that he will now use to classify these organisms will be misconstrued as magical terms he puts in a sarcastic dig at his listeners in the following manner, "Listen now to what I am going to say. You will presently [no doubt] cry out, that I am repeating a string of magical terms [lit. names] after the Egyptian or Babylonian custom."\(^{113}\) Further light is also shed by Lucian who also relates that he knew of an apotropaic incantation which consisted of magical names (see Philops. 17).

Indeed, many believed the gods could even be coerced into subservience by these incantations as Hippolytus takes pains to stress:

\(\varepsilon\pi\nu\delta\alpha\iota\varepsilon\varepsilon\xi\omega\sigma\iota\alpha\nu\varepsilon\chi\varepsilon\iota\nu\ \pi\rho\\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\ \kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\iota\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\iota\upsilon\ \tau\omicron\ \alpha\rho\chi\omega\upsilon\tau\omicron\omega\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \pi\omicron\upsilon\iota\tau\omicron\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \tau\omicron\delta\dot{e}\ \tau\omicron\ \kappa\omicron\sigma\nu\iota\omicron\upsilon\).\(^{114}\)

And Pliny the Elder recites the common observation concerning incantations used by some theurgists to coerce the gods in the NH (28.4.6):

> It is not easy to say whether our faith is more violently shaken by foreign, and unpronounceable words, or by the unexpected (lit. peculiar) Latin ones... being always on the look-out for something big, something adequate to move a god, or rather to impose its will on his divinity [emphasis mine].

Another example is delivered by Pausanius who relates the story of a Persian named Lydia who, while in the Temple at Hierocaesarae caused the wood on the Altar to be consumed through "invocation of a divinity and a foreign and completely unintelligible incantation."\(^{115}\)

A further example can be culled from Lucian in his satirical Menippus (9), where Lucian recounts the magical machinations that must accompany Mnemipus if he is to descend successfully into the underworld. Menippus solicits the aid of a magician who, after performing the requisite rituals, divulges the proper incantation to call up the Tormentors and the Furies:

> ‘Hecate [queen of the] dark night, and dread Persephone,’ [and] with a string of other names, foreign, unintelligible, and polysyllabic (βαρβαρικά ονοματα και αστημα και

---

\(^{113}\) Original passage reads: magica nomina Aegyptio vel Babylonico ritu. The translation derives from The Works of Apuleius comprising the Metamorphoses, or Golden Ass; the God of Socrates, the Florida, and the Defense, or a Discourse on magic. A New Translation. To which are added, A Metrical version of Cupid and Psyche, and Mrs. Tighe’s Psyche, a Poem in six cantos. (London: George Bell and Sons, York Street, Covent Gardens, 1878), 286. No translator is cited, but this work comes from the old Bohn’s classical library.

\(^{114}\) Haer., 7.20. “And (they [magicians] are in the habit of invoking the aid of) subordinate demons and dream-senders, and (of resorting to) the rest of the tricks (of sorcery), alleging that they possess power for now acquiring sway over the Archons and makers of this world, nay, even over all the works that are in it.” Translation from Ante-Nicene Fathers. vol. V.

\(^{115}\) Περιηγήματις της Ελλάδος (Description of Greece) 5.27.
As he ended, there was a great commotion, [the] earth was burst open by the incantation...for almost all was now unveiled to us...the lake,...[and] the abode of Pluto.

Lucian reiterates this theme in his Dialogues of the Courtesans (4). In this production, Melitta, the chief figure in the drama, fears that her lover Charinus will desert her. In a desperate attempt to influence the outcome she solicits the aid of Bacchus who may be able to provide her with a magician who knows the proper spell. Lucian describes the anticipated activities of Bacchus’ potential prospect in this fashion, “She picks out a wheel from her bosom and whirls it around, rattling off an incantation full of horrible outlandish names.”

I also note in this context the statement by Xenophon of Ephesus (1.5, in his Τα κατὰ Ἀνθίαν καὶ Αβροκόμιν Ἐφεσιακά: The Ephesian story of Anthia and Habrocomes), who states that after Anthia fell into an incurable depression, her friends Megamedes and Evippe, in an effort to stave off these dark forces:

...fetched soothsayers and holy men [μάγοι καὶ ἱερεῖς]...to find some solution...These busily offered diverse sacrifices...and pronounced certain unintelligible syllables [φωναῖς βαρβαρικάς] in order to appease, as they said, certain demonic forces.116

To this I also append the beliefs of lamblichus, who is also of the opinion that foreign names and secret formulas endow the theurgist with the dynamis of the gods.117

Within the PGM allusions to the primacy and efficacy of nomina barbarav are numerous. I cite here only one example.118 In PGM (VIII.20) an interesting allusion is found to foreign names at the conclusion of the invocation to Hermes, “I know also your foreign names (τὰ βαρβαρικά ὅνόματα) ἡφανναθαρ βαραχήλ Χθα. These are your foreign names.”

116As quoted in Hopflner, GAOZ § 706. The text reads: μάγοι καὶ ἱερεῖς, οἱ δὲ εὐθύνοντα καὶ ἐπέσπευδον καὶ ἐπέλεγον φωναῖς βαρβαρικάς έξειλάσκοντοι λέγοντες δομομας καὶ προσεποίουσι, ὡς εἴη το δεινόν ἐκ τῶν ὑποχθωνίων. Also Heliodorus in his Aethiopica 6.14 speaks of ineffable and foreign names being used in an invocation designed to call up a deceased person.

117De mysteriis 6.6, 7.5. Paradoxically, however, lamblichus, at 2.11, defends the gods as having their own intrinsic power which does not need any initiative from a ‘subordinate’ being to actuate the proper energy. This Janus-faced stance is due to lamblichus’ apologetic intent to defend his conception that the gods have real existence apart from human imagination and belief. For the interested reader I note that another literary example can be found in Hippolytus’ Philosophumena (otherwise known as the Refutation of All Heresies) 4.28.

118Beyond the numerous examples of nomina barbarav various spells speak of utilizing Hebrew to cast the spell correctly. See III.119-120; IV.3085; V.475, among others.
In light of this evidence it may be fairly said that by the Hellenistic Era the use of foreign (esp. Semitic) names as *instrumentum magicum* appears to be a child of the marriage of the religious worlds of the Orientals and the Greeks.\(^{119}\)

This union was made possible by the fact that various Near Eastern languages were thought to be the most ancient, and according to the statements of various authors of antiquity, the original holy languages.\(^{120}\) Add to this the well-known Greek preference for ancient religious teachings and one arrives at the theologoumenon that because the gods had revealed their names in this holy language it only stood to reason that the proper relationship between the god and his or her name could only be maintained when the name was utilized in its original language.\(^{121}\)

From this same premise it also followed that unless the name was pronounced in its original language the connection between the god and its name would be broken, and therefore the name would lose its power to compel the god.\(^{122}\) The belief that the name, in and of itself, was numinous was bolstered by the further belief that these names were derived from a holy language—even the language of the gods.\(^{123}\) Indeed, insofar as the language itself was holy and the divine name had been delivered in this holy language the name, perforce, was also holy and divine.\(^{124}\)


\(^{120}\) As Güntert notes, it may be possible that much of the so-called *nomina barbarar* may have been seen as a type of divine language. In any event, Hopfner correctly states concerning the impact that these foreign names had “Auf skeptischer, nüchterner Veranlagte aber müssen diese barbarisch klingenden unverständlichen und ungeheuerlichen Namen und Formeln einen geradezu entgegengesetzten Eindruck machen.” For Güntert’s views see Güntert, *Von der Sprache der Götter und Geister*, 28. For Hopfner see *GAOZ* § 716.

\(^{121}\)ibid., § 719.

\(^{122}\) Hopfner, *GAOZ* § 718-719.

\(^{123}\) Ibid., § 719. Another example can be drawn from the *Corpus Hermeticum* (16.2), where we encounter the claim that unintelligible words which are spoken in Egyptian are imparted with power. I am indebted to R. Gordon’s article for this reference. See Richard Gordon, “Imagining Greek and Roman Magic,” in *Witchcraft and Magic in Europe: Ancient Greece and Rome*, (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999), 243.

\(^{124}\) Ibid. § 721.
Indeed, one may wish to follow Proclus here and propose that since the gods were also believed to have come from various geographical areas and knew the indigenous language they were more readily eager to respond to those theurgists who invoked them in their native tongue. And it was naturally believed that the demons understood the words for they hailed from that geographic area, and thus, knew the language.  

In this light it is of some interest to note the work of Tambiah, who has demonstrated that foreign words were absorbed into the fabric of magic of many cultures for the primary reason that it was believed that the demons spoke in these foreign phrases and that it would be inappropriate to communicate with them in one’s native tongue.

Finally, the last factor to come into play in forming this belief is that of human psychology. In this case, some listeners believed that they could not understand the name precisely on account of their human frailty. It then followed that the name must be possessed of some extraordinary power which rendered them incapable of apprehending it.

With respect to the point that divine names were divulged through divine revelation, it should be observed that it was a commonplace to view names as acting as revelatory agents of the gods or goddesses, and as such they were capable of revealing the nature, power and rank of the divinity, or so lamblichus avers, “We possess in those divine names, whose meaning we have obtained, the knowledge of the entire divine nature, power, and rank [of the divinity].” This

---

125 Julian the Apostate also subscribed to this belief. According to Adv. Galilaeans (143 A-B) Julian believed that “over each nation is a national god, with an angel acting as its agent, and a demon, and a hero...” This aspect of territoriality of the spirits shall be taken up further in my discussion of the tutelary gods of cities and provinces.


127 This view was endorsed by Clement of Alexandria; see Stromata 1.143.1, and it is also voiced in b. Baba Bathra 134a. For a practical example see PGM IV. 605-610 and VII. 562-3. Two further points of interest remain. First, this concept that divine beings have their own language goes back as far as Homer. And secondly, perhaps glossalia, spoken of in the New Testament (1 Cor. 13:1), also has some points of contact with this phenomenon (i.e., speaking a heavenly language).

128 In fairness it should be observed that not all were enamored with the use of numinous names. Porphyry in his Of the Philosophy to be derived from Oracles (as quoted in Eusebius, Praep. evang. 5.10) provides one example, while Eusebius himself was incredulous on their power. See Praep. evang., 4.1.

129 Myst. 7.4.23. The text reads: έκι τούτου τῆς Θείας φύσεως καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ τάξεως έχομεν δλης έν τῷ δυνάμει τῆν είδησιν. See also Proclus In Cra. 72.8f.
claim that the name conveys the essence of the gods was also relevant for demons, or so the second century C.E. peripatetic philosopher Aspasius contended:

\[
\text{ὅπερ ἐκ τοῦ ὄνοματος δὴ λαλῇ ἡ ἐυδαιμονία καὶ ἡ κακοδαιμονία περιέληται γὰρ ἐν τῷ ὄνοματι ἑκάτερα τῆς μεν τὸ εὖ τῆς δὲ τὸ κακῶς.}^{130}
\]

In some sense this perspective is not at all unexpected for, as we have seen, even the names of the gods were at times seen to be in heaven along with the gods, or for that matter the ineffable names of the gods could even fill the whole cosmos as Proclus has Cratylos state:

\[
Τὰ ἄρρητα ὄνοματα τῶν θεῶν πεπληρωμα τῶν κόσμων. ὥσπερ οἱ θεουργοὶ λέγουσιν. Καὶ οὐ τῶν κόσμων τούτων μόνον ἄλλα καὶ τὰς ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν πάσας δυνάμεις...^{131}
\]

Further aspects of this revelatory belief is seen in the acceptance that invoking the name of the divinity guaranteed its presence in ritual and cultic acts. In part, such beliefs were predicated on the conception that the names of the gods were ἀγάλματα φωνήματα-vocal images (cultic?) of the gods.\(^{133}\)

Another important aspect of this perception was that the true name of the god could only be received by revelation from the god itself. This theologoumenon follows both directly and simply from the prior belief that since the god possessed a ‘true’ name, a name which by definition only the god itself knew, and only the god, therefore, had the power to disclose the name. Lamblichus enlightens his readers on this point when he writes concerning the nomina barbara that:

You ask namely, ‘What really do the meaningless names intend?’ They are not at all meaningless, as you believe...For while it may be that certain of these [names] are for us

---


\(^{131}\) From ad Alcibiades 150. As quoted in Hopfner, GAOZ § 687. Translated: “The secret names of the gods have filled the whole world, as the theurgist say, and not only this world, but also all the powers above it.”


\(^{133}\) So Democritus. Fr. 142 [Diels', I. 170, 9]. As quoted in Bietenhard, “ὕμνοι,” 249. It should be noted that Bietenhard prefers the translation of “speaking statues.” Interesting Von Rad, when discussing the name of YHWH states that “er [the name of God] nimmt theologische die Stelle ein, an der sich in anderen Kulten das Kultusbild befindet.” See Gerhard Von Rad, Theologie des Alten Testaments. Band I. Die Theologie der geschichtlichen Überlieferungen Israels (Münich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1962), 196.
humans non-understandable....others however are for us understandable, whose interpretation (and significance) we have received from the gods themselves...

Likewise Proclus also asserts that mankind had, through the gods themselves, received the secret names of the gods as he states in his In Cra. 72:8, 122 and In Ti. III 32:18. And moreover he states that these secret names served as a symbolon for the divinity itself (In Cra. 31:4, 25; In Ti. I.211, 1). Proclus states that:

\[ \text{kai theou estin onymata paraedomevna para tois theolopoulos, ois i otheoi ta pergymata kaloudin, all oukie damionwv monon, ta gar dromena ev tois mystiriou ois autois estin toous theous all ouk eis toous ezerthmenous auton daimonas.} \]

It is clear that examples of this belief abound in the PGM as well as virtually all other magical texts from the era of my concern as close inspection of these texts demonstrates. I cite here several texts in support of this conclusion.

For example, the devotee responsible for PGM II. 125-130 (cf. PGM I.160; PGM XII.92-95; PGM XIII.210-211) introduces himself to the god with the following claim, “I am he, NN, who have presented myself to you, and you have given me as a gift the knowledge of your most great name…” In PGM III.155-160 the theurgist introduces himself to the divinity in a similar fashion and states, “I am he whom you met and [to whom] you granted knowledge and holy utterance of your greatest name, by which you control the whole inhabited world…”

These texts witness to the fact that the impartation of the ‘true’ name of the god was attributable to nothing other than divine revelation.

As an aside, it is not without interest to note that this sort of revelatory act extended even to the impartation of rites and incantations as PGM III.438-442 shows (cf. Proclus’ statement in In Cra. 122). In this text the adept imputes to one Manethon (presumably the one and same Egyptian priest who was instrumental in the founding of the cult of Sarapis) the receiving of the magical procedure discussed in the text as a gift from the god. He states that, “A procedure greater than this one does not exist. It has been tested by Manethon, [who] received [it] as a gift from the god Osiris…”

Another area of import to my analysis is the various cultic expressions and acts that we find directed toward numinous divine names. For example, according to PGM I.206 the divine name is said to have been “consecrated by all the angels.” In PGM III.591-595 the devote offers

\[ ^{134} \text{Myst. 7.4-5.} \]
this paean, “We give you thanks with every soul and heart stretched out to [you], unutterable name honoured with [the] appellation god...” Other expressions bound up with divine names are found in PGM XII.256, where the divine numinous name is said to be “hymned” by the angels (cf. XIII.636-637). In PGM XIII.788-789 and XXI. 15-16 the Muses are said to sing out and praise the glorious name. To this it may be added that numinous divine names are said to be glorified in PGM XXXVI.166, as well as blessed in PGM XI.VIII.12-13.

With regard to the import of knowing the ‘true’ name in invoking the gods it is worthy of note that this belief is intimated at least as far back as the time of Plato, where in his Cratylus (71), we find the claim that the names of the gods were secret.¹³⁵

Later witnesses, such as Lucan (first century C.E.), also shed some illumination on this belief. In his epic work on the Roman civil war (the sixth book of De bello civili 6.438-830, otherwise known as the Pharsalia) he relates how Sextus Pompeius consulted a Thessalian witch named Erichtho in order to perform an incantation for him to carry out a necromantic procedure. At stake was the foreknowledge of the outcome of the battle of Pharsalia. At first she invokes Eumenides, and thereafter, chthonic deities such as Persephone. But most interestingly after what appeared to be a dilatory response she threatens to summon the Furies by their “real names.”

Further exposition on this matter can be found in Lactantius, who points out that reference to the ‘true’ names of the gods can be multiplied many times when magical texts are consulted. Lactantius maintains that:

But the magicians, and those whom the people truly call enchanters, when they practice their detestable arts, call upon them (i.e., the spirits) by their true names, those heavenly names which are read in the sacred writings.¹³⁶

This concept naturally also extended to tutelary deities. Perhaps the most interesting aspect of this belief is seen in the fact that the names of the tutelary deities merited classification as military weapons worthy of being kept secret from any enemy. While the practice appears to

¹³⁵ This claim of course implies that a petitioner must find out this secret name in order to invoke the divinity.

¹³⁶ Divinae institutiones 2.17. Along these lines see for example PGM IV.280; VIII.42-45; IX.14; XXXIIa.25; PDM xii.115,121-122; and xiv.218 to cite but a few.
date back to the Babylonian and Assyrians. my interest lies in its practice as evidenced in the Greco-Roman world. For example, Servius (Marius), in his commentary on Virgil, informs us that the true name of the god who guarded the city of Rome was kept secret in order to prohibit the intervention of any antagonist against Rome through evocatio of the patron deity of the city.

Pliny also affirms this use of the power of the true name when used in evocatio against an enemy city:

Verrius Flaccus cites trustworthy authorities to show that it was the custom, at the very beginning of a siege, for the Roman priests to call forth the divinity under whose protection the besieged town was. Down to the present day this ritual has remained part of the doctrine of the Pontiffs, and it is certain that the reason why the [authentic name of] the tutelary deity of Rome has been kept secret is to prevent any enemy from acting in a similar way. There is indeed nobody who does not fear to be spellbound by imprecations.

Further Pliny also relates a story about Valerius Soranus who was purportedly crucified for disclosing the secret name of the Roman Schutzgöttles. That the Roman estimation of the value of true and numinous names of the tutelary gods gained currency in the Greek world is vouchsafed by this comment from Plutarch, in a narrative dependant upon Pliny’s report. The narrative states:

---

137 So Fossey, Magic, 58, 95-96. As quoted in Hopfinger, GAOZ § 697. In addition, Clodd mentions that Alexander the Great received in a dream the name of the tutelary deity who protected Tyre. See Edward Clodd, Magic in Names and Other Things (London: Chapman and Hall, 1920), 135.


139 HN 28.4.18-9.

140 Ibid., 3. 65, “...and besides all these Rome itself, whose other name [its secret ‘true’ name] it is held to be a sin to utter except at the ceremonies of the mysteries, and when Valerius Soranus divulged the secret religiously kept for the general protection and well being of the state, he soon paid the penalty. It seems pertinent to add at this point an instance of old religion established especially to inculcate this silence; the goddess Angerona, [who] is represented in her statue with a sealed bandage over her mouth.” For further information see Angelo Brelich, Die Geheime Schutzgottheit von Rom (Zurich: Rhein-Verlag, 1949) and V. Basanoff, EVOCATIO: Étude d’un Rituël Militaire Romain (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1947). For the interested reader it should be noted that Brelich occupies himself with particular cults and divinities which were involved in this concept and other related issues. Regrettably he does not take up the theme of numinous names in Greco-Roman religion, or the function and role of evocatio in cultic rituals. For this one must turn to Basanoff whose work is profitable in this respect.
Why is it forbidden to mention or to inquire after or to call by name that deity, whether it be male or female, whose especial province is to protect and watch over Rome? This prohibition...they connect with Valerius Soranus [who] came to an evil end because he revealed the name. It is because, as certain Roman writers have recorded, there are certain evocations and enchantments affecting the gods, by which the Romans also believed that certain gods had been called forth from their enemies...and that they were afraid of having the same thing done to them.141

Similarly, Macrobius, drawing upon a report from Sammonicus Serenus, states Furias possessed “a song, by means of which the gods are called out, when the city is surrounded.” Furias, it was said, reserved this song for the last siege of Carthage.142 Further on in his narrative, Macrobius, taking as his point of departure the line from Virgil’s Aeneid (2.351), which reads “Gone forth are all the gods by whose aid this realm once stood,” then goes on to explain the origin and custom of the Romans that the name of the Schutzgottes was to be enveloped in the utmost secrecy. He says:

The reference here is to a Roman custom of the greatest antiquity and to rites of the greatest secrecy. For it is well known that every city is under the protection of some deity, and it is an established fact that it was the custom of the Romans (a secret custom and one unknown to many) by means of a prescribed formula [by invoking a name] to call forth the tutelary deities of an enemy city which they were besieging...That is why the Romans, for their part, were careful to see to it that the tutelary god of the city of Rome [i.e., its name] and the Latin name of the city should not be known. [emphasis mine]...But even the most learned of men do not know the name of the city, for the Romans took care that an enemy should not do to them what, as they well knew, they had often done to enemy cities and call forth the divine protector of Rome, if the [true] name was revealed (si tutelae suae nomen divulgaretur). [emphasis mine].143

Not without further interest is the claim made by both Lydus,144 and Macrobius,145 that the city of Rome had three names. Following Lydus we find that one name was secret (τελεστικῶν), the second a holy name (ἱερατικῶν ὄνομα), and the third a political name (πολιτικῶν ὄνομα). According to Lydus Rome’s secret name was Σφως, which as Hopfner

141 Moralia, Quaestiones Romanae 278-9.
143 Ibid.
144 De mensibus 4.73.
145 Sat. 3.9.2/9.
has observed is the same as the Latin word for love (i.e., amor), which when spelled backwards produces Roma. As for Macrobius he claims that various experts in Roman history were in disagreement over what the name of the tutelary divinity was but he notes that they generally adhered to the following conjectures: Jupiter, Luna, Angerona or Ops Consivia (the god of sowing, lit. personified Abundance).

Macrobius also states that there were in effect two formulae, one formula (a carmen) was for calling out the tutelary deity, the other formula was devoted to ensuring the destruction of the enemy troops. For this latter formula Macrobius cites the Fifth Book of Sammonicus Serenus’ Res reconditae and cites the author to the effect that (9-10):

Cities and armies, on the other hand, are thus devoted to destruction after the protecting deities have been called forth [evocatis], but only rulers [dictatores] and supreme commanders have the power to use the formula. This belief was in part sparked into life by the further belief that cities were believed to be situated within a magical radius (the pomerium, a wall which delimited an augurally constituted city), where so to speak, the power of the Schützgottes was operative.

Naturally this fear of public disclosure meant that these secret names were to be kept secure in various sacred writings which were kept away from curious eyes. In fact, such conceptions led the Romans to create an indigitamenta, i.e. lit. ‘invoked deities,’ a list of divine names used to call down specific gods on specific occasions.

It is of further interest to note a related aspect, viz., that the priest of Jupiter was forbidden to speak out any names of any articles associated with the underworld (which presumably stood in some sort of relationship with the chthonic deities). On a different tack,

146 See GAOZ § 697-698.

147 See Kurt Latte, Römische Religionsgeschichte (München: C.H. Beck’sche Verlang, 1966), 41. As we shall encounter later on, there are numerous passages in the Old Testament which declare that YHWH resided within the city of Jerusalem. It may be that the origin of this sort of claim resides in a similar tutelary-deity belief as we find in Greco-Roman speculation.

148 Lactantius, Div. inst. 2.16.

149 Pulley, “The Power of Names in Classical Greek Religion,” 19. Indeed, as Latte correctly notes the very word indigiter means to call out the names of the gods. See Römische Religionsgeschichte, 43. For the interested reader consult Varro, who offers in his Antiquitates divinae (14) an example of indigitamenta.

150 Plutarch Quaest. Rom. 109 ff.
Cicero states that no masculine being could be allowed to hear the true name of the good god (Bona Dea).\(^\text{151}\)

In point of fact, even knowledge of the true name of the highest god (maximi Dei) could bring death. Lactantius Placidus mentions an Etruscan who once evoked a Nymph in order to ascertain the true name of the god and when he thereafter whispered its ‘true’ name into the ear of one of his contemporaries he immediately expired.\(^\text{152}\) He also relates a story where it is claimed an ox died when it heard the ineffable name of God.\(^\text{153}\) Another example can be found in PGM IV.607-610, where the following invocation is found, “I invoke the immortal names, living and honored, which never pass into mortal nature and are not declared in articulate speech by human tongue…”

These parallels invite comparison with the numerous stories of a similar nature concerning the name of YHWH which we will encounter in the next section on the Semitic name-concept. Although it takes me out of the realm of Greco-Roman magic it is worth observing that in Egypt the secret names of the gods held such power that even their fellow divine beings were occupied in attempting to find out the ‘true’ names of other divinities.\(^\text{154}\)

In light of the data delivered by these authors concerning the Roman Schutzgottes Hopfner’s appreciation of this aspect of Greco-Roman name-mysticism deserves to be noted here. Hopfner states, “Ein solches Name von göttlicher Natur und Kraft, der mit seinem Träger eins ist, ist natürlich geheim und muss auch geheimgehalten werden.”\(^\text{155}\)

With Hopfner’s assessment in mind I shall now turn to non-literary texts such as PGM VII. 1022, where the petitioner is expected to be granted victory because he knows the ‘true’ names of the divinity. That an accurate knowledge of the ‘authentic’ name was important may also be adduced from PGM I.36 where the παραδοσις (i.e., the supernatural assistant of the

\(^{151}\) Cicero, De haruspicium responso 37. As quoted in Schmidt, Die Bedeutung des Namens, 45 fn. 3.

\(^{152}\) Placid. Ad Statius Thebais 4.516.

\(^{153}\) For further details see Stern, Greek and Roman Authors, 683 n. 7.

\(^{154}\) Isis was involved in just such a mission according to an Egyptian legend. For further details see László Kákosy, Zauberei im alten Ägypten, 118. See also Appendix Five.

\(^{155}\) Hopfner, GAOZ § 695.
suppliant, basically a demon or spirit helper) is invoked by recourse to its "authentic name (αὕθεν[τικόν] σου ὄνομα).” ¹⁵⁶

In an interesting charitesion (a charm designed to gain favor) from the early third century C.E. the petitioner states, “If on account of you all beings fear your great name, your great might, give me the good things...If your hidden name has granted favor...give me victory, repute, beauty before all men and before all women.”¹⁵⁷ Texts such as these could lead Heitmüller to state concerning the ‘true’ names of the gods that “…so ist die Kenntnis der wahren N.n [Name's] der Gottheit die Grundlage der „Gnosis“, der Gnosis im höheren Sinn als der Erkenntnis des Wesens Gottes.”¹⁵⁸

Another aspect of name-mysticism was that the names of the gods, as well as demons, were envisioned as being apotropaic. Whether or not this belief originally coalesced around numinous names is uncertain. Plutarch’s comments on the apotropaic use of the Ephesia Grammata¹⁵⁹ may indicate that this theologoumenon was first applied to the Ephesia Grammata and perhaps only at a later date applied to numinous names (i.e., by perhaps the Second or First Century B.C.E.).¹⁶⁰ Of course direct borrowing from Oriental religious practice also remains tenable. In any event, given what appears to us today as an inordinate emphasis upon demons

¹⁵⁶ Other examples of the importance of the true or secret name are given in PGM III. 394-405; PGM XXII.b.20; LXXX.3; XCII. 10; PDM xiv.218; Suppl. 45-6.


¹⁵⁹ Quaestiones convivales 7.5.4 (760e). Plutarch remarks: ῥήτηρ γὰρ οἱ μάγοι τους δειμονιζομένους κελέωσι τὰ Ἐφέστα γράμματα πρὸς αὐτοὺς καταλέγειν καὶ ὄνομαζειν. Additionally, Ogdon reviews the oft-cited fragment from Menander which states that the Ephesia Grammata were used to ward off evil from newly married couples. He also mentions a Cretan amulet from the fourth century B.C.E. which has the Ephesia Grammata inscribed upon it. For further details see Daniel Ogden, “Binding Spells: Curse Tablets and Voodoo Dolls in the Greek and Roman Worlds,” in Witchcraft and Magic in Europe: Ancient Greece and Rome, eds. Bengt Ankarloo and Stuart Clark, (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999), 47, 51.

¹⁶⁰ Of course the Ephesia Grammata may have come to be invoked in apotropaic incantations precisely because its foreign sounding words appear to be nomina barbara. Whatever the case may be, the significance and power of the Ephesia Grammata can be seen in that Pausanias claimed that Artemis had the six terms inscribed on various parts of her body. The passage, which comes from Eustathius’ Od. T 247, runs as follows: οὐκ ἔχεις καὶ οἰνιγματωδῆς ἐπὶ πούδαν καὶ ζώνης καὶ στεφάνης ἐπιγραφαί τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος τὰ τοιαῦτα γράμματα. As quoted in Brashear, “The Greek Magical Papyri,” 3429-3430.
and the like it may prove useful to quickly review the place which demons played in everyday life.

One of the most significant roles which demons played was that they stood between mankind and the gods and served to reveal the divine realm to mankind. This relationship between humans and the divine followed in part both by how the Greco-Roman world viewed the nature of these beings, but also because demons were believed to fill the entire universe. Another significant role which demons played was that they were believed to have advanced knowledge of future events and could convey this knowledge to the theurgist.

Furthermore, it was believed that demons could communicate with humans through dreams and oracles, as well as deliver to mankind the knowledge of various medicinal agents derived from animal and plant sources. Even more important was the belief that demons enabled the magical arts-activators of magical powers as it were. One early witness to this belief is found in Plato’s Symposium 202 D 13, where Plato states that demons stand in an intermediary role between the gods and mankind (καὶ γὰρ πᾶν τὸ δαίμόνιον μεταξὺ ἑστὶν θεοῦ τε καὶ θυτητοῦ). Plato maintains that demons interpret and translate matters between mankind and the gods (ἔρημευον καὶ διαπορθευον θεοὶς τὰ παρὰ ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἀνθρώποις τὰ παρὰ θεῶν) and that this indispensable role allows for the various divinatory arts to operate (διὰ τούτου καὶ ἡ μαντικὴ πάσα χωρεί καὶ ἡ τῶν ἰερεών τέχνη τῶν τε περὶ τᾶς θυσίας καὶ τελετᾶς καὶ τᾶς ἐπωδᾶς καὶ τῆν μαντείαν πάσαν καὶ γοητείαν). A final, but no less interesting aspect of the power of demons, was that some people were disposed to believe that demons caused illness and disease, even in animals. Alexander Polyhistor, in his ap. Diog. Laert. 8.32, quotes from the Pythagorean Commentaries to the effect that:

161 So Diog. Laert. 1.1.27.

162 I draw here upon the list generated by Hopfner in his helpful review of this aspect of Greco-Roman beliefs. As for the appropriate authors see Plato Sym. 202d; Aristotle’s Div. somn. 2; Apuleius De deo Soc. 43; Ambian 21.1; Tertullian De anim. 351D; Apol. 23.32; Clemens Alexandrinus (Clement) Stromata 1.2.155; Iamblichus Myst. 5.18,31, 4.7; Proclus In R. 1.41,19; Lactantius Div. inst. 2.14; Pselius De operat. daem. 24.1.8,3,7; Minucius Felix Oct. 27. This list derives from Hopfner, GAOZ § 4.

163 Diog. Laert. 7.32. See also Cicero Div. 1.3, 2.58.

164 Quote taken from Hopfner, GAOZ § 20.

The whole air is full of souls. We call them *daemons* and heroes, and it is they that send dreams, signs and illnesses to men; and not only to men, but also to sheep and other domestic animals. It is towards those *daemons* that we direct purifications and apotropaic rites, all kinds of divination, the art of reading chance utterances, and so on.\(^{166}\)

Part and parcel of this belief was the notion that demons (and their names) had apotropaic powers. Lucian delivers an interesting narrative that pertains to this theme. In his *Philopseudes* (17) we read of one Eucrates, who is an advocate for magic practices, and who interjects in his argument that unlike some he has no fear of the spirits for, at least in part, he knows the proper apotropaic names:

At first I was disturbed by them [i.e., seeing the spirits], but now of course, because of their familiarity and especially since the Arab gave me the ring made of iron from crosses and taught me the spell of many names [I no longer fear them].

Part of this belief in the apotropaic power of divine names was the notion that such names were capable of keeping hostile spiritual forces at bay. Two texts which echo this belief are *PGM* XIII.761-66, and XXI.1-29 (cf. *PGM* XIII.795), where we read:

Come to me, you from the four winds, ruler of all, who breathed spirit into men for life, whose is the hidden and unspeakable name—it cannot be uttered by human mouth—at whose name even the demons, when hearing, are terrified...

And:

[Hear me lord, whose secret name is unspeakable], at whose [name, when] the demons [hear it, even they are terrified...][...[And] you [lord of life, ruling] the upper and lower regions...whose glorious [name] the Muses praise...no spirit, no visitation, no demon, no evil being will oppose me, for I have your name as a single phylactery [in my heart]...

Similar views are also recorded in a summons of Isis (*PGM* VII. 496-500, ca. third century C.E.; cf. *PGM* V.42-47), where the supplicant prays:

Protect me, great and marvelous names of the [gods]...Protect me, great and marvelous names of the great god [διάφυλαξατέ με, τά μεγάλα καί θαυμαστά ὄνοματα].... glorify me, as I have glorified the name [ἐδόξασα τὸ ὄνομα] of your son Horus....

Another apotropaic role was the use of divine names in exorcisms. This role came to play a cardinal role in both Jewish and Christian thinking, as I shall demonstrate in the section which treats the Jewish and Christian materials. Suffice it to say that numinous names came to be thought of as the chief instrument in affecting the expulsion of a demon.\(^{167}\)

\(^{166}\) As cited by Gordon. See Richard Gordon, “Imagining Greek and Roman Magic,” 226.

\(^{167}\) Heitmüller, “Namenglauben im NT,” 663.
Another aspect that I mentioned in my enumeration of magical praxis was that some magicians believed that *sympatheia* with the gods could be obtained by virtue of their magical machinations. Unlike the amateur who followed simplistic magical practices these adepts believed they possessed a more sophisticated and nuanced means of promoting a relationship between themselves and the gods. They believed that the gods listened to their petition because they were skilled magicians who could adroitly handle magical names, sigla, instruments, and in many cases the application of *historioiak* (i.e. a narrative concerning some significant aspect of the deeds of the deity).  

One interesting example drawn from literary texts is that of Lamblichus. He registers his view that the various names and formulas must be recited perfectly (thus necessitating an experienced votary), lest an inferior being, or worse yet a menacing one, appear in the guise of the god whom the theurgist was attempting to invoke.  

Another example of this viewpoint, as witnessed to in non-literary texts, is found in *PGM* XIII. 55-58, where the magician instructs his acolyte, “For without these [proper rituals and formula] the god will not listen, but, thinking you uninitiated [ός δυσμυστηριαστὸν], will refuse to receive [you]...” This same line of thought is seen in *PGM* III.496-501 and III.622-627 where we read:

Hear me in every ritual which [I perform], and grant all the [petitions] of my prayer completely, because I know your signs, [symbols and] forms, who you are at each hour and what your name is.

And,

Cause now my shadow to serve me, because I know your sacred names [and] your signs and your symbols and [who you are at each hour], and what your name is.

Although the claims posted in these texts appear relatively infrequently, it is nevertheless illustrative of how the knowledge of the proper names and siglas became so complex and baffling that some believed that the gods would only listen to those who could aptly carry out these rites with proper circumspection and order.

---

168 Hopfner, “Mageia,” 343. Other types of *historioiak*, such as short stories designed to sympathetically induce an illness to cease its effects, are not of relevance here.

169 Myst. 2.10 and 3.31.

170 Cf. *PGM* VII.786.
Now the *PGM* was primarily composed by highly sophisticated magicians, and this perhaps signals that many magicians underwent a period of study which demonstrates the necessity for properly knowing the true names and sigla of the gods. Finally, the importance in correctly performing the rites was not to be ignored. Indeed, the consequences of an ill-conceived recitation could even be dangerous as Hopfner observes:

Selbstverständlich müssen diese ὀνόματα und λόγοι peinlich genau nach Vorschrift [Hopfner’s emphasis] recitiert werden; geschickt das nicht, so kann das für den Beschwörenden von sehr üblen Folgen [Hopfner’s emphasis] begleitet sein.\(^{171}\)

The eleventh prominent characteristic of Hellenistic magic in my survey is the use of onomatomantism (i.e., gematria, or the use of numerology to ‘divine’ the gods or spirits), a practice first attested to in Babylonian sources.\(^{172}\) In order to ascertain the true import of the use of gematria I shall review Greco-Roman examples which will underscore the major themes in this practice. I shall first examine the evidence from various Greek corpora.

From the start it should be noted that number symbolism was originally quarried from a particular vein of Greek philosophical speculation, and onomatomantism was to become a particularly vigorous component of Pythagorean philosophy.\(^{173}\) As Lucian, in his scandalous parody of philosophical charlatans,\(^{174}\) remarks concerning the Pythagorean *Zahlenwert*, “God is number and mind and harmony.” In the course of time this belief that the divine could be encapsulated into numbers was to become an important aspect of the philosophical rumblings of significant members of the later Neo-Pythagorean school (e.g., Nicomachus’ θεολογούμενα ὀρθομητικῆς). That Pythagorean onomatomantic belief was important in magic is seen not only in the examples found in the *PGM*, of which I shall say more shortly, but also in literary sources such as Hippolytus, who states that “And he [Pythagoras] also touched on magic—as they say—and himself discovered an art of physiognomy laying down as a basis certain numbers and measures, saying that they comprised the principle of arithmetic philosophy...”\(^{175}\) That such beliefs were

---

171 As quoted in Hopfner, *GAOZ*, § 781.

172 From approximately 800 B.C.E., or so. See Dornseiff, *Das Alphabet in Mystik und Magie*, 156.

173 Although the practice is first attested to in Greek witnesses by Berossos. See Dornseiff, *Ibid.*, 95, 156.

174 *BION ΠΡΑΣΙΣ* or *Philosophies for Sale*, 4.

175 *Haer.*, 1.2.
commonplace in Greco-Roman times is also seen in the comment found in Pseudo-Cyprian, where the author reports concerning the importance of this practice in the magical technique of the Egyptian magician named Bolus\textsuperscript{176} that, καὶ ἔμαθον βολᾶς λόγων καὶ ἀριθμῶν εἰς λόγους καὶ λόγων εἰς ἀριθμῶν.\textsuperscript{177}

Examples of the application of onomatopoeia further reveals that the Zahlwort could be viewed as a conduit for the flow of power. For example, the totentent responsible for PGM IV.935 (ca. second century C.E.) instructs his mente, “hold fast a pebble (Ψῆφος) numbered 3663 on your breast and invoke the god as follows...” The adept then transcribes the name from the mystical palindrome 1+10+50+600+800+800+800+600=3663.\textsuperscript{178}

Similarly, in PGM VIII. 40-50 we read:

Your true name [τὸ δὲ ἀληθινὸν ὄνομα σου] has been inscribed on the sacred stele in the shrine at Hermopolis where your birth is. Your true name: OSERGARIACH NOMAPHI. This is your name with fifteen letters, but the second name has a number seven, corresponding to those who rule the world,\textsuperscript{179} with the exact number 365 days, corresponding to the days of the year.

Here, the cipher was symbolic of the days of the year in which his god reigned (a Tagesgötter).

In PGM II. 129 the supplicant has been empowered because “...you have given me as a gift the knowledge of your most great name, of which the number is 9,999.”\textsuperscript{180} Here the number 9,999 represents the sum of the entire Greek alphabet where each letter has been summed to the next in the series, and thus the number symbolized infinity.

These examples can be augmented by also mentioning PGM IV.1980, where the petitioner states that his invocation should be heeded because:

\textsuperscript{176}Bolus was a third century B.C.E. Egyptian author who wrote on magic.

\textsuperscript{177}As cited in Hopfner, GAOZ § 705.

\textsuperscript{178}According to Dornseiff’s calculations, in his Das Alphabet, 184, the number 3663 refers to BAINCHÔÔÔÔCH which is one of the names of the god referred to in verse 973. The word is Egyptian in origin and means “spirit of darkness.”

\textsuperscript{179}This corresponds with the prevalent ancient conception that there were seven spheres in the cosmos which were ruled by seven archons.

\textsuperscript{180}Other examples from the PGM are XIII. 156-7 and XIII. 467-8.

\textsuperscript{181}So Bonner, Magical Amulets, 141-2. See also Reinhold Merkelbach and Maria Totti, Abrams: ausgewählte papri religiösen und magischen inhalts Band I (Obladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1990), 21. This notion is the same as the Α-Ω imagery which is used of Jesus and God in Biblical tradition.
I call upon your four-part name CHTHETHÔ NI LAILAM ἸΩΩ ΖΟΥΧΕ ΠΙΠΤΟΕ. I call upon your name Horus which is in number equal to the names of the Moirai [i.e., the Fates].

From these examples it can be seen that a number could reveal the nature and function of the god.

Of further interest to my survey is the fact that this usage extended even to the Tetragrammaton. In the spell from Hadrumentum (ca. third century C.E.), which I have already referred to, the author in his reticence to pronounce the Divine Name states, ὅρκιζω σὲ τὸ ᾱγιον ὄνομα ὦ ὧ λέγεται ἐν τῷ ἱσαρίθμῳ ὄνομάς σω αὐτῷ.

In most cases the number clearly functioned as a cipher which reveals the nature and function of the divinity, although in other cases the number was believed to have power in and of itself. An example of this latter belief is found in the narrative of Alexander of Tralles, who mentions a ψῆφος (a pebble inscribed with numbers) which a Cretan held in his hand and then held against his nostrils in order to cure his hicups.

Finally I should mention the interesting discussion found in PGM LXII 47-51, where a die was used to determine the future fate of a person. Here the name of the god was to be inscribed on a die with its numerical equivalent, as the text amply demonstrates:

Make the inquirer throw this die in the bowl. Let him fill this with water. Add to the [cast of the die] 612, which is [the numerical value] the name of god, i.e., ‘Zeus,’ and subtract from the sum 353 which is [the numerical value] of ‘Hermes.’

All of these examples demonstrate that it came quite natural to a magician/theurgist to convert a divine name into its numerical equivalent. And of course it was the divine name which bestowed numinous properties upon the number rather then the number itself.

---

182 This same equation of the Moirai, their names, and numerical equivalency with Horus is also repeated in PGM IV 455. The Moirai were classic chthonic Attic gods otherwise known as the Fates. Thus, the syncretistic impulse to merge Horus with the Moirai is prompted, albeit with a twist, because they were synonymous by virtue of the numerical equivalence of their names (i.e., isophrenism).

183 Merkelbach, Abrasax, 21

184 Once again see Gagner, Curse Tablets and Binding Spells, 112.

185 Ibid. See footnote on page 49 for an explanation concerning the use here of the Tetragrammaton. In any event Wiinsch was unable to ascertain what number was used to represent the Tetragrammaton. See “Antike Fluchtafeln,” 23, footnote to line 20.

186 As quoted in Hopfner, GAOZ § 705. See also Hippolytus’ Haer. 4.44 for a further example.
Another salient characteristic of Hellenistic name-mysticism is that it was perceived that names associated with the most high or potent gods, in particular Jewish divine beings or principal agents (i.e., intermediaries such as angels, apotheosized patriarchal figures, and even Scriptural texts) were the most effectual tools in commandeering, or alternatively prohibiting, demonic influence over someone.\textsuperscript{187}

In this connection it is of some interest to note that many aspects of Greco-Roman magic stemmed, in part, from Semitic and Egyptian sources. Certainly the Romans believed that the Jews had their own branch of magic which had seeped into their culture.\textsuperscript{188} Furthermore, the Egyptians had the advantage in Greco-Roman eyes of being able to claim that they had received the most ancient and venerable tales,\textsuperscript{189} as well as the original names of the gods.\textsuperscript{190}

The charge that Eastern and Semitic religious conceptions had pollinated Greco-Roman religious beliefs finds further corroboration in the fact that Classical Greece provided an intellectual soil that proved to be nonconducive for the growth of the name-magic that we witness in the Hellenistic Era.\textsuperscript{191}

This leads one to conclude that magic as practiced in Hellenistic times did not come to the fore until after the Alexandrian conquest of the Levant, with a concomitant influx of Semitic theological and magical beliefs.\textsuperscript{192}

\textsuperscript{187}Marcel Simon, \emph{Verus Israel: A study of the relations between Christians and Jews in the Roman Empire} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), 340. Campbell Bonner, noted for his cautious stance, also observes that there were precious few Greek magical texts from late antiquity that were without some integral Jewish component. See Bonner, \emph{Magical Amulets}, 28.

\textsuperscript{188}To cite but one example, Pliny in his \emph{Naturalis Historia} 30.2.11 states, “There is yet another branch of magic, derived from Moses, Jannes, Lotapes and the Jews…”


\textsuperscript{190}Among the many indications of this respect, I cite only one: the claim that Jesus derived his power from the names of powerful angels, a knowledge which he learned in Egypt (Arnobius \emph{adversus Gentes} 1.43).

\textsuperscript{191}As Wachsmuth has correctly observed, “The conception of a power which is capable of influencing the course of nature, and by which men may even compel the [Homeric] gods is un-Grecian.” As quoted in Joyce Egerton Lowe, \emph{Magic in Greek and Latin Literature}, (Oxford: Blackwell, 1929), 11. Perhaps it was an oversight but Lowe does not cite where she obtained this quotation. In any case, it should be said that Wachsmuth is not claiming that magical practices were not employed in Classical times, but rather that it was an alien concept to think that some medium, such as names, could force the classical Homeric pantheon of gods into subservience.

\textsuperscript{192}Part of this trajectory can be witnessed in the gradual displacement of the classic chthonic gods of Greece with the aerial spirits and gods of the Semites. The original Greek emphasis upon the chthonic deities may be seen in the fact that in all early Greek καιροσεριον the deities invoked (in order) were Hermes, Ge, Hecate, and
As noted earlier, magic and supernatural manifestations were unquestionably constituent elements of the public domain, and in this arena no one ethnic group occupied more ground than the Jews. No doubt this helps to explain the fact that the Greek name for YHWH (i.e., Iao) is the most administered name in magical papyri from the Hellenistic era. It also helps to explain the fact, in a practice which invites comparison with the occasional use of Homeric verse to enhance magical efficacy, that 38 Christian texts are either utilized or cited within the PGM, among other scriptural citations, as a source of power. Of further relevance in this connection is that the only historical persons invoked in the papyri are Jewish or Christian.

Moreover, as A.D. Nock pointed out, it was the inordinate thirst for supernatural power, rather than dogma or divine personality, which helped create this favorable climate towards syncretism in Imperial times. This willingness to incorporate the views of different religions and mystical beliefs helped to secure a firm place for Jewish beliefs concerning angels, demons, and other aspects of the hylic realm within the magical world view of the Greco-Roman practitioners of the various magical arts.


Indeed, in some circles of Greco-Roman society, Hermes himself was thought to work miracles utilizing Homeric verse. As quoted in Schwarz, “Papyri Magica Graeae und Magische Gemmen,” 489.

So E.A. Judge, “The Magical use of Scripture in the Papyri,” in *Perspectives on Language and Text: Essays and Poems in Honor of Francis I. Andersen’s Sixtieth Birthday*, eds. Edgar W. Conrad and Edward G. Newing, (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1987), 346. Of the 38, 15 draw consciously from Scriptural texts. Judge also mentions the interesting fact that in all of Antiquity only the Old Testament was “...systematically propagated across the whole of the social ranking system.” This may help to explain how Old Testament citations crept into magical argot as even common Jewish people were well-versed in Old Testament narratives and could readily pass these on to non-Jewish neighbors.


A.D. Nock, “Studies in the Greco-Roman Beliefs of the Empire,” *Journal of Hellenistic Studies* 45 (1925): 88. Nock avers that, “This concentration of interest on divine power rather than on divine personality gives a satisfactory explanation of the general absence of exclusiveness from Imperial paganism.”
Furthermore, this ability of the Jews to influence the Greco-Roman world was also due to their unique cohesion as a religious group and their equally unique dispersion throughout the Greco-Roman world.\(^{198}\)

An additional factor was the preoccupation of some Jews with propagating magical arts, a dynamic which helped disseminate the idea that the Jewish God was the most powerful and this belief is echoed in numerous comments from the ancients who often betray some influence of Jewish religious belief. To cite but one example, Macrobius in his *Saturnalia* (1.18.19-21), editorializes on syncretism and the relative strength of the various national deities and states on the authority of the oracle of Apollo that:

> When one has learned the unutterable mysteries one must conceal them, but since your understanding is limited, and your mind feeble, I tell you that the highest god of all is Iao, [who is called] Hades in winter, Zeus in the spring, Helios in the summer, and in autumn the wondrous Iao.

Just as striking is the impression made by the statement found in a third century C.E. *defixio* from Carthage which claims that “I bind you SABÔTH, the god who [brought] knowledge of all the magical arts...”\(^{199}\)

The inroads and extensive diffusion of magical practices colored with Jewish elements is also attested to in the comments Lucian makes in his *Alexander the False Prophet* (13). Delivering caustic sarcasm concerning the methods which Alexander employed to impress his potential clientele, Lucian characterizes Alexander’s address to them in the following manner, “Uttering a few meaningless words like Hebrew or Phoenician, he dazed the creatures, who did not know what he was saying.” Here the composition of the so-called *nomina barbara* probably consisted of (in part at least) Jewish names. In addition, Jewish historical figures were reputed to have extraordinary magical skills. For example, Apuleius, and also Pliny, considered Moses to

---

\(^{198}\) Simon, *Verus Israel*, 342.

\(^{199}\) As cited in Gagner, *Curse Tablets*, 63.
be a sorcerer, and in like fashion Pompeius Trogus (ca. first century C.E.) believed that Joseph became a master of magical arts while in Egypt.

This reputation is also attested to in the well-known narrative in Acts (19:13-20; cf. 13:6-12; cf. 8:9) that contains three separate accounts of Jewish magicians and exorcists that well attest the age and prevalence of this magical belief.

Given the central place that Oriental magical praxis held in the ancient world it comes as no surprise that names indigenous to the Near East were considered by the Greco-Roman world as having more power as Hopfner notes:

Denn auch schon diese landläufigen Götternamen der Orientalen hatten mehr Kraft und ein enges sympathisches Verhältnis zu dem Benannten als die entsprechenden griechischen Namen.

Secondly, as I mentioned earlier, the Egyptians enjoyed preeminence with respect to ancient authoritative traditions. For example, if Iamblichus is at all reflective of his times, then it can be said with confidence that many Greco-Roman students of magic believed that this ‘divine science’ was first delivered to the Egyptians by the gods, with its accompanying divine names, rituals, and formulae, were subsequently taught to the Greeks. In a similar vein Hippolytus (Haer. V.II) claims that many Greeks believed concerning the Egyptians:

They assert that the Egyptians, who after the Phrygians, it is established, are of greater antiquity than all mankind, and who confessedly were the first to proclaim to all the rest of men the rites and orgies of, at the same time, all the gods, as well as the species and energies (of things)...

Celsus also professed this opinion, if we are to believe the report of Origen (C. Cels. 6.80), who charges that Celsus writes concerning this that “...on the present occasion it pleases...

200 Apologia, 90, HN 30.11. Another line of evidence is seen in a PGM work that we have already covered, the Eighth Book of Moses. The magician in this work claims to be Moses (V.109), no doubt wanting to imitate what he believed to be the great magical exploits of Moses in the Old Testament during his showdown with the magicians of Pharaoh’s court (Ex. 7).

201 Historiae Philippicae. The quote is found also in the fourth century C.E. work, Epitome of Justin, 1:7. See Stern, Greek and Latin Authors on Judaism, 335-7.


203 Myst. 4. 7. Iamblichus passes on the prevalent view that the names of the gods came from Egypt as Herodotus (2. 52) also maintains, “And formerly the Pelasgians in all their sacrifices prayed unto the gods...but they gave them none of their names or surnames...But a long time afterward they learned from Egypt the names of the gods except Dionysus...And from that time thenceforth when they sacrificed they used the names of the (Egyptian) gods. And the Greeks received them afterwards from the Pelasgians.”
him to speak of the Egyptian people too as most divinely inspired, and that, too, from the earliest
times...

This same view is propagated in the Pseudo-Clementine Recognitions, where in a report concerning the three sons of Noah the author writes that:

One of these, by name Ham, unhappily discovered the magical art, and handed down the instruction of it to one of his sons, who was called Mesraim, from whom the race of the Egyptians and Babylonians and Persians are descended. Him the nations who then existed called Zoroaster, admiring him as the first author of the magic art...

In this context it is quite interesting to note that Alon has convincingly demonstrated that the Hebrew phrase הָיָה had itself crept into the magical papyri in the form of בָּשֵׁם, בֶּשָּׁם, and בָּשֵׁמִי, where in the latter case the Nun replaced the Mem as is customary at the end of a word. In the case of בָּשֵׁם (PGM IV.1376 and elsewhere) the formula was even apparently transformed over time into the name of an angel.

Apparently the profane use of this phrase became so prevalent that it naturally fell into disfavor with later Rabbinic authorities who felt pressed to come to the following halachic decision, “If a Gentile blesses יָהּ, we respond ‘Amen’, (but if he blesses) הָיָה, we do not answer Amen, unless the entire benediction is heard.” Here the fear of the use of the Name in a fashion similar to an incantation was evidently anticipated and the Rabbis accordingly mandated that a positive response could only come when it was clear that the blessing was done to [or for the sake of] the Name. This passage illustrates not only the prevalence which the Name came to occupy in theurgy, but also the important role that Semitic languages come to play in magical

Persians, too, were spoken of. See Tatian in his Address to the Greeks (I). Also, Celsus, reflecting no doubt the common opinion of the day, asserts concerning Christian thaumaturgists that they are no better than those magicians who have been taught by Egyptians (C. Cels. i.48).

4.27.


Tosephta Berakhot v.11; cf. PT Berakhot viii.12c; Sukka iii.54a; Megilla i.72a. I am indebted to Alon’s work for this insight. See Jews, Judaism, and the Classical World, 245-46.
rites. In light of this belief it is not surprising that there exists scarcely no Latin or distinctly Roman magical elements in the papyri, as it was not considered a divine language. Another significant indication of the predominance of Jewish elements in magical circles is seen in that even in Egypt Jewish terms (along with other pan-Semitic words) were preferred above all others.211

The cause for this high estimation of the divine name by the Greco-Roman world is not difficult to discern. First, as we have already seen, various Oriental cultures came to enjoy pride of place as the receivers and tradents of the most venerable religious traditions. It also stems from the fact that at least some Greeks were persuaded that the Jews had coined the name of their God with a view toward His extraordinary power.212 This perception dovetailed nicely with the widely prevalent view that taxonomies of various supra mundane beings could be drawn up explicitly verifying that one could rank the spirits from the strongest to the weakest.213

Assuredly the second major catalyst for this inordinate emphasis upon the name of the Jewish God was the Jewish reluctance to pronounce the Tetragrammaton (nomen ineffabile).214 This prohibition and the secrecy which shrouded the correct pronunciation of the Name only served to reinforce the perception that the divine Name was kept secret because it was the magical name par excellence. Indeed, theurgical operations presumed that divine names carried

---

209 So Brashear, “The Greek Magical Papyri,” 3425. Ogden cites the interesting case of at least one tablet from Hadrumentum where the Latin text reverts to Greek for the recording of the voces magicae, presumably because, as Ogden states, “this alphabet, apparently being considered more powerful.” See Ogden, “Binding Spells,” 49.

210 Ibid., 3426.

211 Ibid.

212 Praep. evang., 11.6.517d. On this point Eusebius relates his view of how the Jews derived the name of their God. I take from this that at least some members of Greco-Roman society had come to similar conclusions.


214 YHWH was not however alone in this respect for other divine names also could be forbidden to be spoken. For example, on at least one curse tablet the name of Seth-Typhon was forbidden to be expressed. See Hopfner, GAOZ § 704.
numinous power and from this it followed that the mightiest god would naturally possess the most powerful name.\textsuperscript{215}

Several consequences of this belief inevitably developed. The first consequence was that the highest god’s name was so laden with power that one could not express it without dire consequences arising for the invoker. This claim of inexpressibility of the name of the highest god is witnessed to in the Leiden Papyrus where we read, \textit{Δεύρο μοι ὁ ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων, ὁ παντοκράτωρ...οὐ ἔστιν τὸ κρυπτὸν ὄνομα καὶ ἄρρητον [ὁ] ἐν ἀνθρώπου στόματι λαληθέναι οὐ δύναται...}\textsuperscript{216}

Further light upon this subject is cast by the author of Pseudo-Philemon who writes that, \textit{ἐστι καὶ Ἀιδών κρίσις ἔνπερ ποιήσει θεὸς ὁ πάντων δεσπότης, οὐ τούμομα φοβερόν, οὐδὲ ἄν ὄνομάσαιμ ἐγώ.}\textsuperscript{217} Here the fear of even naming the name of the god was the cause of considerable angst.

As I have already noted, Lactantius Placidus’ tale of an Etruscan who expired after hearing the true name of the demiurge, in addition to his story where it is claimed an ox died when it heard the ineffable name of God, also stand in support of the existence of this belief in Greco-Roman thought. Looking at the name of YHWH we find that the epitomizer Artapanus records a tale in which Pharaoh had Moses thrown in a prison after Moses had brazenly demanded that his fellow kinsmen be released from bondage. Thereafter, in the midst of the night the prison doors were cast open and Moses proceeded to leave the prison and enter the sleeping chambers of Pharaoh. Upon being woken by Moses, Pharaoh made jest of Moses and demanded that he reveal the name of the god who had abetted his escape. Straightaway Moses spoke the divine name to Pharaoh with the concomitant result that Pharaoh fell unconscious! According to the narrative, Moses revived Pharaoh and subsequently wrote down the secret name of God upon a tablet. Thereafter, one of Pharaoh’s priests, who is said to have disparaged

\textsuperscript{215}Hopfner, § 701. Hopfner states after review that “...öfter in magischen Partien der Name des höchsten Gottes, eben jenes δημιουργός und κοσμοκράτωρ zwar angerufen wird, um den letzten und stärksten magischen Zwang auszuüben.” Graf states, after review of the nature of the divine hierarchy in magical thought, “Um in dieser Hierarchie Macht zu haben, braucht der Zauberer bloß zu beweisen, daß er mit dem obersten Gott vertraut ist-gewöhnlich eben dadurch, daß er seinen geheimsten Namen kennt.” See Graf, Gottesnahe und Schadenzwecker, 201.

\textsuperscript{216}As quoted in Hopfner, GAOZ, § 701.

\textsuperscript{217}Ibid., § 702.
the sacred Name, was immediately thrown into a convulsive fit which killed him.218 This claim of Artapanus mirrors and invites comparison with what the Leiden papyrus attests concerning Greco-Roman beliefs in this same area.219

In the light shed both by the Leiden papyrus, Lactantius Placidus, and Artapanus, it is worth noting the assessment of Hopfner on this aspect of numinous names:

Je höher und mächtiger der Gott war, desto kräftiger und wirksamer musste auch sein wahrer Name sein. Daher ist es ganz folgerichtig anzunehmen, dass der wahre Name des einen Urgottes, des Schöpfers (Δημιουργός) [emphasis Hopfner’s], für Menschen überhaupt unerträglich sein: denn dieser Name war ja zugleich auch das Göttliche an sich und zwar in seiner höchsten Potenz, daher für die schwache Natur der Sterblichen viel zu stark; daher tötet er den, der ihn hört.””220

It is in this context that the Jewish claim that they alone knew this secret name of the highest god brought the Jews into stark relief against other peoples of antiquity. This claim of the Jews can hardly be overemphasized. They were the sole possessors of the most powerful name among the many other numinous names. Such a claim was tantamount to making a claim to being the most potent magician (and exorcist), for the Jews had access to the most powerful name, as Hull states:

The greatest contribution of Judaism to international magic was the name of the living god. Use of la, lāw and all sorts of variants, of Sabaoth, Adonai, and YHWH appear on almost every page of the magical papyri. It is easy to see how this would arise. To the natives of Egypt [or Greek magicians], the practices of Jewish colonies, especially the large one in Alexandria, must have seemed full of esoteric power, and a monotheistic religion which refused to pronounce the name of its secret and all-powerful deity was bound to be appropriated, whether understood or not, by those in constant search of still more mighty magical names.221

I would hasten to add that this reluctance to pronounce the Name by Jews would have been seen by the Greco-Roman populace as something either analogous to the prohibition

---

218 As quoted in Eusebius, Praep. evang. 9.27.24.

219 As I will note again later in the appendix on magical beliefs in Semitic and Egyptian cultures, according to an inscription dating from the times of Ramses IV (circa 1200 B.C.E.), speaking out loud the name of Ptah-Tatenen was considered to be a sin, as was the case for the true name of Amun. As quoted in László, Zauber im alten Ägypten, 117. I mention here as an aside that Blau has mentioned that Alexandria was the possible source for the inception of the Name into Greco-Roman magic. See, Blau, Das altjüdische Zauberwesen, 38-40.

220 Hopfner, GAOZ § 701.

against speaking out the name of the Roman Schutzgöttens, or alternatively as something which falls under the stricture that the name of the highest god was forbidden to be known (cuinius scire non licet nomen);\footnote{So Statius, Thébaïs, 4.515f., and Lactantius Placidus, Commentarii Satti Thebaidi, 4.516.} which as Proclus points out (In Ti. 2.84a), was applicable to the greatest god, the δημιουργός. In light of these claims, the knowledge of the ‘true’ name of this greatest god which the Jews claimed to possess naturally tended to heighten not only the reputation of the Jews, but also heightened curiosity over the name of the Jewish god.

Another factor worth considering is that apparently only in Judaism was the problem of demonic possession an integral component of their faith system.\footnote{I take as my point of departure for this claim the interesting observation of Schwartz, who in his review of several magical gems found cause to maintain that the prevalence of Jewish names was in part predicated upon his belief that the Jews reserved a particularly elevated status for exorcism of the demonically possessed. Clearly other religions also concerned themselves with this aspect of religion and magic, but this does not blunt the opinion of Schwartz. I would only alter his conclusions to state that Judaism placed a greater emphasis upon this particular problem. In Schwartz’s original context he had just reviewed four magical texts and noted that the fourth, which deals with liberating a possessed person, was infused with Jewish elements. Schwartz then states, ‘...vielleicht ist es kein Zufall, daß die jüdische Religion bloß für die Befreiung eines Besessenen in Anspruch genommen wird, da diese im Gengensatz zu den drei anderen Bitten allein im Judentum bekannt ist.’ Certainly, at least in Greek religion, possession by a daemonion could be seen as a positive thing. Also, Greek religion was taken with divination and demons that were believed to be able to convey the future to mankind. See Schwartz, “Papyri Magicae Graecae und Magische Gemmen,” 493.} Other religions no doubt had concerns over demonic attacks and how one could best ward off evil spirits, but in general the concept of actual possession, was per se, a relatively ignored area.\footnote{Certainly the Greeks originally held demons to be gods or at least god-like (isotheos). It was not until the time of Plato that we witness a growth (or possibly influx) of the concept of demons as evil beings. For an informative but brief discussion of the evidence consult Walter Burkert, Greek Religion (Cambridge Massachusetts: Harvard University Press & Basil Blackwell, 1985), 179-181.} Further, this fact may in part explain the perception that Jewish magicians/exorcists were especially efficacious—considered preeminent even over Egyptian magicians.\footnote{Following Brashear, “Greek Magical Papyri,” 3426 fn. 222.}

Finally I come to the last factor which helped to establish the Name as the magical name par excellence and that is that the miracles recorded in the Old Testament. These were of such impressive force that the Jews naturally drew attention to these events and understandably with some pride publicly proclaimed the glory and power of their god.\footnote{Hopfner, GAOZ § 713.} Naturally, people desired to
invoke the 'the strongest god' (e.g. PGM XII. 238; PGM IV. 732-33; PGM XII. 284-85) and this helped to fuel interest in the divine name.

Certainly during the Hellenistic Era the influx of new, seemingly more powerful names, were pushing out the older traditional names as Betz observes, "In these texts the traditional deities have in principle been moved to a lower level...These deities can hold on to their power only if they are identified with the highest cosmic deity...[emphasis mine]."227 The natural inclination to invoke the greatest god, or the most powerful name that one knew, rapidly became directed to the Hebrew God. I turn now to this facet of the evidence.

For some the name of the Jewish deity seemed so powerful that it found a permanent home in Greek religious speculation. For example, if Porphyry is to be believed, the oracle of Apollo announced that the God of the Jews made all other gods shudder with fear.228

Furthermore, intaglios were often worn which had inscribed upon them a Greek equivalent for the divine Name (e.g. $\pi\tau\iota\tau\iota\nu\iota$).229 Insofar as such amulets were intended to be worn continually we may reasonably deduce that the wearer believed that the toting of the Name would protect and repel misfortune. This belief even extended to the Jewish angelic host as witnessed to by the fact that the name Michael occurs 20 times in the magical papyri and Gabriel seven times.230 These angels not only functioned in areas of protection but were also called upon to mediate revelatory magic.231 Moreover, they could act as functionaries in the carrying out of the request of the magician.232

---


228 De Philosophia ex Oraculis Haurienda, 30. Reference taken from Stern, Greek and Latin Authors, 431-2.

229 For an example of such an intaglio see Horsley, New Documents, Vol. 4, 232. Often if the Name was not written out of respect then a symbol which represented it would be engraved on the intaglio.


231 Arnold has an excellent section in his work which deals with various primary texts. See Arnold, Colossian Syncretism, 23-26.

232 Ibid., 26.
It may be that even the series (or more specifically the fixed arrangement) of vowels which is often cited in magical papyri, viz. ὁμοοιότετοι, which is at variance with the established order of vowels in Greek, possibly derives from the myriad of cases in which the Greek transcription of the divine Name appears in the magical papyrus (i.e. Ἰακώ). In any event, the reciprocal contention, viz., that the Tetragrammaton contained the full magically significant seven vowels was an accepted theologoumenon in at least some circles.

Before I depart this section I have one last pressing issue that I must attend to, viz. the issue of the dates of our sources. Now it might be objected, notwithstanding the acknowledgment that magical technique and theory were relatively static, that the sources upon which I am dependent are too late to serve as reliable witnesses for First Century practices. Such an assessment is hasty and without foundation. First, texts such as PGM XL., “the Curse of Artemesia,” dates to as early as the Fourth Century B.C.E. Secondly, it is widely recognized that the papyri betray clear evidence of being second and even third generation copies. Third, it is also acknowledged that several magical papyri texts contain remnants of spells and practices of the pre-Christian era.

The antiquity of this use of the Name in magic is also confirmed by the observation of Urbach that the various epithets and profane surrogates which were employed in lieu of the Tetragrammaton, and which were subsequently absorbed into the magic that is displayed in the PGM, betray a lengthy evolutionary process.

This process is most explicitly outlined by Origen in his C. Cels. 4.33. Prior to his expounding upon the power of the divine name Celsus had charged that the Jews have recourse

233 Simon, Verus Israel, 344.


236 Brashear, Ibid., 3415-3416.

237 Ibid. See Brashear’s interesting example of the ‘Philinna papyrus,’ which dates to perhaps 200 B.C.E. being preserved in PGM XX. See also his discussion of dating on pgs. 3419-3420.

to tracing their genealogy only by allying themselves with shoddy magicians who employ “dark and ambiguous words [nonina barbara?], the meaning of which is veiled in obscurity.” Origen’s retort asserts that:

The names of these individuals possess such efficacy, when united to the Name of God, that not only do those belonging to the nation [Israel] employ [it] in their prayers to God, and in exorcizing demons, the words, “God of Abraham, and God of Isaac, and God of Jacob,” but also do almost all those who occupy themselves with incantations and magical rites. For there is found in treatises on magic in many countries such an invocation of God, and assumption of the divine Name, as implies a familiar use of it by these men in their dealings with demons. [emphasis mine]

And further that:

Moreover, the phrases, the God of Israel, and the God of the Hebrews, and the God who drowned in the Red Sea the king of Egypt and the Egyptians, are formulae frequently employed against demons and certain wicked powers. [emphasis mine] And we learn the history of the names and their interpretation from those Hebrews, who in their national literature and national tongue dwell with pride upon these things, and explain their meaning.

A further indication of the antiquity of the use of the Name in Greco-Roman magic and religion is that almost all transcriptions of the Name recorded in the Fathers either derive from the magical papyri, or are grossly similar to those variants of the Tetragrammaton even from the earliest patristic witnesses. Moreover, some magical papyri which use the Name can be confidently dated to as early as the second century B.C.E. demonstrates that the use of the Name almost assuredly has roots which extend into the pre-Christian era.

In fact, we may consolidate this conclusion by reviewing the pertinent evidence offered in the Book of Acts. Of particular import is chapter 19, which as I have already noted contains the story of the Jewish exorcists. The use of identical magical rituals and formulae as we find in the PGM attest that these were en vogue in the First Century Hellenistic world. Thus, we may

---

239 So Blau, in dependence on the authority of Deissmann. See Blau, Das Alphabet, 130.

240 It is also worth noting that the introductory formula found in PGM I, 39-39 seems to indicate a Hebrew original which was corrupted upon being taken up into magical rites, or so Scholem believes. The magician here mistakenly believes that these angels are gods, an error no Jew would have made. The passage reads, “I conjure you by the God Jao, the God Abaoth, the God Adonai, the God Michael, the God Suriel, the God Gabriel, the God Raphael.” The use of compound names, or should I say misunderstanding of these names, suggests a Hebrew original that was taken up by others who did not know the Hebrew tongue. See Gershom G. Scholem, Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mystic, and Talmudic Tradition, (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1960), 71.

firmly employ these texts in helping to grasp the profile of name-mysticism as it occurs in its First Century Hellenistic context.

In summary we can confidently posit that the following twelve points were integral components of the name-concept in Greco-Roman magic and religion:

1) The names of the gods and other supernatural agents were considered to be numinous and laden with power.

2) The names themselves were often thought to have an autonomous existence apart from the designated god or demon.

3) The names of the gods were indissolubly intertwined with the gods themselves, so much so that to control the former was to control the latter.

4) Foreign names and words (nomina barbara) were viewed as having more supernatural vitality than commonplace names.

5) Pursuant to point four, the rationale for the emphasis upon foreign names was in part due to the fact that magic in general, and the name-concept in particular, were heavily indebted to Eastern (especially Semitic and Egyptian) pollination of Greek religion.

6) The power, which was resident in the name, remained so only if the original language was utilized, or at least transliterated into the magical lingua franca of the theurgist/magician. In part this concept is derivative. Insofar as demons were viewed as having originated in specific geographic areas it appeared to the masses that they naturally responded to their ‘native tongue.’

7) It was imperative for the supplicant to ascertain the “true” name of the god or demon. True names allowed for greater control over the numinous realm, per point 3.

8) The invocation of numinous names was arguably the major means in securing apotropaic power on behalf of the petitioner.

9) It was necessary for the god to reveal its ‘true’ name for only he or she was privy to it.

10) Some theurgists believed that they could generate a state of sympatheia with the gods or demons by demonstrating their proficiency in correctly apprehending, and adroitly applying, the appropriate rituals, appurtenances, sigla, historiolae, and invocational formula.

11) For many votaries a more profound apprehension of the mystery of the god or demon was often believed to be facilitated by utilizing onomatomantism. The number of the god or demon could be seen as being tantamount to a revelation about the nature of the divine being.
12) The most efficacious name (s) for tradents of the magical crafts were usually imputed to be those associated with the Tetragrammaton or its profane surrogates.

Given the deep and extensive nature of the evidence we are now in a position to appreciate the view which Heitmüller so forcefully promulgated:

\[\text{Er [the name] steht einerseits in engster mystischer Beziehung zu dem Wesen Gottes: er nimmt teil an diesem Wesen Gottes und partizipiert infolgedessen an dieser Macht....Andererseits hat er in gewissem Sinn selbstverständige Stellung und Bedeutung neben Gott; er ist eine Art Hypostase neben ihm..., ein Doppelgänger Gottes. [emphasis Heitmüller's]}^{242}\]

---

\(^{242}\) Heitmüller, *INJ*, 154.
CHAPTER THREE
THE NAME-CONCEPT IN JUDAISM

The Name of God played a greater role and had greater meaning in Judaism than in any other religion of Antiquity.243

As the quote above highlights, the name of God occupied a central place in Jewish theological reflection. As scholars have turned their attention to study this phenomenon they have, in the main, concentrated their efforts on three major areas. The first area involves quarrying for the philological source, and meaning of, the Tetragrammaton, or in some cases, seeking the grammatical origins and meaning of the phrase יִהְוָה.244

The second area entails examination of the theological implications of the various permutations of, or surrogates for, the Name (e.g. El Elyon, El Olam, El-Shaddai, etc.) as found in various strands of traditions recorded in the Old Testament. This latter quest can be taxing because the name of God, in one form or the other, occurs approximately 350 times.245

The third area concerns itself with the use of the Tetragrammaton246 in Jewish circles. For my purposes only this last quest is of relevance. I shall not, therefore, take up the works of those scholars who treat the philological questions. Neither shall I endeavor to review those works that have attempted to explicate the practical, or theological, significance of the various Name permutations. Such works would carry my study too far afield. Therefore, I intend to limit myself to those works that have focused almost exclusively upon how the Name was employed among Jewish pietists in cultus, as well as the place that the Name held within the larger scope of Jewish theological speculation. In particular, I shall be looking for possible apotropaic and numinous applications, as well as various attributions or roles which were imputed to the divine name.


244 See for example, Julian Böhmer, Das Biblische 'Im Namen.' Eine Sprachwissenschaftliche Untersuchung über das Hebräische יִהְוָה und seine Griechischen Aequivalente (im besonderen Hinblick auf den Taufbefehl Matth. 28:19) (Giessen: J. Ricker'sche Verlag, 1898).

245 Ibid., 42. The summary assessment of Exodus Rabba gives us some indication of how these names were viewed and states the matter well when it declares that, "Abbi Aba bar Memel [said]: The Holy One, blessed be He, said to Moses: You wish to know my name? I am named according to my actions. At different times I am called El Shaddai, Tzevaot, Elohim, YHWH [list of actions and correlative names follow]." Exod. Rab. 3.6.

246 Or its profane surrogates, inclusive also of other divine or numinous names.
Moreover, this review will entertain only the major overarching claims and conclusions of these scholars. I shall reserve a more specific treatment of their views for my analysis of those key Old Testament and Intertestamental passages that bear on my thesis. With this outline in hand, I shall begin my review.

**Status Quaestionis**

The first decade of the Twentieth Century witnessed the greatest outpouring of scholarly reflection upon the name-conception. No less than three major works were published during this interval. The first work was by Friedrich Giesebrecht.  

Giesebrecht held that in Jewish circles the Name was both a means of divine disclosure, a numinous object, as well as being a hypostatic entity (selbstständiges Wesen).

Furthermore, the Name carries a special power (besondere Kraft) for the Jew in Antiquity, and could actually mediate power (Machtmittel). Giesebrecht was also of the opinion that divine names, as numinous objects, carried their own specific numen. By invoking one of these names the bearer of the name was constrained to do the bidding of the supplicant. Moreover, Giesebrecht envisioned the Name as being apotropaic, as well as being an agent of help or salvation (Rettungsmittel).

Additionally, Giesebrecht also maintained that an integral part of the theology of the Deuteronomist was the notion that the Name was a hypostasis, a belief which, in his opinion.

---


248 Ibid., 41-44.

249 Ibid., 44.

250 Ibid., 33.

251 Ibid., 41.

252 Ibid., 95.

253 Ibid., 90.

254 Ibid., 22.

255 Ibid., 41.

256 Ibid., 33-37.
can be dated to at least the 8th Century B.C.E.257 This conception led Giesebrecht to posit that divine names formed a type of ‘real’ alter ego (Nebengottheit or Doppelgänger) of the bearer of the name.258 In keeping with this finding Giesebrecht also believed that early Israelite religion conceived of the Name in a very primitive manner which is best characterized as concrete and localized (i.e., discrete). Later, in the ongoing evolution of the religion a more abstract and transcendent view of the Name developed.259 Congruent with this line of thinking Giesebrecht also postulated that in the incipient stages of Israelite religion the Name, by virtue of its concretized localization, became a surrogate for YHWH Himself in Jewish cultus.260

Beyond this it should be noted that Giesebrecht’s work advanced the fruitful proposition that the elevated status given to the Name in Jewish cultus was facilitated in part by its usefulness in polemical contexts, that is, by attaching the Name to a particular cultic site the claim could be secured that divine discourse and interaction were sanctioned at that site. Thus, one sacred site could establish its dominance and legitimization over and against other rival sites.261 This legitimizing function of the Name effectually bound the Name not only to the cultic site but also to the cultic activities which were carried there.

The next work is that of the Jewish scholar B. Jacob.262 In reaction to the perceived excesses of Giesebrecht, Jacob’s work evolved into a broadside designed to engage polemically and blunt the force of Giesebrecht’s views.263

257 Ibid., 36.
258 Ibid., 89, 91, 98.
259 Ibid., 120.
260 Ibid., 26-27. In fact Giesebrecht believes that the phrase “YHWH is His name” is itself a phrase at the center of many cultic activities. See pg. 68. He also believes that the name of God occupied a lead role in Jewish cultic acts. See pg. 33, 95.
261 Ibid., 38, 66.

263 Before Jacob had fully committed his research to writing Giesebrecht’s monograph became available to him. Consequently, Jacob’s study deviated from an independent investigation and became a polemical retort to Giesebrecht. The main body of the work is dedicated to refuting Giesebrecht. Unfortunately, Heitmüller’s study was published too late for Jacob to interact with it. See Jacob’s forward for fuller details.
It becomes apparent early on that Jacob resists any notion that the Old Testament contains any sort of name-mysticism.264 In his judgment name mysticism is derived solely from Egyptian religion and beliefs.265 In fact, this is Jacob’s only source for he denies that any other Semitic religion, in its pristine primitive form, embraced any form of name-mysticism.266 For Jacob, all evidence for name-mysticism, both Jewish and Christian, as well as Greco-Roman, derives from the corrupting influence of Egyptian religion.267

To this it should also be noted that Jacob, contra Giesebrecht, denies that the Name was used as surrogate for God in Jewish cultus,268 although he does recognize that the Name was without doubt a centerpiece of Jewish cultic activity.269

As for his apologetic tone, I note, for example, that when taking up the locus classicus of Gen. 32:24-30, Jacob contends that the reason that the Angel of the Lord would not reveal his name is simply because angels do not have names!270 Not surprisingly Jacob also affirms the traditional date for the Pentateuch,271 a position that entails a rejection of the JEPD theory of authorship. In keeping with this conservative approach Jacob rejects any suggestion that the Deuteronomist ever viewed the Name as a hypostasis; indeed, Jacob generally rejects the Deuteronomist Name theology, which is so generally accepted today.272

Along similar lines, Jacob rejects the validity of the evidence contained in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha for evidence of Jewish belief. For him, these works were reflective of nothing more than superstitious folk religion (Aberglaube),273 which, he contends, did not even

264 Ibid., 48, 89.
265 Ibid., 100, 106, 118.
266 Ibid., 80.
267 Ibid., 86.
268 Ibid., 14ff.
269 Ibid.
270 Ibid., 23.
271 Ibid., 45.
272 Ibid., 113-117.
273 Ibid., 63, 65.
arise until after the Exile. More grievous yet is Jacob's flouting of the consensus dating for these sources. Jacob finds grist for his mill in his insistence that the evidence from many of these documents is not only post-Christian in date, but in fact reflects a stream of Judaism that may have been tainted by Christian name-mysticism.

Jacob's only concession to Jewish name mysticism comes with his acknowledgement that the Essenes evidently did subscribe to such views. Whatever else may be said it is clear that Jacob intends to stake out a strong position intended to affirm a conservative Jewish perspective.

At first blush, Heitmüller's inclusion may seem a bit paradoxical given that the stated objective of his work was an examination of the use of the name of Jesus in Early Christianity (esp. baptism), but in his pursuit of the New Testament application of the name of Jesus Heitmüller devoted a fair amount of his work toward uncovering the Jewish background to this practice and thus his work deserves to be tabled in this review.

For Heitmüller the evidence was unequivocal that the Name was conceived of as a numinous agent, as well as a being an apotropaic shield, and additionally a source of healing (Heilmittel). In concert with these positions Heitmüller also maintains that the Name was fully hypostatic (Doppelgänger), which accordingly existed in close mystical union with God.

Of further interest is that Heitmüller put forth a plausible scenario to explain the seemingly marked increase in speculation over angelic names. The first link in his chain starts with the observation that during intertestamental times the unauthorized use of the Tetragrammaton was coming under increasing stricture. Thereafter, he contends that the proper

---

274 Ibid., 18.
275 Ibid., 68.
276 Ibid., 106.
277 Heitmüller, IAJ, 142-144.
278 Ibid., 144. An interesting point which Heitmüller raises is that the written name was believed to be the most effective source of apotropaic protection, presumably because it was enduring.
279 Ibid., 140-141.
280 Ibid., 154.
281 Ibid.
Tetragrammaton was coming under increasing stricture. Thereafter, he contends that the proper pronunciation of the Name became lost among the people. Insofar as the true name of a god is necessary in unleashing the power of the god the people had become hindered in their attempt to harness the divine power for their own use. Since, however, there was no prohibition concerning articulation of the names of the angels at least some Jewish conventicles began to engage in speculation about the proper names of the angels and their relevant sphere of operation. On this showing, Heitmüller is able to claim that the prohibition of the articulation of the Name catalyzed a concomitant evolution and influence in Jewish name-philosophy. While I can envision even more plausible scenarios, Heitmüller’s scheme is not without interest.

Over and above these considerations, Heitmüller was disposed to accept that the Name played the chief role in Jewish cultus, serving there, as it were, in a sacramental sense.

After Heitmüller a long un-tenanted period ensued which lasted until 1921 when D. Friedrich Nägelbach’s Der Name Gottes und Jesu nach dem Verständnis und dem Sprachgebrauch der Heiligen Schrift appeared. Nägelbach, as Jacob before him, took issue with Giesebrecht over whether intertestamental literature should be drawn upon to correctly inform us concerning Biblical religion. Nägelbach, again like Jacob before him, maintained that the sole source worthy of discussion is the Old Testament. He also contended that the comparative History-of-Religion approach was methodologically unsound and that the only valid means to decipher the meaning and intent of the biblical authors was to undertake exegesis of the relevant passages in light of the rest of the Old Testament. In many respects Nägelbach’s conclusions mirror those of Jacob, although on numerous occasions his reasoning is somewhat different. Given this starting point Nägelbach comes to the conclusion that the name of God was not

---

282 Ibid., 156-157.
283 Ibid., 157.
284 Ibid., 30, 42, 168.
285 Ibid., 155.
286 Friedrich D. Nägelbach, Der Name Gottes und Jesu nach dem Verständnis und dem Sprachgebrauch der Heiligen Schrift (München: Müller & Fröhlich, 1921), 15. As far as I can tell this work has never been cited by other scholars who have subsequently dealt with this question. During my year at Tübingen I took leave and examined the library at Göttingen. The welcome result was the discovery of Nägelbach’s contribution.
viewed as a hypostasis.\textsuperscript{287} In concert with this finding Nāgelsbach also insisted that the Name was not viewed as a numinous, apotropaic object.\textsuperscript{288}

Carrying the work of these scholars further, Oskar Grether published his study in 1934.\textsuperscript{289} Like Heitmüller, Grether asserted that divine names were numinous and served as a medium of power (\textit{Machtmittel}),\textsuperscript{290} as well as an apotropaic force (\textit{Schutzmittel}),\textsuperscript{291} by which one could compel the gods to do one's bidding.\textsuperscript{292} Indeed, Grether maintained that the most ancient usage of divine names was as a mediating agent that was utilized to invoke the gods (\textit{Rufmittel}).\textsuperscript{293}

Moreover, in concert with Giesebrecht and Heitmüller, Grether maintained that the phrase נִמְנֶה כְּנָבָא כְּלֹא was both at the heart of cultus, as well as serving as its terminus.\textsuperscript{294} Grether, however, contends that this phrase was originally derived from magical usage, not religious considerations.\textsuperscript{295} And with Jacob he believed that Egypt was at the center of the development concerning the belief that names were magical.\textsuperscript{296}

\textsuperscript{287} Nāgelsbach assures us that the Name is never grammatically the subject in any part of the OT and thus any notion that the Name could act independently of God is erroneous. See, \textit{DN/GHS}, 14.

\textsuperscript{288} Ibid., 20-27.

\textsuperscript{289} Oskar Grether, \textit{Name und Wort Gottes im Alten Testament}, (Giessen: Alfred von Töpelmann, 1934).

\textsuperscript{290} Ibid., 19. Grether's observation was not meant to be universal in scope. Grether carefully discriminated between his sources, and thus, this view of the Name applies primarily to the Deuteronomist, the Psalmist, and the author of Jeremiah, among others.

\textsuperscript{291} Ibid., 50.

\textsuperscript{292} Ibid., 18.

\textsuperscript{293} Ibid., 41, 175. Indeed, Grether was of the opinion that the prohibition against voicing the name of God in Ex. 20:7 (=Dt. 5:11) is meant to stop magical misapplication of the Name. See pg. 21.

\textsuperscript{294} Ibid., 18-19. It is an interesting exercise to compare how Jacob and Grether come to such diametrically different conclusions on Old Testament spirituality. Jacob rejects any notion that the Name was believed to have actually resided in the Temple. For Jacob there exists not the slightest trace of name-mysticism in the Old Testament (pg. 48). For Grether, the Name was conceived of as residing in the Temple, for most people today a clearly superstitious belief, but Grether presses that this notion belongs in the rarified air of a high spirituality (\textit{die hohe Geistigkeit}), unparalleled in any pagan religion of the time! See \textit{NWGAT}, 34.

\textsuperscript{295} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{296} Ibid., 18.
Where Grether perhaps deviated the most from prior scholars was in his emphasis that the Name was the medium through which God revealed Himself. Grether puts the matter quite simply: one must know the name of the god or goddess in order to know them truly and interact with them. Additionally, by invoking the name of the divinity the supplicant insured the vital presence of the divinity. Finally, Grether, as an indicator of the significant place the Name played in revelation, points to the fact that only in Israel was the ‘true’ name of the national god revealed to the people.

Grether distinguishes himself further by advancing two particularly fascinating propositions. The first is his contention that the evolution of the name-concept from a magical, hypostatic theologoumenon towards a more transcendent conception was catalyzed by the destruction of the First Temple. Grether argues that insofar as the Name was perceived in pre-Exilic times as having its dwelling place (Wohnstätten) in the Temple, then with the destruction of the Temple this theologoumenon fell prey to these circumstances and helped forge, or more pointedly forced, a new conception of a more transcendent name-concept. Conversely, as the view of God evolved into a more sophisticated and transcendent one the Name took on an even more important role in serving as the intermediary between the now distant God and His people.

Succinctly summarized, Grether’s understanding posits three stages of development. The first is the early mythopoetic conception of the magical use of the Name in cultus and magic, which emphasizes the power in the Name. Secondly, the pivotal role which the Name comes to play in the theology of the Deuteronomist and thirdly, in the post-Deuteronomistic era the people viewed the Name as a surrogate for YHWH Himself.
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299 Ibid., 19.
300 Ibid., 176. Grether means that YHWH possessed no ‘hidden’ name like the gods of the nations.
301 Ibid., 43.
302 Ibid., 179.
The second proposition revolves around the issue of what symbolic role the Name played in both cultus and practical theology. With respect to the cult, Grether believed that the Name functioned in an analogous fashion as an idol in pagan sanctuaries. By this Grether means that insofar as the idol was literally the earthly representation, or even embodiment, of the deity, the Name served a similar function in Judaism. The second aspect is a direct corollary of the first, viz. that the Name served as an earthly power-laden proxy for the heavenly enthroned God. Thus, on earth, the Name served as a surrogate for God in matters pertaining to the numinous realm (e.g., miracles, prophecy, healing, etc.). With this review in hand, I shall now turn to the Jewish evidence.

303 Ibid., 34.
304 Ibid.
THE NAME-CONCEPT IN JEWISH FAITH AND PRACTICE

In order to measure the breadth of the name-concept in Judaism, I shall partition my inquiry into three different types of sources that exhibit impeccable Jewish parentage. The first will be comprised of exclusively literary texts. Within this group I shall first focus upon several Old Testament passages which were the progenitors (in part) of the name-concept in Judaism. I should at this point state that I do not intend to perform a detailed exegesis of each relevant passage. There are many scholars whose competence in Old Testament studies far exceeds my own and who have already performed this task. Accordingly, I intend only to flag these passages and briefly review what scholars have concluded about them. In addition, given the constraints of the scope of this inquiry, I shall, when it becomes convenient, review Old Testament texts together with related texts drawn from the Intertestamental Era. By interweaving pertinent non-canonical and canonical materials together I hope to achieve brevity that would be otherwise unattainable.

My second inquiry, also devoted to literary texts, will review the name-concept during the Intertestamental Era as found in non-canonical sources. I intend to catalog briefly any passages that are of pertinence to my inquiry. Here my aim will be to note how extensive the name-concept appears to have been within certain books, or within certain communities.

In the third class of evidence, I shall examine explicitly magical materials, some of which will be literary, along with other material, including amulets, incantation bowls, and various other non-literary miscellanea.

Finally, at the end of my review, I shall collate the evidence into its various phenomenological categories. This will facilitate comparison with the Early Christian material that will be treated later.

---

305 For those interested in reviewing the historical lineaments of the Semitic name-concept, I have reviewed some material in Appendix Five.
FIVE FOUNDATIONAL PASSAGES FOR UNDERSTANDING THE NAME-CONCEPT IN JUDAISM

The phrase יהוה occurs approximately 133 times in the O.T., while the related phrase שם יהוה occurs approximately 56 times. In fact, the Name (יהוה) was in time to become one of the most oft used surrogates for the Tetragrammaton. Of further interest is the fact that save for one exception (Ps. 69:3; and here it is שמ יהוה), the expression שם אלהים never occurs in the O.T. Of course my interest here lies in those passages which helped shape the name-concept in Judaic thought. There are in the main 5 major passages that provided the foundation for the development of the name-concept. I shall turn to these now.

My first text is the well-known story of Jacob’s encounter with an angel in Gen. 32:25-30. Here we read that:

Then Jacob was left alone, and a man wrestled with him until daybreak...Then he said, Let me go, for the dawn is breaking. But he said, I will not let you go unless you bless me. So he said to him, What is your name? And he said, Jacob. And he said, Your name shall no longer be Jacob, but Israel; for you have striven with God and with men and have prevailed. Then Jacob asked him and said, Please tell me your name. But he said Why is it that you ask my name? And he blessed him and named the place Peniel, for he said, I have seen God face to face, yet my life has been preserved.

The angel’s curious refusal to state the name provided Heitmüller a springboard for his views. In an interesting take on this passage Heitmüller maintains that when properly viewed in a historical-critical context the request by Jacob for the angels name was designed to be used as an agent (to exert control) which Jacob could use to command the divine being. The refusal to yield the name is likewise seen to be a defensive measure designed to keep the power of the name out of Jacob’s hands.

---

306 According to Boehmer’s count. See, Das Biblische „Im Namen“, 4.

307 Ibid. Also Jacob, INJ, 19.

308 Ruck-Schröder quotes Cohon to this effect. His article is Samuel S. Cohen, “The Name of God: A Study in Rabbinic Theology,” HUCA 23/1 (1950/51). See also, DNGJNT, 4 fn.4.

309 Boehmer, Das Biblische „Im Namen“, 22.

310 So Heitmüller, INJ, 166; Grether, NWGAT, 18 and Trachtenberg, Jewish Magic and Superstition, 80.
Nagelsbach takes a contrary view. He counters that Jacob had inquired after the name only after he had already defeated the messenger. Accordingly, Nagelsbach stakes out the position that the name could not have been seen as something that Jacob could use to defeat the angel.311

Whatever one thinks concerning the timing of the initial request, the refusal to give the name may reflect the common perception, as Heitmüller conjectured, that a divine being could be controlled through its name, a notion which was quite prevalent in the Ancient Near East.312 In this context I draw attention to the work of Grether, who claims that this passage provides the springboard for the later development of the formulaic אֵלֶּה שֵׁם אֱלֹהִים, insofar as this formula presupposes that a divine being [in this case God] could be ‘called up’ by use of his name.313

In two interesting antitheses to this position Jacob, on the one hand, proposes what I consider to be the wholly unwarranted reading that the angel does not divulge its name for it simply did not have one due to the fact that it has no personality.314 And Duhm, equally unwarranted, believes that the angel refuses to disclose his name because his appearance was a one-time event.315 I think it far more likely either that Heitmüller’s view is correct, or that the passage should be read as an attempt by the angel to beg off disclosing his name so that he could deflect any veneration that was due to God alone.316 Still, whatever one makes of these various positions, it is clear that the request to learn the name amply displays the importance of names in ancient Semitic thought.

311 Nagelsbach, DNG/JHS, 22.
312 See Appendix Five for more details.
313 Grether, NWGAT, 18-19.
314 Jacob, ING, 23.
316 Other scholars see the Angel as a manifestation of YHWH. Von Heinz, for example, points to Tob. 12:15 and avers that lesser angels demonstrate no such reluctance to disclose their names, and hence, the Angel of the Lord fails to do so because he is not an angel, but rather YHWH. Von Heinz states, “sowohl Erzähler wie Zuhörer wissen von Anfang an ganz genau, daß es Jahwe ist, der da erschienen ist...” KruseVon Heinz, “Der Wunderbare Name: Zu Herkunft und Sinngehalt des Jahwe-Namens,” Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie 112 (1990): 385.
The second of my five texts is the Old Epic account of Ex. 3:13-15, where God reveals Himself to Moses in a unique way—He reveals His name to him—something that no other human had the privilege of prior to this. The text reads:

Then Moses said to God, “Behold, I am going to the sons of Israel, and I shall say to them, ‘The God of your fathers has sent me to you.’ Now they may say to me, ‘What is His name?’ What shall I say to them?” 14 And God said to Moses, “I AM WHO I AM”; and He said, “Thus you shall say to the sons of Israel, ‘I AM has sent me to you.’” 15 And God, furthermore, said to Moses, “Thus you shall say to the sons of Israel, ‘The LORD, the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, has sent me to you.’ This is My name forever, and this is My memorial-name to all generations.

To this should be added the narrative of Ex. 6: 2-3, from the Priestly source, where God reveals His Name to Moses:

I am YHWH. I appeared to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, as God Almighty, but by my name YHWH I did not make myself known to them.

First it should be noted that this declaration is intended to stand in contrast to Gen. 17:1, where God had given His name previously as El Shaddai.317 The giving of the Name signifies a new stage in the relationship between Israel and YHWH,318 a phase in which YHWH will be present among His people.319 Clearly both narratives are concerned to highlight YHWH as the Deus praesens—the present God, and that an integral component of this abiding presence is the disclosure of the Name. This self-disclosure was to prove so decisive for the relationship of Israel to her God that it has led several exegetes to view this disclosure as the very foundational core of the Old Testament.320 Indeed, the disclosure of the Name was to have a lasting impact on Jewish perceptions both of God and of the Name. Several of these perceptions are worth mentioning.


319 Ex.29:45

320 An excellent example here is Walter Zimmerli. An interesting study in this regard, especially with respect to the role that the disclosure of the divine name plays, is Jochen Motte, Biblische Theologie nach Walter Zimmerli: Darstellung und Würdigung der alttestamentlichen Theologie Walter Zimmerlis und der sich aus ihr ergebenden Perspektive zum Neuen Testament in systematisch-theologischer Sicht (Frankfurt am Main: Europäischer Verlag der Wissenschaften, 1995).
First, irrespective of how we understand the Name today it appears quite probable that the original audience understood the Name to signify, among other things, that their God was independent of all other creatures or other gods—He was totally independent and totally unique—thus forming one of the pillars for the full blown monotheism that we find in Judaism. In point of fact, the very act of disclosure carried with it the notion that this god was to be distinguished from all other gods. The importance of this notion can be seen in the fact that later prophets were to maintain that the true people of God would know His name. The import of the disclosure of the Name can also be seen in the fact that the Decalogue prohibits the use of icons or material objects to represent God, and this paved the way for the Name to assume this role, in a manner of speaking.

Secondly, this revelation of the ‘authentic’ Name allowed for proper cultus to ensue for it was always a matter of utmost importance to have the true name of the god in order to invoke him properly and thus to worship him properly. Accordingly, such practices could be carried out with the full power and authority that the true name carried. And now, in contrast to the other gods that had secret names, YHWH had disclosed His Name.

Third, the disclosure of the Name provided the mortar and brick for the erection of the concept that the name of God was a medium of revelation—the medium for the Deus revelatus—a connotation not readily paralleled among the other religions of the day. This text also set into motion the conception that the Name was the medium of revelation.


322 Von Heinz rightfully calls the revelation of the divine name the true beginnings of monotheism in the Ancient Near East. See, “Der Wunderbare Name: Zu Herkunft und Sinngehalt des Jahwe-Namens,” 401.

323 Is. 52:6 and Jer. 16:21.

324 Niles, in my judgment, has altogether missed the point of the significance of the ‘true’ name. He contends that the formula 'invoke the name of NN' did not have magical overtones in Ancient Israel; that is Biblical Religion, because the formula is only used with the Tetragrammaton. However, this is precisely the point of magical conceptions concerning numinous names as I have demonstrated. It was the ‘true’ name of the deity, which carried the numinous power. Still, I do not deny that Ancient Israel did not normally attempt to coerce YHWH to do its bidding simply because His name was invoked. For Niles' views, see *TNGW*, 191-192.

325 Bietenhard, “ὁνομα,” 255.

326 Ibid. As Grether puts the matter, “Das Tetragramm bezeichnet Gott als den sich offenbarenden, als den Deus revelatus.”
Fourthly, the disclosure of the Name to Moses was to serve as the ultimate authentication of Moses' mission.\textsuperscript{327}

Now insofar as Moses received this name in order to authenticate his mission, as well as to confront Pharaoh, it is rather probable that later Jewish tradents of this lore were led to believe that God had handed over to Moses an overpowering weapon.\textsuperscript{328}

The potency of this weapon can be seen not only in the fact that it is with the Name that the most powerful potentate was to be confronted, but also in the fact that its authority and power were efficacious in this foreign land—indeed a land of oppression.\textsuperscript{329}

Another facet of this revelation, at least according to Bietenhard, is that it is not beyond the realm of possibility that the disclosure of the Name was meant to convey that while the Name was powerful it was not a secret magical Name, in contrast to the names of foreign gods.\textsuperscript{330}

All of the above considerations led Zimmerli to state that the disclosure of the Name stands as the center of OT revelation, while Besnard was led to claim that “L'histoire de la Révélation peut se lire comme l'histoire de l'enracinement du nom de Yahvé dans les peuples et dans les cœurs...” and, “Pour la tradition sacerdotale le nom de Yahvé était avant tout l’élément distinctif de l’Alliance mosaïque.”\textsuperscript{331}

The third foundational text which laid the groundwork for the elevation of the Name comes from Exodus 20:7, where we read:

You shall not take the Name of the Lord your God in vain, for the Lord will not leave him unpunished who takes His Name in vain.


\textsuperscript{328}Jacob is probably correct in his hypothesis that this story helped lead to the belief that an aura of supernatural power enshrouded the Name. See \textit{ING}, 109. An interesting analog is found in the Samaritan document \textit{Memar Marqoh}. At I.3 God states to Moses, “I have given him My Name, so that he need not fear.” Indeed, the Name imparts to Moses some degree of its numinous prophylactic power as stated in I.3, “Receive authority from Me and set it in your heart, for all your enemies will fall before you...Who will be able to stand before you, when My great Name is with you? Verily, every foe will fall before you as suddenly as evening falls.” As quoted in Jarl E. Fossum, \textit{The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord}, (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1985), 119.

\textsuperscript{329}Grether, \textit{NWGAT}, 8.

\textsuperscript{330}So Bietenhard, “ονόμα,” 254. Von Rad notes the disclosure of God’s name here demonstrates that it was never to be held as a secret mystery in Israel. See \textit{Theologie das Alien Testaments Band I}, 198.

It should occasion no surprise that this prohibition conditioned the future evolution of the name-concept as Heitmüller correctly pointed out.\[^332\] Certainly, the sacredness of the articulated Name engendered a curiosity and reverence for the power of the Name in both Jewish and non-Jewish circles. And no doubt there is some semblance of truth in the oft-repeated charge that one of the primary reasons for prohibiting the Name to be spoken in vain was to interdict its use in magic.\[^333\] Certainly, it seems true that later purveyors of the mystery of the Name wanted to interdict any use of the Name in theurgy.\[^334\]

It remains then in this context to note that the translators of the LXX, at Lev. 24:16, probably understood this passage to include death for expressing the Name because of its association with magical practices.\[^335\] In addition, the commandment may also have had in view the misuse of the Name in false prophecies.\[^336\] Moreover, the command also appears to attempt to limit the use of the Name in oaths and curses.\[^337\] In any event, further evolution of this command led to a complete prohibition of any articulation of the Name by Rabbis, who often employed surrogates. With respect to the magical conception of the Name I shall have more to say later.


\[^333\] Ibid., 156; “Und was den Gebrauch in der Praxis, d.h. in der Magie und Theurgie, betrifft, so beweist gerade auch in diesem Verbot, dass er im Schwange war.” And Von Rad speculates that אֱ-וֹ-ף was originally used for magic. See *Theologie des Alten Testaments Band 1*, 197. Another factor that tells in favor of this interpretation is that magic plays a surprisingly narrow role in the Old Testament when we compare the O.T. to other contemporary religions in the area as Eissfeldt pointed out. See Otto Eissfeldt, “Jahwe-Name und Zauberwesen,” in *Kleine Schriften Erster Band*, eds. Rudolf Selchow and Fritz Meier, (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1962), 150. For further discussion on the use of the Name and magic see also Simon, *Venus Israel*, 344; Grether, *NIGAT*, 21; Bietenhard, *Jüngere Jahwisten - Jahwe* in the *Deuteronomium* in den Gesetzesgeboten des Dekalogos. *Theologische Zeitschrift* 38.2 (March/April 1982): 69; cf. Jacob, *IVG*, 16; Johannes Mehlmann, Der “Name” Gottes im Alten Testament (Rome: Pontifico Instituto Biblico, 1956), 75; K. Baalke, “Namenglaube” in *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, 3rd Ed.*, V. 4. (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1960): 1303; and Eissfeldt, “Jahwe-Name und Zauberwesen,” 157.

\[^334\] e.g., *Sam. Targ., 24:11ff.*

\[^335\] The text reads: καὶ τοὺς οὐδὲν Ισραηλ ἔλαβεν καὶ ἐφέσι πρὸς αὐτὸς Ἀ-σ-τ-ρ-ο-πο-ς, ὡς ἐὰν καταράσσεται θέλων, ἀμεβτίαν ἠλίμασθαι. ὡς ἐὰν ἐκ τοῦ θύμα κυρίου θανάτῳ θανατοῦσθαι λέγοις ἄμφοτεροι αὐτῶν πάσα εὐνοούμεν Ισραηλ [emphasis mine], ἐὰν τε προσήλυτος ἐὰν τε αὐτόχθον, ἐὰν τὸ θύμα διατέλεσα αὐτῶν τὸ θύμα κυρίου τελευτάτος.


\[^337\] Ibid., 80-81.
The last of my four texts comes from Exodus 23:20-21, which reads:

I am going to send an angel in front of you, to guard you on the way and to bring you to the place that I have prepared. Be attentive to him and listen to his voice: do not rebel against him, for he will not pardon your transgression; for my Name is in him.

For somewhat obvious reasons, this passage was to play an important role in the development of the name-concept in Judaism. In many respects, it became the locus classicus for the future evolution of the Jewish name-concept. Here, the line of demarcation between God and the Angel of Lord becomes effaced in a tangible way—abutting mediated almost exclusively by the transference of the Name to the Angel, and this in spite of the fact, at least in the opinion of one scholar, that the sending of the angel indicates that he is not to be identified with God. Furthermore, YHWH and the angel seem to blend into one another as the tradition continued to evolve.

Nonetheless, the function of the Name is not expressly stated and rather prompts the question of what the precise function of the Name was. Certainly the Angel of the Lord was sufficient in and of himself to lead the people to the land of promise. What then is the function here of the implantation of the Name in the angel?

Its first function appears to be that it was a symbol and guarantee of the presence of God Himself—where His Name is there is where His presence will be. Indeed, it is this direct presence of God that makes disobedience against the Angel of the Lord unforgivable for the


341 Grether, NIGG, 29. As Guggisburg notes, the Name in the Angel indicates that God Himself is present in the Angel. Still, it should be pointed out that Nägelsbach resisted this interpretation and held that the implantation of the Name signifies only that the angel came in the commission of YHWH. See Nägelsbach, DNGHJS, 64 and Guggisburg, Die Gestalt des Mal'ak Jahwe im Alten Testament, 61.
disobedience is not against the Angel, but rather against God Himself. The second function which the implantation of the Name serves is that of legitimizing the Angel of the Lord as God’s representative. Accordingly, the emplacement of the Name grants to the bearer the authority to carry out activities normally reserved for God alone. In this respect the Name served the same legitimating function that it did for Moses.

With these observations in hand a brief tracing of the further use and development of this motif would be instructive. Moving diachronically, I shall survey the continuation of this tradition by the tradents of Jewish angelological lore.

The Angel is first encountered in Gen. 16:7-14 where Hagar, after a dialogical encounter with the Angel of Lord says that, “the Lord”, and “God”, had spoken to her (v. 13). In Gen. 18:2 three men appear to Abraham, yet one of them is YHWH (v.1), while 19:1 suggests that the other two men are angels. In his commentary on this passage Philo envisions that one of the angels is actually YHWH, while the other is nebulously conceived of as some extension of YHWH (De Abrahamo 142-143). This creative exegesis should generate little surprise, for Philo clearly believes that God can assume angelomorphic form on occasion (De Somniis I.232).

Of further interest is the fact that in later speculation another hypostatic agent, Wisdom, is the one who leads Israel from Egypt instead of the Angel of the Lord (Wis.10:15-7). In conjunction with this I also note that Philo aligns the Logos doctrine with the Name doctrine in his De Confusione Linguarum (146), where we find:

And even if there be not as yet any one who is worthy to be called a son of God, nevertheless let him labor earnestly to be adorned according to his first-born word, the eldest of his angels, as the great archangel of many names; for he is called, the authority, and the Name of God [emphasis mine], and the Word...

---

342 Ibid.
343 Ibid.
344 Correctly noted by Bietenhard, "QWYQ", 255. It is of some interest to consider Giesebrecht’s claim that the manner in which the angel is addressed, as well as the how he speaks, indicates that the angel is none other than YHWH Himself. See DATSGN, 119.
345 Philo, in Som. 1, 230-33, speaks of Moses having received the divine name, a name which embodies that aspect of the divine reality that mankind is incapable of understanding. It is by this equation of revelation through God’s word, and the Name, that the logos and the Name become associated together. An additional (possible) element is D.T. Runia’s observation that Philo’s Logos is “That aspect or part of the divine that stands in relation to created reality.” Thus, the Logos functions very much in the same sense as the Name in Old Testament revelation, i.e. they are that side of God turned toward mankind. Runia’s quote is found in Davies, The Name and Way of the
Further, Philo conceives that the Logos holds the "eldership among the angels" (*De Conf. Ling.* 146)-a position derived from the traditions concerning the Angel of the Lord. This is manifest in Philo's equation between the Logos and the Name.

As I have already mentioned Philo equates the Name to the Angel of the Lord and the Logos. Accordingly, what Philo attributes to the one conception can logically be readily transferred to the other. In this capacity it is instructive to note that Philo explains that the Logos appears as a god to mankind.\textsuperscript{346} The Logos is both the medium through whom the world is brought into being,\textsuperscript{347} and by extension its support. The Logos is even called the High Priest by Philo.\textsuperscript{348}

This conflation of the Logos and the Name in Philo suggests that the Angel of the Lord, by virtue of its possession of the Name, had already begun to take on the outlines of a manifestation of God.

Moving along intertextual lines, the account of the Abrahamic sacrifices found in Gen.15:9, is rehearsed in *The Apocalypse of Abraham* (12:8), but here it was the angel Iaoel who commands Abraham to cut the animal sacrifices in two. Yet in Gen. 15:9 it is YHWH who issues the imperative. And in a paraphrase of the event in Gen.32: 24-30, where Jacob wrestles with an angel, *Test. Jac.* 2:14-15 states:

Blessed are you also, O Jacob, for you have seen God face to face. You saw the angel of the God-may he be exalted!...Then you beheld the Lord sitting at its top [of the ladder] with a power which no one could describe.

The angel of the Lord is again encountered in *Apocalypse of Abraham* 10:3, 7-8. In the first passage we read of Abraham being prostrate subsequent to hearing the voice of the YHWH. Thereafter, the text reads:

---

\textsuperscript{346} *Legum Allegoriae* 3.207, *Questiones et Solutiones in Genesis* 2.62.

\textsuperscript{347} *De Fuga et Inventione* 2.12, Cf. *De Fuga et Inventione* 20.109. This remarkable theologoumenon finds ready parallels in later Jewish tradition. For example, in the Isaiah Targum 45:12, we find the following, "I by my Memra made the earth and created man upon it...[emphasis from original translator]." Translation from Bruce D. Chilton, *The Isaiah Targum, Introduction, Translation, Apparatus, and Notes*, The Aramaic Bible V. 11, (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987), 90.

\textsuperscript{348} *De Gigantibus* 12.52; *De Somniis* 1.215; *De Migratione Abrahami* 102.
I heard the voice speaking, "Go, Iaoel of the same name, through the mediation of my ineffable name, consecrate this man for me and strengthen him against his trembling.

In the second reference to Iaoel we encounter Iaoel speaking in the first person concerning his mission and his essence:

I am sent to strengthen you and to bless you in the name of God...I am Iaoel and I was called so by Him who moves that which existed in me on the seventh expanse upon the firmament, a power in virtue of the ineffable Name that is dwelling in me.

Returning to the Old Testament we find, in Ex. 3:2, that although it is the Angel of the Lord that appears to Moses, curiously the conversation is between Moses and YHWH (v.4). This conflation is further accentuated when in v. 2 the Angel is located within the bush, yet in v. 4 God is also located within the bush. In Judges 6:11-22 the Angel of the Lord comes to Gideon (vv. 11-2), yet in v. 14 YHWH becomes the speaker. Furthermore, these appearances at cultic sites, which are normally reserved for YHWH, further blur the lines between YHWH and His Angel.

In I Chron. 21:15-30 YHWH dispatches His angel to appear at the threshing floor of Ornan. However, during the angelophany David prays to YHWH. Adjunctively, II Chron. 3:1-2 intimates in its recitation of the events that YHWH appeared to David at the threshing floor.

A similar representation of the angel of the Lord, but this time with respect to Jacob, is found in the fragment of the Prayer of Joseph which is preserved in Origen’s In Johannem Commentarius (II.31). The text that Origen preserves for us is noteworthy. Its evident point of departure is the narrative in Gen. 32:29ff., where Jacob wrestles with an angel. But in this text a remarkable transformation of the story occurs:

If one accepts from the apocrypha presently in use among the Hebrews the one entitled ‘The Prayer of Joseph,’ he will derive from it exactly this teaching....I Jacob who am speaking with you, am also Israel, an angel of God and a ruling spirit...And when I was coming up from Syria Mesopotamia, Uriel, the angel of God came out and said that I had descended to earth and I had tabernacled among men and that I had been called by the name Jacob. He envied me and fought with me and wrestled with me saying that his name and the Name of Him that is before every angel was to be above mine. I told him his name and what rank he held among the sons of God: ‘Are you not Uriel, the eighth after me and I, Israel, the archangel of the power of the Lord and the chief captain among the sons of God?’...And I called upon my God by the inextinguishable Name...

Finally, in the later text known as III Enoch (12:5) the Angel of the Lord, who is conflated with the figure of Metatron, is claimed to be worthy of exaltation because the Name had been deposited in him.
Further observation of the Angel of the Lord leads one to conclude that it was also believed that the Angel interceded on behalf of God’s people.\textsuperscript{349} Passages such as Test. Dan 6:2 (cf. I Enoch 40:6, where one of the four angels prays for mankind) attest to this function.

In light of the evidence which has been adduced it seems clear that by the First Century the name-conception had produced new nuances of the Name-Angel of the Lord combination depicted in Ex. 23:20-21.\textsuperscript{350} Beyond dispute is Boehmer’s estimation that the Angel is warranted to act as a surrogate for God because the Name is in him. Indeed, if knowledge of the true name of God endorses one to be His representative\textsuperscript{351} then how much more might the Angel represent Him because he actually possesses the Name.\textsuperscript{352} Indeed, it is the possession of the Name that grants the Angel the divine prerogative to forgive sins.\textsuperscript{353}

Having reviewed the pertinent passages I close this section with Fossum’s summation of the significance of the placement of the Name in the Angel of the Lord:

When God promises to send his angel carrying his own Name in order to guide Israel to the land he has appointed for them, this means that he has put his power into the angel and thus will be with his people through the agency of the angel. The Angel of the Lord is an extension of YHWH’s personality, because the proper Name of God signifies the divine nature. Thus, the Angel of the Lord has full divine authority by virtue of possessing God’s Name: he has the power to withhold the absolution of sins.\textsuperscript{354}


\textsuperscript{350}Segal correctly states that, “Thus, it seems very likely that, by the beginning of the second century and back into the first century as well, there existed apocalyptic speculations about the name of God as a mediator in creation which probably was very early connected with the idea that this mediation could also be portrayed by a principal angel.” See Alan Segal, Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1977), 197. Also, Bousset believed that this tradition demonstrated that the Name was here already conceived of as hypostatic-like in nature. See Wilhelm D. Bousset, Die Religions des Judentums im Späthellenistischen Zeitalter 4\textsuperscript{th} ed., ed. Hugo Gressmann, (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1966), 349.

\textsuperscript{351}So Giesebrecht, DATSGV, 45 and Bietenhard, “דִּוְוָוָא,” 255.

\textsuperscript{352}The import of this emplacement of the Name has drawn various responses from scholars. For Boehmer the emplacement of the Name signifies that the angel has the true perfect nature of God placed in him and that he is, in essence, the same as God. For Jacob’s part he makes the unwarranted, but quite interesting reading, that the הִלַּלְתָּלִי is one and the same with Joshua-i.e., he is not an angelic being! Jacob comes to this conclusion by assuming that the name that is in him, which is God’s name, is really הִלַּלְתָּלִי. Jacob points out that Joshua’s original name, viz. עָזָיָה (Num. 13:16), was changed by the addition of הִלַּלְתָּלִי. Accordingly, Jacob conflates the Angel with Joshua. See Boehmer, BIN, 31 and Jacob, ING, 23.

\textsuperscript{353}Bietenhard, “דִּוְוָוָא,” 255.

\textsuperscript{354}Jarl E. Fossum, The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord, 86. See also Joseph Barbel, Christos Angelos: Die Anschauung von Christus als Bote und Engel in der gelehrtten und volksmündlichen Literatur des 87
My last text is 1 Sam. 17:41-46. Here David stands against Goliath in the name of the Lord. The text reads:

Then the Philistine came on and approached David, with the shield-bearer in front of him. 42 When the Philistine looked and saw David, he disdained him; for he was but a youth, and ruddy, with a handsome appearance. 43 And the Philistine said to David, "Am I a dog, that you come to me with sticks?" And the Philistine cursed David by his gods. 44 The Philistine also said to David, "Come to me, and I will give your flesh to the birds of the sky and the beasts of the field." 45 Then David said to the Philistine, "You come to me with a sword, a spear, and a javelin, but I come to you in the name of the Lord of hosts, the God of the armies of Israel [emphasis mine], whom you have taunted. 46 "This day the Lord will deliver you up into my hands, and I will strike you down and remove your head from you. And I will give the dead bodies of the army of the Philistines this day to the birds of the sky and the wild beasts of the earth, that all the earth may know that there is a God in Israel.

Here the Name is apparently depicted as a protective agent capable of being employed as a weapon in defense of David in his encounter with Goliath (cf. II Chron. 14:10). 355 This passage understandably helped foster the notion that the Name was laden with power. 356 Together with the prohibition against taking God’s name in vein, these passages triggered the belief in the numinous power of the name of God. With these five texts in hand I shall now turn my attention to a thematic review of the name-concept in the Old Testament.

---

355 So Boehmer, BIV, 54-55 and Brongers, "Die Wendung b’šēm jhw,” Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft V. 77 nu. 1 (1965): 2-3. In contrast, Nägelsbach notes that while David did proceed against Goliath with the name of God, at the decisive moment in the confrontation David relied on his sling and not the Name. One may question however, as to whether the Name was at least seen as the guarantor of the success of this enterprise. For Nägelsbach’s views see DNG.JHS, 25-26.

356 II Edras 1:16-17 possibly paints a similar picture when God complains against His people that they “...triumphed not in my name for the destruction of your enemies...” Still, this passage may just signify that the name of God serves as a symbol for, who or what, someone fights for.
THE NAME-CONCEPT IN THE REST OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

One of the most prominent categories of name-speculation is found in the claim that God had chosen a place for His Name to dwell, or that a sanctuary was built in order to house the Name. This belief is attested some 23 times. Moreover, at least the rudiments of this sort of theologoumenon appear to reach back into ancient Egypt (1500 B.C.E.).

Of further interest here is that only in Judaism is the name of a deity claimed to have been placed (not simply invoked) in a particular cultic site. Perhaps this helps explain the inordinately great role that the Name came to play within Jewish cultus.

One possible basis for this emphasis upon the Name may stem from the fact that in Jewish cultus there were no idols, or figures. This means that functionally speaking the representation of the deity in Judaism was served by the Name, an altogether rather stark difference to pagan cultus, which employed material objects to represent the presence of the deity.

Another aspect was that cultic sites were places in which God had "caused" His name to be remembered. Such commemoration was intended, in part, to call into remembrance the mighty deeds of YHWH.

---

357 E.g. Deut. 12:5, 11, 21; 14: 23; 16: 2, 6, 11; 26: 2; I Sam. 7:13; I Ki. 3:2; 5:17, 19; 8:16-20 (=II Ch. 6:5-10); 8:44 (=II Ch. 6:34); 8:48 (=II Ch. 6:38); 9:7 (II Chron. 7:20); 1 Chron. 22:7,8,10,19; 28:3; 29:16; II Chron. 1:18; 2:3; 6:20; Neh. 1:9. If one excludes the building of altars and the like to the Name the number is 23 times according to Boehmer, B.N. 4.

358 Jacob cites several examples of similar phraseology in earlier Near Eastern religions. See, ING, 45.

359 So Grether, NWGAT, 42. Bietenhard is possessed of a similar conviction. See "zewa," 255. Giesebrecht is also disposed to this view. DATSGN, 121. Examples of this phenomenon are found, inter alia, Dt. 12:5, 11; 14:23; 16:2, 6, 11; 26:2; Neh. 1:9; II Ch. 6:20; I Ki. 9:3; 11:56; 14:21; II Ki. 21:4, 7 (=II Ch. 33:7); Ps. 74:7. This theologoumenon persisted into the Hellenistic and Imperial periods, e.g. Jdt 9:7-8. "...they intend to defile your sanctuary, and to pollute the tabernacle where your glorious Name resides..." See also Josephus, AJ 8, 108. In tandem with this theologoumenon, the Temple was the place where the Name was to be invoked. See I Esd 6:33.

360 Grether goes so far as to claim that the name of God played a greater role in Judaism than in any other religion of its neighbors during this same time. See, NWGAT, 42-43.

361 Grether, NWGAT, 34.

362 Ibid., 31-32.

363 Besnard, Le Mystère du Nom, 112.
All of the foregoing raises the question as to whether the Deuteronomist actually envisioned the Name as a hypostatic-like entity. While it is not the task of this work to deal with this issue (indeed the subject is so complex and broad that a full dissertation or monograph would be needed to treat it comprehensively), what we can say is that whatever the conception of the original writer, the popular view of the people was presumably that the Name did indeed dwell within the cultic site. Additionally, the placing of the Name in the Angel of the Lord does provide some evidence that at least some authors, and no doubt later authors, believed that the Name could be in some sense localized. A further buttress is found in the fact that during this stage of Jewish religion anthropomorphic thought abounded and the abstract theological reflection that God’s Name dwelt in the Temple was a suitable correction to the notion that God Himself, was within the Temple. By the time of the Intertestamental Era it would also seem probable that a great many people felt that the Temple literally housed the Name.

Over and above the question of the hypostatization of the divine Name it can be said that something approaching consensus exists with respect to seeing in the Namensetzen formula the concern to insure the presence of YHWH in the cultic site. In line with the numerous references to choosing a particular site it is now generally supposed that the formula was utilized to designate one site in the preference to another.

Certainly, the Name played a prominent role in the carrying out of cultus. For example, as the place where God’s Name dwells the Temple is the place where God will hear the prayers of His people. An interesting interchange of this idea is found in 1 Kings (8:29, 44-45, 48-49; 9:3), where Solomon and God discuss the viewpoint that God’s Name dwelt there:

---

364 I agree here with Stade that this is probable. See Bernhard Stade, Geschichte des Volkes Israel II, Allgemeine Geschichte in einzeldarstellungen, ed. Wilhelm Oncken (Berlin: G. Grote, 1887-1888), 247. Moreover, Weippert indicates that other scriptures, such as Ps. 74:7, seem to clearly reflect the view that the Temple was believed to house the Name. See, “Der Ort, den Jahwe erwählan wird, um dort seinen Namen wohnen zu lassen: Die Geschichte einer alttestamentlichen Formel,” Biblische Zeitschrift 24.1 (1980): 78 fn. 6.

365 Gustav Westphal, Jahwes Wohnstatten nach den Anschauungen der alten Hebräer: Eine alttestamentliche Untersuchung (Gießen: Von Alfred Töpelmann, 1908), 192.


367 McBride, The Deuteronomic Name Theology, 52.

368 See Giesebrecht, DATSGN, 33.
...that your eyes may be open night and day toward this house, the place of which you said, 'My Name shall be there,' that you may heed the prayer that your servant prays toward this place...and the city that you have chosen and the house that I have built for your Name. The LORD said to him, '...I have consecrated this house that you have built, and put my Name there forever.'

In a very interesting assessment of these verses, Goodenough states that these verses demonstrate that the Shekinah which was supposed to rest between the cherubim on the Ark—the very throne of YHWH—is actually a surrogate for the Name. Moreover, the related phenomenological activity of the building of an altar for the Name, as Elijah was reported to have done (I Kings 18:30-32), intimates this also. Here the meaning is clear—the Name signifies that this altar is sanctified for the execution of proper cultus. The altar is dedicated to the cult of YHWH and these cultic activities are carried out in His Name. Because they are executed in His Name the devotee can be sure that God will answer him.

A related function of the name-conception, and one that we have already encountered, involved the Name in theophanic contexts suggestive that it functions as the medium of the Deus revelatus. That a divine intersection was believed to exist where God and man came together through the combination of place and the invoking of the Name can be seen from Gen 28:17, where Jacob states after his dream, “This is no other than the House of God, and this is the gate of heaven.”

Beyond the obvious cultic aspects a further prominent theme with respect to the Name is the thought of doing something for the sake of the Name (לְמִיתֶּן שֵם). This expression occurs approximately 16 times. Here the primary thought is to perform or carry out some action that

---


371 That is, it legitimates the site. Nägelsbach’s opinion is that the reference to the Name is only “worin die Vorgänge zu betrachten sind.” See *DNGJHS*, 25.

372 Ps. 20:6; 8:4; 118: 10-12; 124:8.

is meant to bestow honor and glory to the name of God.\(^{374}\) It is little wonder given the sanctity of the Name that this expression occurs only with reference to the divine name.\(^{375}\)

For example, God displays mercy in the face of sin for the sake of His Name (Jer. 14:7; Eze. 20: 8-9, 13-14, 22, 44; cf. I Sam. 12:22), exercises forbearance (Isa. 48:9), brings salvation (Ps. 106:8), and forgives trespasses (here the petitioner asks God to act for His name’s sake, see Ps. 25:11; 79:9).

The concept that the name of God and His reputation or image are bound together is made transparent in verses such as I Ki. 8:42-43, where it states with respect to pagan nations and the Name:

Also concerning the foreigner who is not of Thy people Israel, when he comes from a far country for Your name’s sake for they will hear of Your great name and Your mighty hand, and of Your outstretched arm; when he comes and prays toward this house, 43 hear Thou in heaven Your dwelling place, and do according to all for which the foreigner calls to You, in order that all the peoples of the earth may know Your name, to fear Thee, as do Your people Israel, and that they may know that this house which I have built is called by Your name.\(^{376}\)

Even those who petition God for mercy are actually appealing to God to deal with them mercifully for the sake of His Name (Ps. 109:21); indeed, forgiveness is anticipated, for God will act for His name’s sake (Ps. 79:9).

There are numerous other noteworthy references to the Name which do not readily fall into any neat categories. For these cases it is perhaps best simply to flag them. To that end then I note the following. The Name is said to have gold and silver brought to it (Isa. 60:9). The people

\(^{374}\) Pace Jacob and McBride, correctly Westphal. I cannot agree with Jacob’s claim that the phrase means simply to act in a fashion that is commensurate with the Name—an explanation that I presume means that one is to behave in a manner which is as elevated as the Name itself. A similar explanation is attached to the phrase by McBride who believes that the phrase means to act “according to revealed or essential nature.” However, this nuance does not take into account the highly proactive nature of the various actions taken by God which seem to indicate a robust effort to keep the Name from falling into disrepute and to create a place of respect and honor for it. That the name of a person (e.g., II Chron. 26:8; 26:15; Gen. 12:2; II Sam 7:9; Jos. 7:9), or of God (e.g., I Sam. 12:22) is connected to their reputations is made quite clear in the Old Testament. Indeed, in many of the references above in the New American Standard translation the word ‘name’ is translated by ‘fame.’ Accordingly, I part company with McBride and Jacob. See Jacob, ING, 16; McBride, The Deuteronomic Name Theology, 69 and Gustav Westphal, Jahres Wohnstätten, 194.

\(^{375}\) Jacob, ING, 17. Mehlmann has also noted that when God acts on behalf of his Name it can be in the sense of underscoring a divine property or characteristic. See Mehlmann, Der “Name” Gottes im Alten Testament, 46-47.

\(^{376}\) Cf. also II Chron. 6:32; Isa. 52:6; Jer. 16:21.
shall be assembled in Jerusalem for the Name (Jer. 3:17). In a passage which we shall come across again, Mal. 1:11, we find the claim that everywhere offerings are directed to the Name. It may be of some passing interest that these passages all employ לְשׁוֹם rather than לְשָׁם.

Two final categories in which the Name appears is in those sometimes curious places where the Name is featured as a particularizing manifestation (or as Grether calls it a “Erscheinungsform”) of God Himself, or in those places where the Name is no longer depicted as being restrained to a single place, but to the contrary, is conceived of as being everywhere, or used as a symbol for the universal glory of God. I will review the former category first.

A number of passages are worthy of note. The first is Isa. 30:27, where the Name is spoken of in the following terms:

See, the name of the Lord comes from far away,
burning with his anger, and in thick rising smoke;
his lips are full of indignation,
and his tongue is like a devouring fire...378

Another conspicuous place where the Name is depicted as a particularizing manifestation is Prov. 18:10 which reads, “The name of the LORD is a strong tower; the righteous run to it and are safe.” Another text along similar lines is Ps. 54:3, which reads, “Save me, O God, by your name; vindicate me by your might” Here it is noteworthy that a parallelismus membrorum exists between the first member, i.e. “Save me, O God, by your name,” and the second member “Vindicate me by your might.” Clearly God’s might or power is made synonymous with His name. Other passages display a similar view, as Ps. 20:1 shows, “May the LORD answer you in the day of trouble! May the name of the God of Jacob set you securely on high!”379 In a similar vein the author of Ps. 44:6 states that in war, “Through you we push back our enemies; through your name we trample our foes.” All of this is reminiscent of David’s claim that when he faced

377 Grether, NFGAT, 30. Although Grether still labels the Name as a hypostasis due to these verses. See pg. 44f.

378 While I do not accept that this passage actually conveys the idea that the name of God is some sort of hypostasis there are dissenting opinions on this. To cite but one example, Schmidt believes that this passage does in fact support the notion that the Name is a hypostasis. See Hans Schmidt, “Namenglauben im AT,” in Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart Vol.4, eds. Friedrich Michael Schiele and Leopold Zscharnach, (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1913), 660.

379 Other passages are Ps. 33:21, 52:11, 124:8. Mettinger maintains that such passages support the notion that Ancient Judaism believed in the Name as a sort of hypostatic entity. See Dethronement, 130.
Goliath he came against him "...in the name of the LORD Almighty, the God of the armies of Israel."

Still other texts speak of the Name as existing in power (Jer.10:6), a force which is believed to be the source of help for His people as Ps. 124:8 states, "Our help is in the name of the LORD, the Maker of heaven and earth." When we turn to the LXX we find the interesting inclusion in Numbers 14:20-21, where the name is said to be alive. The passage reads:

καὶ εἶπεν Κύριος πρὸς Μωυσῆν Ἰλεως αὐτοῖς εἴμι κατὰ τὸ ρῆμα σου, ἀλλὰ ζῶ ἐγὼ καὶ ζῶν τὸ ὅνομα μου καὶ ἐμπλήσει ἡ δόξα κυρίου πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν.

All of these passages may betray the possibility that the Name was viewed in some circles as the earthly power of YHWH.

As for other categories, such as those which universalize the Name, there are texts such as Ps. 8:2, 10, which declare that God’s Name is glorious in the entire world.

And the final, and in some sense the most important function which the Name plays, is in securing salvation for those who call upon it. The foundational passage is the oft-cited Joel 2:30-32 where we read that:

And I will display wonders in the sky and on the earth. Blood, fire, and columns of smoke. 31 “The sun will be turned into darkness, And the moon into blood. Before the great and awesome day of the LORD comes. 32 “And it will come about that whoever calls on the name of the LORD will be delivered.” (cf. Ps. 54:1 and reads, “Save me, O God, by your name, and vindicate me by your might” and Ps. 91:14-15 “But I call upon God, and the LORD will save me, I will protect those who know my name).

The passage has served as the foundation for later Christian speculation on the import of the Day of Pentecost and the reception of the Spirit. In addition, several other particulars should be pointed out.

The first aspect to be noted is that those who invoke the name of YHWH will be saved-but this only prompts the question of just what it is that YHWH will save them from. Our clue is found in the verb that the author employs here, which is mālat. This usage here is quite suggestive of how the author sees the Day of the Lord. The verb connotes escape to safety from a concrete physical event. This connotation differs markedly from the meaning of the cognate verb.

---

380 Here we must follow Delling and agree that the passage means to say that YHWH is their help. See Gerhard Delling, Die Zuteignung des Heils in der Taufe. Eine Untersuchung zum neuestamentlichen „tauen auf den Namen” (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1961), 21.
yāša’, a verb which can convey the meaning of salvation in the spiritual sense. Insofar as the author has chosen to use mālat it is clear that he sees this salvation as that of escaping the very real and terrible wrath of God which will visit mankind on the day of His visitation. For the author it is clear that only those who invoke the name of YHWH will find themselves protected from this eschatological wrath.

The author also gives a complementary conception in that this salvation is reserved for those whom the Lord has called (2:32). Of further significance is that this salvation is accomplished through the Spirit of the Lord, in keeping with the promises for this day of salvation where the promise is for the bestowal of the Spirit upon Israel (2:28). With this review in hand I shall now review the name-concept as it is found in non-canonical sources.

THE NAME-CONCEPT IN NON-CANONICAL SOURCES

I begin my review with that most extraordinary of documents, I Enoch. In the Similitudes of I Enoch the Name plays an inordinately pivotal position in the author’s Heilsgeschichte. The author has Enoch begin one of his first discourses with the following engrossing description concerning the beginning of his divine indoctrination into the mysteries of the Lord of Spirits (39:9). Enoch says, “In those days, I praised and prayed to the Name of the Lord of Spirits with blessings and praises…” Enoch in effect was doing nothing other than following the lead of the angels in the court of God, who are described as, “blessing the Name of the Lord of Spirits” (40:5), and, “supplicating in the name of the Lord of Spirits” (40:6).

The author progresses further within the realm of the name-concept in his narrative when he declares that the believers are those who believe on, and appeal to, the name of the Lord of the Spirits (43:4; 45:3). Indeed, in the eschaton all the nations shall fall prostrate and sing the name of the Lord of the Spirits (48:6). In addition, the righteous shall be saved in His Name (48:7; 50:3b), while the ungodly cannot believe in His name (67:9). For believers, it was the good pleasure of the Lord of Spirits that they might have life (48:8). In that Day the elect will glorify, praise, and bless the name of the Lord of Spirits (47:2). Indeed, that Day will see the Elect One reign in the name of the Lord of Spirits (55:4). Through the Name the righteous person (50:2; 53:7) shall be made victorious, while the wicked will deny, and refuse to extol (46:6). the

---


382 Ibid., 138.
name of the Lord of Spirits (38: 2; 46:8), which is the cause for their destruction (41:2; 45:1,2; 46:7).

As for the Son of Man he is said to have been given a name by the Lord of Spirits while standing in his presence before the creation of the world (48:2-4; cf. Phil 2:9). The Son of Man will be the hope of the nations, as well as be victorious (50: 2), in this name (48: 7; 50:3), for which cause they glorify, bless, and sing the name of the Lord of Spirits (48: 5). Furthermore, the people praise and bless Him because the name of the Son of Man is revealed to them (69: 27). Upon review it is obvious that all of these texts bear witness to the important role that divine names played within the conventicle that produced this fascinating document. Clearly, I Enoch displays several remarkable characteristics which find ready parallels to New Testament conceptions. Later, in my section on the New Testament we shall run across I Enoch again.

Moving on to other intertestamental texts we find that names could also be symbolic of majesty so profound that they were prohibited from being divulged. In Joseph and Aseneth 15:12, in a passage more than tangentially touched by Judges 13:18, Aseneth receives a visitation from an archangel, possibly Michael or the Angel of the Lord, whom Aseneth then implores to reveal his name:

And when the man finished speaking these words, Aseneth rejoiced exceedingly with great joy about all these words and fell down at his feet and prostrated herself face down to the ground before him, and said to him, ‘Blessed be the Lord your God the Most High...and blessed be your name forever. What is your name, Lord tell me in order that I may praise and glorify you forever and forever.’ And the man said to her, ‘Why do you seek this, my name, Aseneth? My name is in the heavens in the Book of the Most High, written by the finger of God in the beginning of the book before all the others, because I am the chief of the house of the Most High. And all names written in the book of the Most High are unspeakable, and man is not allowed to pronounce nor hear them in this world, because those names are exceedingly great and wonderful and laudable.’

Another name related aspect comes from texts which show some reflection upon the apotropaic role of the divine Name, as for example the First Century C.E. Jewish Prayer of Manasseh (1:1-3),\(^\text{383}\) where the hymnodist believes that the Name keeps the domain of the demons sealed:

O Lord, God of our fathers,

---

God of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and their righteous offspring;
He who made the heavens and the earth with all their beauty;
He who bound the sea and established it,
by the command of his word,
he who closed the bottomless pit
and sealed it by his glorious and powerful Name.

Turning to the DSS we find that the covenanters of Qumran also entertained some aspects of the name-concept. To be sure the name-concept is more diffuse in the Qumran texts and in general it clears no new trails, but notwithstanding their close adherence to normative Old Testament boundaries some facets of the name-concept stand out. I shall point out these singularities at the end of my DSS review.

Now not unlike injunctions in the Old Testament, members were to praise and glorify (and/or extol, exult, and celebrate) the Name (IQH IX-30, XI-23, XIX-24, XX-3; IQ28b col. IV l. 28; IQ34+34bis Frag. 3 col. I, l. 6; IQM XIV l. 12; 4Q242 Frags. I-3 l. 5; 4Q427 l. 6; 4Q511 Frag. 2 col. I l. 1; 4Q416 Frag. 2 col. III l. 11; 4Q418 Frag. 126 col. III l. 10; 4Q503 Frags. 29-32 col. VIII l. 9. Frags. 40-41 l. 2; 4Q511 Frag. 35 l. 6); and were enjoined to cherish and love the Name (IQPs\* Syriac Psalm III-XIX; IQH XVI). as well as sanctify it (IQ427 Frag. 7 col. I l. 15-16; cf. IQ177 col. IV l. 15). The community also reflect upon God’s name (CD XX I. 19-20), celebrate it (IQ34+34bis Frag. 3 col. I, l. 6; IQ508 Frag. I l. 2), and bless it (IQM col. XIII l. 7, col. XVIII l. 7; IQH col. IV l. 20, col. X l. 30, col. XIX l. 6. Frag. 4 l. 17; 4 Q 504 frags. 1-2 col. VII l. 4-5; 4Q503 Frags. 7-9 l. 3. Fraggs. 13-16 l. 4: 11QH I.4). They do this for this is the very action for which they were created (IQ508 Frag. I l. 2), and which they are obliged to do for YHWH commands them to do so (IQ370 col. II l. 2). The community believes that the Name is worthy of such encomium for the Name is holy, great, and eternal (4Q202 col. III l. 16; 4Q504 frags. 1-2 col. VII l. 4-5, Frag. 3 col. II l. 10, Frag. 4 l. 16, frag. 5 col. II l. 3). These beliefs could lead the hymnodist responsible for 11Q (IQ380 Frag. 1 col. I l. 7) to muse, “Who is worthy to utter the Name”?

Such respect for the Name was not without its reward, for according to the hymnodist of the Apocryphal psalms YHWH listens to, and protects, the covenanters because they love His

---

name (11QPsalm$^d$ [11Q5] col. XIX 1.6, 12; 11QPs$^b$ [11Q6] Frag. a. l. 6; cf. 4QPseudo-Ezekiel$^a$ [4Q385] Frag. 2 l. 2, 4QPseudo-Ezekiel$^b$ col. 1 l. 1). The covenanters who called upon the Name (4Q504 col. III 1.4) viewed the Name as a source of strength for themselves (IQ$^b$ col. V 1. 28; 4Q$^b$ Frag. 4 l. 2; 4Q$^b$ [4Q269] Frag. 4 col. II 1.1-2; and quite probably 1QH col. XXI 1.8), just as David had done centuries before in his combat with Goliath (1QM col. XI 1.2).  

Quite significantly the community sought refuge in the Name for they believed that it would bring about their salvation (4Q381, Frag. 24 l. 7; cf. CD col. XXI 1. 34; 4Q$^b$ [4Q267] Frag. 6 col. 1 l. 7). All the while the covenanters are rendering thanks to His Name (as suggested by 4Q504 col. VII 1.4-5). 

In parallel to those Old Testament passages which speak of housing the Name in a special locality, the community believed that the Temple (and the chosen city) was where the Name would one day dwell (11Q19 col. XXIX 1.3-4; 11Q19 col. XLVII 1.3-4; cf. col. LIII 14-16, col. 9-10, col. LX 1.13-14; 4Q504 frags. 1-2 col. IV 1. 1-4; 4Q529 l. 9). In point of fact this chosen place is where the community was to ‘commemorate’ God’s name (4Q158 Frags. 7-8 l. 7). In this context their claim to be the community which has the Name called over them (4Q14 frag. 1, col. III 1.15); indeed, even called by His name (4Q418 Frag. 81 l. 12; 4Q504 col. II 1.12), signifies that they belong to YHWH and have been chosen by Him to be His faithful remnant. Furthermore, the Qumran community believed that the Holy City would always endure for the Name was invoked over it (4Q380, Frag. 1 col. I 1.2-5). Because they are the people of YHWH they invoke only His name (4Q504, frags. 1-2, col. III 1.4), and their use of the Name characterized the community as those who rely on the name of YHWH (11Q11 col. II 7-10.

Where the covenanters part company with established Old Testament conceptions is in the area of demonology and eschatology. We find also that the Name was considered to be numinous (1QH col. XVII 1.39, and probably also col. XXIII 1.8). For example, as already noted, the covenanters believe that the invocation of the Name produced apotropaic and numinous effects, e.g. it could expel demonic forces (11Q11 [11QPs$^p$] col. V 1. 2-4). Moreover, the

---

385 I have already mentioned that Näge alsbach denies that the Name is seen as a numinous source in the original narrative. Whatever one may say about the original narrative, it is clear that the Qumran community believed that it was the power in the Name which made David victorious.
Qumran traditions also record their belief that they possessed a spell to cast out demons in the name of YHWH (יְהֹוָה, 11Q11 [11QPsAp] col. II 1.2-5). 386

This emphasis upon the apotropaic quality of divine names may be responsible for the curiously excessive preoccupation with the names of the angelic host that evidently existed at Qumran. 387 As Josephus relates about the prescriptions placed upon the Essene initiate:

He is made to swear tremendous oaths: First that he will practice piety toward the deity...that he will wrong none whether of his own mind or that of another; to conceal nothing from the sect and to report none of their secrets to others, even though tortured to death...and in like manner carefully to preserve the books of the sect and the names of the angels (τὰ τῆς αἰρέσεως αὐτῶν βιβλία καὶ τὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων ὄνοματα). 388

Beyond this it must be said that the preceding context of this passage in Josephus, which speaks of the Essenes dabbling in ancient roots and other speculations, seems to lend some credence to this hypothesis. 389 Yet another passage that leans in this direction is 11Q11 col. II 1.1-4, which intimates that Solomon’s name may have been invoked in apotropaic rituals.

Whatever the case may be with respect to angelic names, other aspects need to be highlighted. For example, within the community the hymnodist who wrote the Hodayoth could speak of the Name as the agency that created spiritual light for the covenanters (1QH col. XVII 1.26).

As for Qumran eschatology they posited that in the final age all the nations would offer sacrifices to the Name (4Q504 frags. 1-2, col. III. 1.9-11). And the author of the Temple Scroll, in an important cultic setting, mandates that in the final eschaton the people of God can only

---


387 This sort of apotropaic speculation is also clearly reflected in Test. Levi 5:5, where Levi states to His protective angel, “I beg you Lord, teach me your name, so that I may call on you in the day of tribulation.” Here, without doubt, the angels were thought to offer physical protection and could be called into the fray by calling out their name. Another example is found in Arnobius’ Adversus Gentes (sometimes referred to as adversus Nationes), 1.43, where Jesus’ powers are imputed to derive from Jesus’ knowledge of the names of powerful angels. The text reads, “He [Jesus] effected all these things by secret arts. From the shrines of the Egyptians He stole the names of angels of might, and the religious system of a remote country.”

388 Bellum Judaicum, 2.142.

389 Arnold, Colossian Syncretism, 34. This sort of speculation fits well with the sort of magical conception of divine names found in Greco-Roman conventicles.
sacrifice where the Name shall dwell (11Q19, col. LIII. 9-10). Furthermore, God, it is said, will make His name known in that time (4Q542 col. II.1)

As for other Jewish sources we find that the Name of YHWH was imputed to have had a mediating role in creation. This is attested to in various texts. In Jubilees 36.7, the author Isaac is said to desire that Jacob and Esau take an oath to always fear and worship God. This oath has the most powerful binding power of all oaths for it is taken, “by the glorious and honored and great and splendid and amazing and mighty Name which made heaven and earth and everything together.”

This mediating role is also found in I Enoch where the text states that “the secret Name enunciated in the Oath” (LXIX, 14) is the selfsame oath whereby, “the heavens were suspended before the world was created... By this oath the deeps were established” (LXIX, 16-19). We find that the Oath is said to be, “established in power over the spirits” (LXIX, 25). What should not be left unnoticed is that it is the invocation of the secret Name that empowers and enfranchises the Oath to effect these works.

We also find traces of this sort of belief in later Jewish texts. For example, a similar sentiment is also expressed in Targum Yerushalmi I Ex. 28:30, where the Targumist (or the meturgeman) alleges that the Urim and Thummim had the divine Name inscribed upon them, the Name which the text maintains had created the three hundred and ten worlds. Unfortunately this Targum has an eclectic mixture of traditions and it is difficult to separate the traditions temporally. Nevertheless, for this Targumist it is the Name that is the medium through which God has created the cosmos and it is the Name that governs the spiritual realm. In similar fashion we find this same belief in the admittedly late Hekhalot literature. In Hekhaloth Rabbati 9 we

---

390 Among Samaritan documents, Menar Marqah records a similar view at 1.4.
391 As Philo notes it is the divine name which confirms an oath. De Sacrificiis Abelis et Cauiti. 28.93.
392 The tradition that the divine names were inscribed upon the Urim and Thummim is otherwise unattested. However, the belief that 310 original worlds were created is found as early as m. Uktisin 3:12. It is also mentioned in b. Sanh. 100a.
read, "Great is the Name through which heaven and earth have been created." This theologoumenon continues in texts such as III Enoch (13.1; 44.1), where we read, "He wrote with His finger with a flaming style upon the crown of my head the letters [which form the name YHWH] by which were created heaven and earth," and, "Come and behold the letters by which the heaven and the earth were created."

Coming back to the first century we find that the Jewish historian Josephus also affiliates himself with the name-concept in three rather marked passages. In the first text, Josephus passes on an apocryphal anecdote concerning the arrival of Alexander the Great into Jerusalem. According to Josephus, when the high priests were appraised that Alexander had drawn near unto the city they came out in considerable servility in order to stave off Alexander’s well known proclivity for rapacious behavior. Josephus narrates that as Alexander and his entourage approached he saw:

The multitude in white garments the priests at their head, and the high priest...wearing on his head the mitre with the golden plate on it on which was inscribed the Name of God (ἐγέρασεν τῷ ὄνομα), he approached alone [i.e. Alexander] and prostrated himself (προσκύνησε) before the Name (τῷ ὄνομα)...Then all the Jews together greeted Alexander with one voice and surrounded him, but the king of Syria and the others were amazed at his action thinking he was deranged...And [when] asked why, when all men had prostrated themselves before him he had prostrated himself before the high priest of the Jews, whereupon he replied, ‘It was not before him that I prostrated myself but the God (τὸν Θεὸν) of whom he has the honor to be high priest.’ (AJ XI.331-333).

Josephus’ use of language here is most telling. First, the Greek verb προσκύνεω can often connote worship. Josephus is presumably signifying true worship, for he is quite unmistakably signifying that YHWH was being acknowledged by Alexander as “the God” (τὸν Θεὸν). Moreover, in the narrative Josephus has given us no other indication whereby the reader might apprehend just how it was that Alexander was cognizant of which god he was dealing with, or how preeminent He was, unless the Name conveyed this information. But how might this be so? Josephus’ readers would presumably know that Alexander could not read Hebrew, nor could he have understood the Tetragrammaton to be the divine Name. Thus, how did the

394 It should be observed that the power and meaning of the divine name is highly emphasized within the Hekalot literature on the whole. For further reading, consult Peter Shäfer, Der verborgene und offenbar Gott: Hauptthemen der fruhen juedischen Mystik (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1991), 48, 54-55, 68-70, 74-77, 92-97, 102-108, 121-122.
Name communicate this fact? One is left to surmise that Josephus would have his reader believe that the Name itself was numinous.

It is an interesting exercise to compare this tale with the Philonic understanding of this priestly diadem:

And a golden leaf was wrought like a crown, having four names [letters] engraved upon it which may only be mentioned or heard by holy men having their ears and their tongues purified by wisdom, and by no one else at all in any place whatsoever.... and above this cedaris is a golden leaf on which an engraving of four letters was impressed; by which letters they say that the Name of the living God is indicated, since it is not possible that anything in existence, should exist without God being invoked...\(^{395}\)

Returning to Josephus we find in Josephus' second exposition on the divine name a narrative that tells his version of how Moses came into the possession of the divine name. According to Josephus Moses had seen such great miracles that he could no longer doubt that God was with him, or in his commissioning. Nevertheless, Moses sought confirmation for his call to confront Pharaoh with supernatural wonders. It is said that:

Moses...prayed and entreated that he might be vouchsafed this power in Egypt; he also besought Him not to deny him the knowledge of His Name...since...when sacrificing he might invoke Him by His Name to be present at the sacred rites. Then God revealed to him His Name, where ere [before] then had not to men's ears, and of which I am forbidden to speak. (AJ II.275-276)

Another apparent belief was that the Name could be used to carry out injurious acts (AJ 3.270-275). We see this in a free paraphrase of the prohibition found in Num. 5:12-28, where Josephus now adds the use of the divine name. With the addition of the divine name Josephus maintains that cases of adultery could now be adjudicated (more accurately?):

But if anyone suspect that his wife has been guilty of adultery, he was to bring a tenth deal of barley flour; they then cast one handful to God, and gave the rest of it to the priests for food. One of the priests set the woman at the gates that are turned towards the temple, and took the veil from her head, and wrote the name of God on parchment, and enjoined her to swear that she had not at all injured her husband; and to wish that, if she had violated her chastity, her right thigh might be put out of joint; that her belly might swell, and that she might die thus; but that if her husband, by the violence of his affection, and of the jealousy which arose from it, had been rashly moved to this suspicion, that she might bear a male child in the tenth month. Now when these oaths

\(^{395}\)De Vita Mosis, II. 23.114 and 26.132. As an aside I note that in later tradition Metatron was evidently also given a crown with the Name engraved upon it. In 3 Enoch 13.3 we read:

He wrote with His finger...upon the crown which was on my head, the letters by which the heaven and the earth were created; the letters by which the seas and rivers were created; the letters by which mountains and hills were created; the letters by which stars and constellations, lighting and wind, thunder and thunderclaps were created....
were over, the priest wiped the name of God out of the parchment, and wrung the water into a vial. He also took some dust out of the temple (if any happened to be there), and put a little of it into the vial, and gave it her to drink; whereupon the woman, if she were unjustly accused, conceived with child, and brought it to perfection in her womb; but if she had broken her faith of wedlock to her husband, and had sworn falsely before God, she died in a reproachful manner; her thigh fell off from her, and her belly swelled with a dropsy. And these are the ceremonies about sacrifices, and about the purification’s thereto belonging, which Moses provided for his countrymen.

As for other literary texts I have already noted in the section on Greco-Roman magic, but which bears repeating here, that the Jewish historian and epitomizer Artapanus narrates a tale in which Pharaoh had Moses thrown in a prison after Moses had brazenly demanded that his fellow kinsmen be released from bondage. Thereafter, in the midst of the night the prison doors were cast open and Moses proceeded to leave the prison and enter the sleeping chambers of Pharaoh. Upon being woken by Moses, Pharaoh made jest of Moses and demanded that he reveal the name of the god who had abetted his escape. Straightaway Moses spoke the divine Name to Pharaoh with the concomitant result that Pharaoh fell unconscious. According to the narrative, Moses revived Pharaoh and subsequently wrote down the secret name of God upon a tablet. Thereafter, one of Pharaoh’s priests, who is said to have disparaged the sacred Name, was immediately thrown into a convulsive fit that killed him. Even Justin in his First Apology claims concerning the Name that “no one can utter the Name of the ineffable God; and if anyone dare to say that there is a name, he raves with a hopeless madness.”

Such speculations on the power of the divine name are by no means restricted to the pseudepigraphical, or historical literature. They are found both in rabbinic, as well as Samaritan literature. I shall reserve my review of some Rabbinic concepts for appendix six. With that said, I shall review the name-concept in Jewish magic.

\[^{396}\text{As quoted in Eusebius, } \text{Praep. evang. } 9.27.24. \text{ As an aside, it is interesting to note that Fossum, crediting an insight from S. Bartina, has rightly speculated that the narrative in Jn. 18: 6 refers to God’s name being pronounced. In the narrative, Jesus replies to the Jewish guards who have come to arrest him and when asked if he is, “Jesus of Nazareth,” he replies, “I am.” Most scholars see here a reference to various Deutero-Isaiah passages where God refers to Himself as κέρι τοῦ (e.g. Isa. 43:25; 51:12). Now in the Johannine passage, when Jesus replies, “I am,” the guards fell down to the ground. The reaction of the guards implies that the divine name was spoken out. Within Judaism, we find several examples where at the pronunciation of the Name a profound effect was generated and this seems to fit quite well the reaction of the guards. This would imply then, that Jesus was claiming the divine name for himself. See Fossum, “In the Beginning was the Name,” 127.\]
THE NAME-CONCEPT IN JEWISH MAGIC

During the Intertestamental period Jewish interests turned increasingly toward a preoccupation with the demonic, and in many respects magic. This inordinate interest garnered for them a number of pejorative epithets. Juvenal, in his Satires (6.546), accuses the Jews of being unscrupulous in the manner in which they plied their exorcistic and magical trade. In the following Juvenal tells of an encounter with a Jewish prophetess:

No sooner has that fellow departed than a palsied Jewess, leaving her basket and her truss of hay, comes begging in her secret ear; she is an interpreter of the laws of Jerusalem, a high priestess of the tree, a trusty go between of the highest heaven. She, too, fills her palm, but more sparingly, for a Jew will tell you dreams of any kind you please for the minutest of coins.397

According to Celsus (C. Cels., 1.26) the Jews are “addicted to sorcery which Moses first expounded to them.” Further, Lucian (ca. 160 C.E.) could complain of those “fools [who] fall for the spells of the Jews.” In fact, as early as Posidonius (ca. 135-150 B.C.E.) we encounter the complaint that “the (Jewish) people are sorcerers and pretend to use incantations.”399 In point of fact, magic came to play an increasing important role in the syncretistic intermeshing of Jewish and Greek culture as E. Schwartz points out:

It must not be over-looked that Judaism derived publicity not only from its apologetic, properly so called, but also a more debased sort of publicity through practitioners of elements in the syncretism which underlies magic. They are really the most important and interesting elements in it.400

While one may wish to argue that pagan observers misunderstood Jewish exorcists to be magicians, in my view it seems likely that these itinerant exorcists would have incorporated some magical-type procedures, for example, an apparatus (e.g., the Seal of Solomon which is clearly an example of materia magica), in their exorcisms. All of these texts from contemporaneous non-Jewish authors attest to the fact, or at least the perception, that post-

397 Translation from Stern, Greek and Roman Authors on Jews, 101. The original text reads: Cum dedit ille locum, cophino fenoque relieto arcanum ludaea tremens mendicat in aurem, interpres legum Solymarum et magna sacerdos arboris ac summi fida iniminitia caeli. Implet et illa manum, sed parcius; aere minuto qualiacumque voles Judaei somnia vendunt.

398 Gout 170.

399 Strabo in his Geographica 16.2.43. As quoted in Stern, Greek and Latin Authors, 147.

Biblical Judaism was becoming increasingly preoccupied with magic. Coupled with texts cited earlier, we can infer that Intertestamental Judaism was increasing taken with magical notions.

Shifting to non-literary magical sources of obvious Jewish provenance we encounter amulets that have been cataloged by Goodenough, among others. Congruent with our examples culled from the SHR these amulets attest to the same reliance upon knowing and utilizing divine names. For example one amulet reads:

I summon thee, Gabriel, by the holy names of the Father, Marinab, Marmaru, Balam, Phiou, Bathuriel, Ioa. Sabaoth, Adonai, Pantokrator, Manuel, Sabaoth, Abathu....

And in another amulet we find inscribed the following supplication:

By virtue of the [power] of your holy Name, Iao, Sabaoth, Adonai, Eloi, the Pantokrator... great and only god... send Gabriel to me, the angel of righteousness, that he may drive away before me all the impure spirits...

An even more telling fact which can be adduced for the centrality of the divine name in these magical reliquaries is the fact that through time, the basic form of both the amulet, and the pivotal position that the divine name plays, remains for all intents and purposes unchanged.

Other examples from a demonstrably Semitic (almost certainly Jewish) provenance are provided for in various incantational texts. Although after the era of my concern, they nevertheless give us some idea of how Jews might have used divine names. In any case, several examples are particularly engaging. The first invokes various angels to provide healing:

This bowl is designated for the sealing of the house of Mihr-Hormizd bar Maml. In the name of Michael the healer, and Raphael the reliever, and Gabriel the servant of the Lord. Bound and sealed is all evil that is there in the body of Mihr Hormizd bar Mami...

In yet another text we find the name of YHWH directly invoked:

Salvation and bound are all blast-demons and evil destructive demons... May the sorceries be turned back on those who worked them... in the name of YHWH YH Elohim נלעש [shebeoth] amen, amen, selah...

---


Several Aramaic incantational texts from ca. 400 C.E. also tell in favor of this portrait of Jewish magic. Although I am stretching the bounds of my chronological envelope I, nevertheless, have just cause for consulting these texts for two valid reasons. First, the function and various forms of these incantations are highly analogous to earlier traditions and in fact appear to draw from them. Secondly, as a distinctive corpus derived exclusively from Aramaic sources, these texts allow us a window in which to view distinct traditional Semitic idioms that might otherwise go unnoted.

Given the breadth of the material in this collection I shall choose four representative samples, which I trust, will prove illustrative for my investigation. I shall withhold my analysis of these texts until all four have been presented.

Our first text comes from an amulet whose provenance is near Ağabeyli, Turkey. The incantation is apotropaic in nature and was intended to ward off evil spirits. A relevant portion of the charm reads as follows:

Put mercy from heaven on ślnw. In the name (םשג) of Michael, Raphael, Azzael, Azriel, Ariel...the holy angels which stand in front of the throne of Great God. In your Name (גשנפ) sacred God, may there be extinguished the evil spirit and the demon and the shadow spirit and the tormentor and the destroyer. In your Name (גשנפ) God of Israel, may the words rise up to the heaven, at the side of the throne of the great, powerful, awful, sacred, magnified, praised, and exalted God...For mercy in front of the throne [may] there be extinguished the tormentor, the destroyer and...the demon...

Our second text is also apotropaic in nature and seeks as its terminus a successful exorcism. The text reads:

[This amulet is for Shim‘]on son of Sappira against every...and Satan and evil eye and fever [...]and every] spirit that shakes. In the Name (םשג) of the God of Israel Zairphthaō phozakh[ot][magic characters][...el, God’s divine Presence above my head...exorcise Satan...
Our third text comes from an incantation bowl from Mesopotamia that evinces an interesting international flavor to its magic, but also an apotropaic cast. The text reads:

Overturned [repeated seven times] is the earth and heaven...Overturned is the curse...[of the ones] who stand...on the mountains and the temple and the synagogue. Bound and sealed is the curse which she made [?] In the name (םשנ) of Betiel and Yequitiel, and in the name of YYY the Great, the angel who has eleven names...Whoever transgress against these names, these angels, bound and sealed are all demons and evil spirits...

My last group of examples comes from one amulet, one lamella, and one intaglio respectively. The amulet originated in Horvat Kanaf. The text reads:

An amulet to heal Ya’itha the daughter of Marian from the fever and the shiver and the evil eye...Yahu Yahu Yahu Yahu [magic signs] exorcise the fever from the body of Ya’itha...In the Name (םשנ) of I-am-who-I-am.

This lamella carries the typical adjuration formula with a crude drawing of the Seal of Solomon, which encircles the Tetragrammaton. In a final example, the intaglio of the Pibeechan exorcism admonishes the demon not to “disobey the Name of God.”

---

408Ibid., 27. In the expression of יבש מיא ית וה יירה (pg. 34) we seem to have reference to pagan temples, but also to a Jewish synagogue.

409For full access to the text see pg. 135 of Naheh and Shaked.

410The use of an acceptable form of the Tetragrammaton is paralleled in an exorcistic text from the 12th century Cairo Genizah. The text reads, “In the Name of yy the God of Israel...In the name of the I-am-who-I-am...I adjure you spirit in the Name of the Tetragrammaton, who sits on the wings of the winds,...who sits on the clouds...” See Naveh and Shaked, Amulets and Magic Bowls, 225-226.

411The Seal of Solomon was famous in antiquity for having the power to exorcise demons. According to Duling at least 12 references to the Seal have been found upon Aramaic incantation bowls. Interestingly, the Seal of Solomon, which is similar to the ring of Solomon, as Josephus makes clear, was believed by many Jews to carry the Tetragrammaton, and was credited with binding Amodai, the prince of demons (Test. of Sol. 1:6-7, b. Git. 68b).

Further enlightenment can be found in Josephus. In AJ 8:45 he relates concerning Solomon that “God gave him [Solomon] knowledge of the art that is used against demons, in order to heal and benefit men.” Josephus appends the further comment that Solomon, being the greatest exorcist of all, had left explicit spells (שדסז) concerning the proper protocol for exercising authority over the demonic realm (ἐρωδέω). As Duling notes the origin of this speculation probably is to be traced to 1 Kings 5:9-14, where Solomon is said to have stated 3,000 proverbs and 1,005 songs (5,000 in the LXX), and 4:29-34, where it is said that Solomon’s wisdom exceeded all the peoples of the east, including Egypt-the home of magic par excellence. This tradition is expanded upon in Josephus (Ant. 8:2.5.), where Josephus relates that Solomon had written books of parables and 1,005 books of מָגִיא, as well as incantations. It is of some interest to take note also of Wisdom of Solomon 7:15-22: “For it is he that has given me unerring knowledge, to know the constitution of the world and the working of the elements...the powers of the spirits and the designs of men the varieties of plants and the virtues of roots, all that was secret or manifest I learned, For wisdom, the fashioner of all things, taught me.” Perhaps of greater interest is that Josephus’ statement presupposes a circulating magical text, a type of Liber Sacer, in his day. Such a book may lay behind the so-called ‘Hygromancy of Solomon,’ which possibly dates to the First Century C.E. It is of some interest to note that such a text may very well have instructed the practitioner to apply the name of Solomon as the source of authority in the exorcism. Further corroborations for this idea is found in the fact that at Qumran the covenanters added the name of Solomon to Psalm 91 (119PsA), a psalm that was interpreted in a manner so as to deal specifically with demonology. His name is also associated with demons in three Nag Hammadi texts. In any event, it should be noted
In another narrative, this time from the First Century C.E., we find Josephus’ narration about the contemporary exorcist Eleazar, to whom he was an eyewitness. Josephus states that Eleazar relied not only upon magical roots but also called upon Solomon’s name to effect exorcisms. These narratives, along with Jesus’ comments that the Sons of the Pharisees cast out demons (Mt. 12:27; Lk. 11:19 par.), and the well-known passage from Acts 19, which tells of the itinerant Jewish exorcists who attempted to use the name of Jesus in exorcisms, establishes that first century Jews practiced exorcism and that many believed that numinous names, even apart from God’s own, could be used as an apotropaic shield. One last point remains. Insofar as God’s name could drive out demons, it could also heal illness, as we have seen in the Greco-Roman magic section, for there existed a widely spread belief that demons caused disease. Thus, the Name could by virtue of the one act perform the other.

At this point some provisional comments and observations are in order. First, Greco-Roman magical praxis demonstrates that an adjuring (ὁρκισμός) of the demon or illness was often times effected by calling upon the name of the demon or god. We see that here also. Second, the instrumental use of the preposition ἐν, with τῷ ὄνοματι and the genitive of a person, is quite rare in Greek. Thus, the use of ἐν in these texts indicates that we are witnessing the employment of a Semitic idiom. As our Aramaic examples attest, invocations that the use of Solomon’s name is most likely not because his name was thought to be numinous, but rather because Solomon knew the techniques for warding off demons. See, On the Origin of the World, 11.5:107; Apocalypse of Adam V, 5:78-79; Testimony of Truth IX, 3:70. For further reading see Dennis C. Duling, “Solomon, Exorcism, and the Son of David.” Harvard Theological Review 68 (1975): 235-252, and, “The Eleazar Miracle and Solomon’s Magical Wisdom in Flavians Josephus’ Antiquitates Judaicae 8.42-49,” HTR 78 No. 1 (1985): 16.

414One must assume in this particular case that the presumed efficacy of the Seal was due primarily to the divine name rather than to the legend of Solomon, as can be shown by examining comparative material. For further details of the lamella itself see Kotansky, “Greek Exorcistic Amulets,” 267-8.


416AJ 8.2.5 (44-49).


418Heitmüller, IV, J. 140.

419Bietenhard, “ὁνόμα,” 244.
were done ‘into the name’ and employed the preposition bet (בֵּית). It is also worthy of note that we nowhere observe the use of the preposition lamed “to” or “for” (i.e. לְ) with the use of the name of someone. This observation will be useful for my review of the phrase that will be undertaken later on. Third, in exorcisms the Name seems to have been construed as the agent or medium through which the divine being was anticipated to join the supernatural battle. Fourth, there appears to be a clear emphasis on apotropaic magic. This emphasis is seen in the incantational bowls, Josephus, and the DSS texts, not to mention the New Testament.

Corroboration from literary sources that such exorcistic practices continued into the Christian era are numerous.418 Putting aside for the moment the PGM we have such practices attested to in variegated sources. In Justin’s Dialogue (85.3), Justin deals with a Jewish magician where he expresses the sentiment that Jewish exorcist employ the Name as their apotropaic medium:

If you exorcise a demon in the name of any of those who once lived among you—kings, righteous men, prophets, patriarchs—it will not obey you. But if you exercise the demon in [the Name]... of the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob, it may obey you. No doubt your exorcists apply these techniques when they exorcise, just like the Geptiles, and they use fumigations and incantations. And just decades later Irenaeus ventures a similar opinion:

And...all things have been placed under the sway of Him who is styled the Most High, and the Almighty. By calling upon Him, even before the coming of our Lord, men were saved both from most wicked spirits, and from all kinds of demons, and from every sort of apostate power... This was the case...because they [demons] knew of the existence of Him who is God over all, at whose invocation they trembled, as there does tremble every creature, and principality, and power...419

These texts fit perfectly with the portrait of Jewish magical practice painted by the amulets, incantation bowls, non-literary texts, and as I mentioned earlier, Josephus and the Qumran community. Moreover, these texts date to the Second Century C.E. and confirm that the Name was used for exorcisms (and certainly magic) in this early period.

All of these materials support the contention of Heitmüller who correctly noted that “Es ist eine völlig unberechtigte Spiritualisierung, wenn man behauptet, der ‘Name’ Gottes sei nur als

---

418 While direct evidence from the first century is fragmentary the Jewish (?) defixio from Megara is dated to the first or early second century C.E. and invokes sacred Jewish names. See Kotansky, “Greek Exorcistic Texts,” 275.

419 Ad Haer. II. 6.2.
der Ausdruck für Gottes Wesen, seine Attributen...[for] Die übernatürlichen Kräfte stehen nun auch dem Menchen...⁴²⁰ Clearly, the Name was viewed as having numinous and apotropaic qualities. With this review in hand I will now turn my attention to systematizing the various phenomenological uses of the divine name.

⁴²⁰ Heitmüller, JNJ, 134-135.
PHENOMENOLOGICAL USES OF THE NAME OF GOD

The biblical Homologia has its roots in Jewish cultus and liturgy. The literal meaning of ἡμιν (LXX, ἐξομολογεῖσθαι) is to agree upon the same thing. In the Greek papyri the word ἐξομολογεῖσθαι takes on the sense of a compact or agreement reflecting a legal character. In religion we find a more varied use, e.g., for commitment to vows, as well as for the confessing of sins, to name but a few uses. It can also take on the meaning of an outward expression of one’s faith. As such the word can take on the meaning both of acknowledgement, as well as praise. Given this it is not surprising that the Homologia is almost always directed toward God. In this context of course, public confession is often presupposed. It carries the thought of magnifying God by confessing or rehearsing his mighty acts.

Given the fundamental meaning of praise or confession toward God the original Sitz-im-Leben of this use of word has been surmised to reside in various cultic settings. Such praise has the objective of acknowledging the power and salvation of God and broadcasting the same to others.

Insofar as confession encompasses a person’s religious belief it can therefore be used to represent a person’s religious affiliation. In this category of usage we find numerous examples.

---

421 Grether, NWGAT, 17.
423 The LXX prefers the compounds of ὁμολογεῖν, such as exomologesthai and exomologesis, which in secular Greek denote public admission or acknowledgment. On the basis of Heb. yada, however, the idea of praising God is added to that of acknowledgment (cf. 1 Kgs. 8:33, 35 and Neh. 9:3 for the linking of the two).
424 E.g., Ladder of Jacob 7:35. It should be noted that ἡμιν could also be translated by ‘confess.’
426 Ibid., 122-123.
427 Ibid.
For example, confession could be directed toward affirming that the God of Israel was to be acknowledged as the one true Lord. To cite but one relevant text, Josephus (BJ 7.417-418), in a polemically tainted passage, refers to the Jewish refusal to acknowledge Caesar as Lord (cf. 2 Macc. 7:37). He describes them as those:

Whose courage, or whether we ought to call it madness, or hardiness in their opinions, everybody was amazed at; (418) for when all sorts of torments and vexations of their bodies that could be devised were made use of them, they could not get anyone of them to comply so far as to confess or seem to confess (ὁμολογήσωσιν), that Caesar was their lord; but they preserved their own opinion, in spite of all the distress they were brought to, as if they received these torments and the fire itself with bodies insensible of pain, and with a soul that in a manner rejoiced under them.

Further uses of the term are seen in cases where one confesses-sometimes in the name of another-that they had transgressed in some manner and now seek repentance and reconciliation. This usage could be framed in such a fashion so as to emphasize the role which the divine name played in such confessions. For example, in I Kings 8:35 we read of Solomon interceding for the people of Israel and he asks God to hear His people when they pray toward the Temple because it is the place “which you said, My Name shall be there.” Solomon then goes on to importune God to forgive Israel when they repent and confess His name:

When the heavens are shut up and there is no rain, because they have sinned against Thee, and they pray toward this place and confess Thy Name (ἐξομολογήσωσιν τῷ ὄνομά σου) [emphasis mine] and turn from their sin.

Similar examples of this phenomenon are found in II Chron. 6:24, where we read, “When your people Israel, having sinned against you...turn again to you, confess your Name, pray and plead with you in this house, then hear in heaven, forgive the sin of your people...When... they have sinned against you, and then they pray toward this place, confess your Name, and turn from their sin... then hear in heaven, and forgive the sin of your servants...” (cf. I Ki 8:33, “When Thy people Israel...have sinned against Thee, if they turn to Thee again and confess Thy Name and pray and make supplication to Thee in this house...”).428

In later Judaism this usage carried the thought of a confession of sin mated with penitential prayer. For example, it is said that the great men of the past publicly confess their guilt (Dan. 9:1ff.; Jdt. 9:1ff., etc.). Prominent in this type of confession is the concept of divine judgment, which inspired the need for confession, but which also averted it.

428 Other passages which reflect this motif are found in PsSol 6:1; 9:6.
We have just seen how the name of God and confession of sins found expression in the Old Testament, but one of the most intriguing examples are found in the Pseudepigrapha. I refer here to the act of confessing the Name (=repenting in the Name) for expiation of sin in *Joseph and Aseneth* 15:7, where Repentance is depicted as a particularizing manifestation of God who entreats God on behalf of those “who repent in the name of the Most High.”

Another place where the Name and confession plays an important role within a religious context is found in the *Psalms of Solomon* (15.2), where the Psalmist states that only the person who confesses the Name will be enfranchised to receive power. Here we see a distinct connection drawn between the Name and the dispensation of divine power.

All of the foregoing attests that for the Torah-faithful the Name was the preeminent source of authority, forgiveness and access to God. Indeed, it was a symbol for God Himself. It was in His name alone that sins were to be forgiven. In fact, since confessing the Name resulted in the remission of sin, this function placed the Name at the very heart of the relationship between God and man. By confessing the Name man and God were reconciled. Not surprisingly, therefore, this function also placed the Name at the very focal point of the cultus, for as we observed in the introductory chapter, the very essence of the cultus is a setting and specific actions whereby God and man are brought together.

**INVOKING THE NAME**

Of all of the various practices in which the Name was central, none was more important than the use of the Name in invocation. The formulaic הוהיִשָּׁבָּב אוֹרֶפֶת occurs approximately 26 times in the Old Testament,⁴²⁹ and its Septuagintal equivalents (e.g., ἐπικαλεῖσθαι, ἐπικληθῆναι, ἐπονομάζειν, καλεῖν, and ὀνομάζειν)⁴³⁰ display several remarkable traits which deserve notice.

---

⁴²⁹ According to Jacob’s count this usage occurs 17 times (*JWV*, 25), while Boehmer counts 21 occurrences (*BIN*, 5) for the name of God and 8 times in connection with the name of a person or thing. Davies, in his *Name and Way of the Lord* (pg. 103), counts 25 occurrences in the MT. Examples include Ex. 31:2; 35:20; Num. 32:38; 42; Jos. 21:9; 1 Chron. 6:50; Jud. 18:29; Isa. 40:26; 43:1; 44:5; 45:3–4; 48:4; Ps. 49:12; Est. 2:14; and 36:17a. This phrase when combined with the Name of God occurs in Gen. 4:26; 12:8; 13:4; 21:33; 26:25; Ex. 33:19; 34:5; 1 Ki. 18:24; 2 Ki. 5:11; Isa. 12:4; 43:25; 47:7; 64:6; 65:1; Jer. 10:25; Joel 3:5; Zeph. 3:9; Zech. 13:9; Ps. 79:6; 80:19; 105:1; 116:4; 13:17; Sir. 47:18b. The expression could also be applied with respect to profane names although the semantic meaning is changed accordingly.

⁴³⁰ The vast majority of cases employ ἐπικαλεῖσθαι or one of its middle voice variants (counting not only this verb stem with the Name, but also with God and Lord, etc.). By Davies’ count, in the LXX there are 114 occurrences with the middle voice; of these all but 11 refer to an invocation of God. Davies furthermore points out
Before I delve into these traits I need to point out that the meaning of the idiom, ὁ θεός, has engendered some controversy. The trouble seems to be whether the idiom means calling upon the name of God, or in contrast, proclaiming His name.431 Niles has persuasively argued that both interpretations are correct. Proclaiming the Name, Niles shows, occurs in the context of thanksgiving, while the invocational nuance occurs during petitions.432

Turning now to the aforementioned traits for ἐπικλασθεὶσθαι, the first is that in the vast preponderance of places in the LXX where God is invoked (inclusive of all verbs; ἐπικλασθεῖν, and ἐπικλῆσθαι, ἐπονομάζειν, καλεῖν, and ὁνομαζεῖν; some 176 times in all)433 the name given is simply kyrios, or the compound kyrios-theos.434 Additionally, it is fair to say that this expression is reflective of a technical term.435 Further, this rendering of the Tetragrammaton by the term kyrios signifies how Jews of that era viewed God-He was the Lord and sovereign over all things.436

The second trait worthy of note is that the majority of those places that speak of invoking the name of God do so within the context of ritual activities.437 In fact, the phrase is almost

---

431 According to Niles, the action of ‘proclaiming the name’ occurs only with respect to God. Evidently, there are no examples that apply this action to humans. See, TNGIW, 75.

432 I direct the reader to Niles’ discussion on this topic. See, Ibid., 75-93.


434 Gen. 4: 26; 13: 4; 21: 33; 26: 25; 48: 16; Nu. 21: 3; Dt. 12: 11; 26: 14: 23; 16: 2; 15: 28: 10; II Ch. 6: 20; Is. 64: 6; Jer. 10: 25. Nǎgelsbach takes this pattern to mean (in prayers at least) that the name YHWH was not a name of power for only by invoking the proper authentic name could God be moved. Part of his arguments rests on the dubious assumption that many prayers are ipsissima verba records. In any event, Jews understood that Kyrios was a reverential substitute for YHWH and it stands to reason that those who did not know how to pronounce the Tetragrammaton used it in invocations, especially in apotropaic contexts. See Nągelsbach, DNGHJS, 27-29.


436 Grether, NWGAT, 17.

437 Ibid., 19. Of course the root of this usage stems from the Hebrew where the phrase הוהי דבש אֲדֹנָי is itself formulaic and generally restricted to calling the name of YHWH in cultic activities. See Niles, TNGIW, 88.
solely restricted to this usage and is almost always found exclusively tied to the name 'YHWH' in cultic usage, rarely with Elohim or other names.\textsuperscript{438}

The third trait worth considering is that the invocation of the Name is intimately bound to petitionary use in times of duress. It is, for example, remarkable that in all of the Laments found within the Psalms there is only one reference to calling upon the name Elohim rather than YHWH (Ps.57:3).\textsuperscript{439}

Indeed, as Deut. 4:7 demonstrates, for this reason the association of the presence of God and invocation was remarkable in Israel and the passage itself deserves full citation, “For what great nation is there that has a god so near to it as is the Lord our God whenever we call on Him?” The author of Exodus draws the cord of this connection even more tightly when he claims that God proclaims that “You shall make an altar of earth for Me, and you shall sacrifice on it... [and] in every place where I cause My name to be remembered [i.e., to be invoked and proclaimed], I will come to you and bless you (Ex. 20:24).” As these passages attest, invoking the name of the God was something which characterized cultic activities.

Now, interestingly, the practice itself is claimed to go back to the time of Adam where, according to Gen. 4:25-26 we read:

And Adam had relations with his wife again; and she gave birth to a son, and named him Seth, for, she said, ‘God has appointed me another offspring in place of Abel; for Cain killed him.’ And to Seth, to him also a son was born; and he called his name Enosh. Then men began to call upon the name of the Lord.

Of some interest here is that Brongers has rightly stressed that the last line of this passage can be translated as, “Men began to worship YHWH.”\textsuperscript{440} Thus, we can create the equation:

\[\text{invocation} = \text{worship}.\]

Of further interest is Philo’s take on this passage. Philo writes on this passage that “Enosh, being interpreted, means hope. ‘He hoped first,’ says Moses, ‘to call upon the name of the Lord his God.’”\textsuperscript{441}

\textsuperscript{438}Ibid., 12. Von Rad emphasizes the importance of the name of God when he says that it is “das Herz des altisraelitischen Kultus.” See Von Rad, Theologie des Alten Testaments Band I, 196.

\textsuperscript{439} This stands in contrast to hymnic praise where various surrogates for the Tetragrammaton are found relatively often.

This cultic use of the name of God is also claimed for the patriarch Abraham, at least according to Genesis (12:8; 13:4; 21:33). Perhaps it is this claimed antiquity for the practice that leads most investigators to suspect that the formula בֵּית אָדָם is the basis of both all later Jewish prayer and cultic devotion, not to mention Jewish magic.

This liturgical usage is also attested to early in other passages too, for example in Deut. 32:3, where Moses invoked the Name, “I invoke the Name of YHWH, ascribe give greatness to our God.” This sort of act is more than an invocare, it is also a calling out of the Name as a type of doxology.

Further use in this direction can be found in the repeated calling upon the Name when a cultic object, such as when an altar was constructed, or an offering dedicated, (e.g., Gen. 12:8; 13:4; 21:33; 26:25).

Given this claimed antiquity for invoking the Name in Jewish cultus it is not surprising that the true Jew was to call upon God by His “inextinguishable name.” Indeed, for the Israelite it could be said that “Happy is the man whose heart is ready to call on the name of the Lord.” In point of fact, even people such as Moses, Aaron and Samuel are described as, “...among those who called on His name.” In a reciprocal fashion God states that He will answer those who invoke His name (Zeph. 3:9); a promise that establishes the fact that it is

---

441 Quod Deterius Potiori insidiari solet 138.

442 Here, however, presumably Abraham simply invoked God through some other name than YHWH. Isaac also is said to invoke the name of God during cultic acts at 24:23.

443 Heimtmüller, INJ, 169. Bietenhard believes however, as do I, that the invocation of the Name was probably originally based on magical conceptions (see, "בֵּית אָדָם." 254). In any event, it is worth pointing out that the sole unambiguous cultic use of the name of YHWH in the Old Testament with respect to prayer is found at Ps. 63:4. Here in a Psalm of praise, the Psalmist says, “So I will bless Thee as long as I live; I will lift up my hands in Thy name (BHS 63:5; וַיַּלֵּא).” Niles, along similar lines, notes that the idiom, וַיַּלֵּא was used in petitions that were delivered in an act which included the invocation of the name of God. See, Untergaßmair, INJ, 237 fn. 156 and Niles, TNGIW, 176.


445 E.g. Jer. 10:25; Ps. 79: 6; Isa. 26:13; 41:25; Ps. Sol. 16:1. In slightly different contexts see inter alia, I Kings 8:43; Bar. 3:7.

446 Prayer of Joseph 9.

447 Ps. Sol. 6:1.
invocation which initiates relationship with God. In addition, the most significant of ritual acts, sacrifice and worship, are bound to the Name in Old Testament piety. In fact, the Name even became an object of love.

Of further importance are those passages, such as Zechariah 13:9 and Joel 3:5 (LXX), which state that in the Day of the Lord’s visitation those who call upon His Name will be saved. In light of these passages we find that the most common situation for the act of invoking the name of YHWH is either for help in distress or for salvation. Indeed, this latter connection is amply demonstrated in Ps.116:13, where the author states that he will:

Lift up the cup of salvation,
And call upon the name of the LORD.

The belief that God would come and save those who call upon His Name is strongly emphasized in passages such as Psalm 20: 1, 8, which states, “Some trust in chariots, and some in horses, but we will make mention of the name of the Lord our God”. This belief is also attested in the Pseudepigraphical literature, for example in Joseph and Aseneth, where Aseneth in great fear at the impending approach of Pharaoh and his men “called upon the Name of the Lord her God” for protection (26:7). Aseneth is described as someone who takes, “refuge in the Name of the Lord God (16:16).” Indeed, she even feels led to speak out a soliloquy on how she was able to sum up the courage to invoke the “terrible holy Name” (11:15-18). In this fearful refrain Aseneth is said to be afraid to “open her mouth and to name the name of God” (v.15; cf. 11:18; 26:8).

448 Ps. 99:6.


450 E.g., Ps. 54:6; 63: 4-5; 105: 1-3 (cf. I Chron. 16: 10); 116:17.

451 E.g., Ps. 5:11; 69: 36; 119: 132 and Isa. 56: 6.

452 Zechariah reads, “And I will bring the third part through the fire, Refine them as silver is refined, And test them as gold is tested. They will call on My name, And I will answer them; I will say, ‘They are My people, And they will say, ‘The LORD is my God.’” (cf. Ps. 9:10; 91:14-15).

453 Niles, TVG/M. 83.

454 See also Ps. Sol. 15:2 where the author states that during persecution he “called on the Lord’s name.”

455 Joseph and Aseneth 16.16.
A similar view stands behind Ps. Sol. 7.6, where the author confidently boasts that “While your Name lives among us, we shall receive mercy, and the Gentile will not overcome us.”\(^{456}\) Here it can be seen that the passage reflects the belief that as long as the name of YHWH is named the people of God will be saved from their enemies.\(^{457}\) In a similar vein, Josephus (BJ 5.438) states that during times of duress, one was to call upon the “dreadful” name of God.

Now invocation could also be used to erect community boundary markers. For example, in Ex. 23:13 Moses states, “...be on your guard; and do not mention the name of other gods, nor let them be heard from your mouth.”\(^{458}\) Similarly, Joshua 23:7 reads, “Do not associate with these nations that remain among you; do not invoke the names of their gods or swear by them.”\(^{459}\) In this context it is of some interest to consider that it is claimed that God Himself will strip the people of the names of the Baals and reveal to them how he is to be invoked.\(^{460}\)

In fact, the very act of invoking the name of YHWH could also serve as the litmus test for delineating those nations who do not follow YHWH, and correspondingly, those who are to be destroyed.\(^{461}\) Conversely, when the people of Israel have strayed from following YHWH they are described as those who have become “like one who is unclean...and all our righteous acts are like filthy rags...No one calls on your name, or strives to lay hold of you.”\(^{462}\) These references demonstrate that a religious conventicle could be defined by their ritual practices, in this case invocation.

There is yet another powerful connection between invocation of the Name and God’s Name; that is, invocation insures God’s presence. We find the foundation for this belief being laid in earlier texts. For example, in Ex. 20:24, YHWH promises to come whenever His Name is

\(^{456}\) The phrase, “While your Name lives among us” can be loosely rendered as “While your Name is in currency among us...”

\(^{457}\) Cf. Psalm 44:5; Jeremiah 10:6; Proverbs 18:10; Psalm 20:1 and Sir 51:3.

\(^{458}\) Although here the verb employed is הָאָשָׁר.

\(^{459}\) cf. Mi. 4:5.

\(^{460}\) Hos. 2: 16-17.

\(^{461}\) Ps. 79:6; Jer 10:25.

\(^{462}\) Isa. 64:6-7.
invoked. Here invocation and God’s presence are ineluctably intertwined. Another example of this phenomenon appears to be the theophany described in Ex. 33:17-19 and 34:5-6. In this narrative God reveals Himself to Moses, but will not allow Moses to see His face; instead He offers to call out His own Name. Notwithstanding the problems involving both source and redaction, which both of these two passages bear, they imply that the calling out of the Name is surely a symbol of YHWH’s presence, and through this presence the promises and covenant of YHWH are vouchsafed.

Now as I mentioned earlier the invoking of the Name is tied directly to cultic activities in sacred rites. Here the invoking the name of God is a terminus technicus that legitimates the cultic site and its activities. As Grether has pointed out the invocation of the name of the divinity was an integral component of ritual offerings. In effect, the invocation of the deity insured his presence in the rituals-they were an indispensable element for their success. Indeed, it can be said that in cultus the name of the God was in many respects the centerpiece of

---


464 It should be noted that various scholars, noting the strange nature of this claim, have preferred to see Moses as the subject of the verb; that is, Moses calls out the name of God. For a discussion of the problems encountered with this passage see Niles, TNGIW, 125-128, who has marshaled several weighty objections to this reading of the text. Davies, for his part, has also noted the difficulty in envisioning God invoking His own name. He quotes Mobley favorably to the effect that God is simply offering a demonstration for Moses. Thus, God’s action is designed to teach Moses how to call upon Him and insure His presence. For more see Davies, Name and Way of the Lord, 105.

465 Grether, NWGAT, 20 and Niles, TNGIW, 158.

466 As Josephus mentions, Moses invoked the Name of God during animal sacrifices, AJ 2.12.4 (275).

467 Brongers, “Die Wendung b’sêm jhwh,” 12; Mehlmann, Der “Name” Gottes, 70; and K. Baltzer, “Namenglaube,” 1303.

468 Grether, NWGAT, 19.

469 Ibid.
cultic ritual.\textsuperscript{470} Simply put, the invocation of the name of God was the most elementary, and most important component, of ritual action.\textsuperscript{471} Commenting on this Besnard has stated that:

L’invocation de dieu par son nom propre, à haute voix, était peut-être l’acte le plus solennel et le plus grave de toutes les religions archaïques.\textsuperscript{472}

Likewise Schmidt was led to comment that “Die Gemeinde, die dieses Wort [i.e., the name of the divinity] zu Anfang ihres Gottesdienstes ausspricht, stellt sich damit in den Bereich der Wirkung dieses Namens.”\textsuperscript{473}

This theologoumenon of the interconnectedness of ritual acts and the divine name is highlighted in Malachi, where in perhaps the most interesting cultic setting in all the Old Testament (in terms of God’s Name), the Name is figuratively viewed as the object of smoke offerings (Mal. 1:11). As Grether notes, the immediately preceding verses provide the thematic relationship between the name of God and its symbolic place in praise directed toward God. Thus, here we find the intertwining between the Name itself and praise directed toward God.

Yet other passages associate some cultic activity, usually worship, with the act of proclaiming the Name. Isa. 12:4-6, for example, states, “Give thanks to the LORD, call on His name,” in connection with “Praise the LORD in song” and “Make them remember that His name is exalted.” The same association is seen in Ps. 105:1, “O give thanks to the LORD, call upon His name; Make known His deeds among the peoples.”

Other passages hint at a cultic background in the context of purification. One text of note is Zeph. 3:8, where in the End Times God declares that:

For the day when I rise up to the prey.
Indeed, My decision is to gather nations, To assemble kingdoms,
To pour out on them My indignation, All My burning anger;
For all the earth will be devoured By the fire of My zeal.
For then I will give to the peoples purified lips,
That all of them may call on the name of the LORD,
To serve Him shoulder to shoulder.

\textsuperscript{470}Grether, NWGAT, 19, 39, 43. Heitmüller states, correctly in my judgment, that the Name served a sacramental function in Judaism. See INJ, 155.

\textsuperscript{471}Heitmüller, INJ, 168.

\textsuperscript{472}Besnard, Le Mystère du Nom, 25.

\textsuperscript{473}Schmidt, Die Bedeutung des Namens, 38.
Zechariah too (13:9) speaks of God purifying His people so that they may call upon His name. The text reads:

This third I will bring into the fire; I will refine them like silver and test them like gold. They will call on my name and I will answer them; I will say, ‘They are my people,’ and they will say, ‘The LORD is our God.’” (NIV translation)

These passages make a good case for seeing a tight association between cultic activity (in this case purification) and invoking the name of God.

Other areas where the invocation of the Name could be applied were in polemical confrontations where the greater power of YHWH would be set against other gods. In 1 Kings 18:25-36 Elijah challenges the priests of Baal to a contest of power. Elijah, for his part, was to “call on the name of the Lord,” while the priests of Baal were to “call on the name of their god” (BHS קָרָא אֱלֹהֵי בָּאָל, LXX καὶ βοῶ τε ἐν ὄνοματι θεῶν υἱῶν; καὶ ἐγὼ ἐπικάλεσομαι ἐν ὄνοματί κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ μου). Upon calling on YHWH, fire came from the heavens and consumed the “the burnt offering and the wood and the stones and the dust, and licked up the water that was in the trench (1 Kings 18:38).” Needless to say, YHWH comes out the victor.

Another passage of interest is Amos 6:10. This passage relates the story of the promised destruction of Jerusalem by non-Jews. The narrative claims that a surviving relative, or a undertaker, will enter the house of those who are slain and ask if anyone is still left in the building. It is then claimed that any survivor will say, “Keep quiet. For the name of the LORD is not to be mentioned.” Here we find a possible allusion to the belief that speaking out the Name would cause God to come on the scene and continue the destruction.

Along more apotropaic lines the Test. of Sol. 4.12, 5.9 states that in order to subdue the various demons Solomon invoked the name of God. Indeed, it is even claimed that the Name

---

474 Curiously, Niles states that the phrase, “call in the name of G,” where G represents the name of the god, is not found in non-biblical examples. While it is indeed curious that so little evidence of the exact phrase exists, one can not help but wonder why this expression is put in the mouth of the prophets of Baal if the phrase was not widely recognized as a common cultic expression. Niles states, “As far as is presently ascertainable, the idiom qāra' b'šm G is not attested among Israel's neighbors.” See Niles, TNGJ, 65.

475 Nagelsbach adopts a more cautious view and notes that this passage only illustrates what the relative, or perhaps a non-Jew, might think, not necessarily what a Jew would think. Giesebrecht however takes a different tack and I think his view that the Name carries the power to insure God's presence is correct. Thus, naming the Name was thought to bring God on the scene. See DATSGN, 128 and DNGJHS, 24.
could even bring dread upon the non-Jew; intimating a numinous conception of the Name.\textsuperscript{476} And in an eschatological context, when the evil end-time days arrive, the author of Jubilees 23: 21 claims those who do not follow the path of righteousness will “pronounce the great Name, but not in truth or righteousness.”

In summary, as numerous texts show, invoking the name of God could insure many salutary effects, viz. God’s presence and power. The invocation of God’s name could bring about effects as divergent as successful exorcisms, to successful demonstrations of God’s power in the face of pagan challenges. Also, invocation of the name of the ‘true’ God could be used to delineate those who really worship Him from those who are outside the covenant with the one God.

**MAKING AN OATH IN THE NAME**

The expression \( \text{ותוק} \) (or \( \text{ותוק} \) as the case may be\textsuperscript{477}) occurs only a few times in the O.T. and in every case it has either God as the referent (e.g., \( \text{nu} \text{YHWH} \) Judg. 21:7 II Sam. 19:8 and I Kings 2:8), or His name (Lev. 19:12; Deut. 6:13; 10:20; I Sam. 20:42; Jer. 12:16; Zech. 5:4).\textsuperscript{478} Accordingly, the structure of the vow, at least as it is found in biblical usage, normally contains at some point an appeal or address to God.\textsuperscript{479}

As for the background of this practice, an oath given in the name of God can be traced from antecedent pagan practices.\textsuperscript{480} Perhaps the most striking aspect that this background material highlights is that vows were made almost always directed to God, at least as evidenced in biblical usage.\textsuperscript{481}

\textsuperscript{476}E.g., Deut. 28:10; Ps. 102:15; Isa. 59:19. To this the circumlocution in Ps Sol 7:6 might be added. Here the claim is made that as long as the Name is resident in Israel the nation is guaranteed victory.

\textsuperscript{477}E.g., Jos. 23:7 and Is. 48:1.

\textsuperscript{478}See Tony W. Cartledge, *Vows in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East* (Sheffield: J.S.O.T. Press, 1992), 140. An essential component in oaths is the use of the divine name. On this matter see Friedrich Horst, “Der Eid im Alten Testament,” in *Gottes Recht. Gesammelte Studien zum Recht im Alten Testament*, ed. Hans Walter Wolff, (München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1961), 297. It should be observed that other expressions also occur using various circumlocutions such as giving an oath by ‘the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.’

\textsuperscript{479}Following Cartledge, ibid., 145.

\textsuperscript{480}So Jacob, *ING*, 28 and Cartledge, *Vows*, 134.

\textsuperscript{481}So Cartledge, *Vows*, 134 and Brongers, “Die Wendung \textit{b’sam jhwh},” 10.
Essentially, within Judaism the oath was activated, so to speak, by the speaking out of the Name. Philo proposes this very thing in his *De Sacrificiis Abelis et Caili* 93:

And it happens, indeed, that our opinions are confirmed by an oath; but that an oath itself is confirmed by the addition of the name of God. God, therefore, does not become credible because of an oath, but even an oath is confirmed by God. In similar fashion, Josephus claims that the name of God is expressly added to oaths to make them valid.\(^4\)

Some scholars have concluded that this binding of God’s name in oaths explains Ex. 20:7, which states that the speaking out of God’s name in an untrue oath violates the command to not use the Name in vain. In other words, it is believed that this violation drew God into the false oath in order to punish the violator.\(^4\) This thought probably lies behind the wrath of God witnessed to in Zech. 5:1-4 concerning false oaths undertaken in God’s name. In the narrative, Zechariah has a vision in which he sees a flying scroll. The scroll symbolizes God’s wrath. What is of interest here is what God’s wrath is directed at; theft and falsely swearing in His name. The text reads:

> Then I lifted up my eyes again and looked, and behold, there was a flying scroll. 2 And he said to me, ‘What do you see?’ And I answered, ‘I see a flying scroll; its length is twenty cubits and its width ten cubits.’ 3 Then he said to me, ‘This is the curse that is going forth over the face of the whole land; surely everyone who steals will be purged away according to the writing on one side, and everyone who swears will be purged away according to the writing on the other side.’ 4 ‘I will make it go forth,’ declares the Lord of hosts, ‘and it will enter the house of the thief and the house of the one who swears falsely by My name; and it will spend the night within that house and consume it with its timber and stones.’

Along these same lines Philo mentions in his *De Specialibus Legibus II* (the Tenth Festival 254) that the most egregious violations of piety include “to show a contempt for the sacred name of God by means of perjury.” Again, in *De Specialibus Legibus IV* (40), he states concerning the nature of false swearing:

> Every false accuser is at once a perjured man, thinking but little of piety, since he has not just proofs; on which account he has recourse to what is called the inartificial mode of proof, that by oaths, thinking that by the invocation of God he shall produce belief among those who

\(^{45}\) *AJ* 27.93.

\(^{46}\) As Brongers notes, the Name must be viewed cautiously for any misuse would invite God’s wrath. See, Brongers, “Die Wendung b’šem jwh,” 11.
hear him. But let such a one know that he is ungodly and impious, insasmuch as he is defiling that which by nature is undefiled, the good and holy name of God.\textsuperscript{484}

Moving beyond Philo, we see that in a positive sense the Name insured God's presence and that the Name also functioned as a source of the power of God, or His authority as God, in order to vouchsafe the oath.\textsuperscript{485} In fact even God swears by His own name, for there is no greater name by which He can swear.\textsuperscript{486}

Normally, at the fulfillment of these vows the person thanked God by making public payment to God for helping the person fulfill the vow. To cite but one example, public sacrifices were used to express thankfulness at the fulfillment of the vow.\textsuperscript{487}

Furthermore, vows were derived from the personal piety of the person—indeed their creation do not reflect the concerns of organized religion.\textsuperscript{488} This characteristic of personal piety is clearly on display in Ps. 50:14-15 where the Psalmist proclaims:

\begin{enumerate}
\item Offer to God a sacrifice of thanksgiving,
\item And pay your vows to the Most High;
\item And call upon Me in the day of trouble;
\item I shall rescue you, and you will honor Me.
\end{enumerate}

It should also be borne in mind that because vows were made to God they were considered sacred, and thus the payment of the vow was also sacred.\textsuperscript{489} An excellent example of

\textsuperscript{484}Clement, in his \textit{Stromata} (VII.VIII) says, "The man of proved character in such piety is far from being apt to lie and to swear. For an oath is a decisive affirmation, with the taking of the divine name." And Tertullian provides us with an insight into just how sanctified divine names could be in the context of oaths. Tertullian, in his \textit{Apologia} (28), castigates the impiety of some when they swear false oaths in the names of lesser deities. However, when they swear in the name of Caesar they then tell the truth. Tertullian remarks, "This brings us, then, to the second ground of accusation, that we are guilty of treason against a majesty more august; for you do homage with a greater dread and an intense reverence to Caesar, than Olympian Jove himself.... But this is not done by you on any other ground than regard to a power whose presence you vividly realize, so that also in this you are convicted of impiety to your gods, insasmuch as you show a greater reverence to a human sovereignty than you do to them. Then, too, among you, people far more readily swear a false oath in the name of all the gods, than in the name of the single genius of Caesar." Furthermore, in his \textit{de Idol} XX, he states concerning oaths in the names of false gods, "Further, what will an oath be, in the name of gods whom you have forsworn, but a collusion of faith with idolatry? For who does not honor them in whose name he swears?" When the same logic is applied to Judaism it is apparent that the Jews performed their oaths in Yahweh's name because of their respect and fear of the one, true God.

\textsuperscript{485}Brongers, "Die Wendeung b'sêm jhwh," 10 and Besnard, \textit{Le Mystère du Nom}, 27.

\textsuperscript{486}Gen. 22:16; Isa. 45:23. Tertullian says in this regard, in his \textit{Contra Marcion} (XXVI), "But God also swears... by Himself! What was He to do, when He knew of no other God, especially when He was swearing to this very point, that besides himself there was absolutely no God?"

\textsuperscript{487}Cartledge, \textit{Vows}, 135.

\textsuperscript{488}Ibid., 27.
this aspect can be seen in those cases where a person had given a vow to serve God in Temple services.

Another aspect of oaths is that God could also be called upon to be a witness to the actions sworn to—thus lending the oath a distinct legal flavor.490 In other instances vows or oaths could be petitionary prayers which were intended to secure a favorable end to an imminent crisis.491 As such vows stem in part from the human inclination to deal with God as if He were a human; that is, vows could be a sort of quid pro quo whereby the person struck a deal with God (by vowing to do something), in order to deflect distress. Not unexpectedly then, the use of the name of another god (to secure an oath), rather than the name of YHWH (Deut. 6:13; 10:20; Jos. 23:7; Isa. 48:1) was seen as inappropriate for a Jew and prohibited by apodictic law (Jos. 23:7).

Not surprisingly, therefore, the executing of oaths in the name of a foreign god was considered to be apostasy (e.g., Jos. 23:7; Jer. 5:7; Amos 8:14 and Zeph. 1:5). In part this aversion was driven by the fact that the execution of such oaths was cultic in nature.492 Moreover, vows in God’s name by their very nature were such an integral component of Israelite piety that religious authorities felt compelled to regulate vows by the imposition of proper strictures (Deut. 23:21-23).

In summary, oaths were taken in God’s name in order to insure the carrying out of the oath. This insurance came about because calling on God’s name was similar to an invocation; both were designed to draw God near.493 By drawing God near it was thought that God would witness the oath and thus become a participant in the process.

---


491 Ex. 5:23; Deut. 18:19, 20, 22; I Ki. 22:16; (=II Chron. 18:15); Jer. 20:9; 26:16; 29:23; 44:16; Zech. 13:3; Dan. 9:6; I Chron. 21:19; II Chron. 18:15; 33:18; and Sir. 36:20b.

492 Brongers, “Die Wendung b’šém jhwh,” 17. As Brongers points out בְּשֵׁם in Jos. 23:7 refers to a cultic invocation of the god’s name. The author admonishes his readers as follows: “…you may not associate with these nations, these which remain among you, or mention the name of their gods, or make anyone swear by them, or serve them, or bow down to them.”

493 Of some interest in this regard is the statement of Origen (C. Celts. V. XLV), in a passage which we have already covered in the Greco-Roman magic section, that intimates that an oath and an invocation are similar. Origen states, “If any one, either in an invocation or in swearing an oath [emphasis mine], were to use the expression, ‘the God of Abraham,’ and ‘the God of Isaac,’ and ‘the God of Jacob,’ he would produce certain effects, either owing to the nature of these names or to their powers, since even demons are vanquished and become submissive to him who pronounces these names…”
PROPHESYING OR SPEAKING IN THE NAME OF GOD

The phrase דבר בשם occurs some 14 times in the O.T., and one time in the Apocrypha, while בשם אבות occurs roughly ten times. The basal meaning here must be taken to be that one speaks in the place (or authority) of the one being named, and correspondingly reports what the one being named desires, rather than proclaiming one’s own message. It means, more pointedly, that the one who is speaking has been commissioned by the one whose name is being used as Deut. 18:18-20 (cf. Jer. 14:14, 15; 23:25; 27:15; 29:9; Ez. 13:3-9) clearly points out when God says to Moses concerning Israel that in the future He will:

‘Raise up a prophet from among their countrymen like you, and I will put My words in his mouth, and he shall speak to them all that I command him. 19 ‘And it shall come about that whoever will not listen to My words which he shall speak in My name, I Myself will require it of him. 20 ‘But the prophet who shall speak a word presumptuously in My name which I have not commanded him to speak, or which he shall speak in the name of other gods, that prophet shall die.’

Here we observe that the prophesying in God’s name signifies that the one prophesying speaks the very words of God; it is as if God Himself had directly spoken to His people. Appended to this basal meaning, at least with respect to speaking in the name of God, is that the person is presumed to be speaking in and with the Spirit of God. Furthermore, by way of extension, clearly the one who speaks in the name of God can only speak the truth (1 Ki. 22:16; cf. II Chron. 18:15).

494 Ex. 5:23; Deut. 18:19:20; I Sam. 25:9; I Ki. 22:16 (= II Chron. 18:15); Jer. 20:9; 26:16; 44:16; Zach. 13:3; Dan. 9:6; I Chron. 21:19; II Chron. 33:18; Wis. of Sir. 36:20.

495 Jer. 11:21; 14:14:15, 23:25; 26:9, 20; 27:15; 29:9, 21; and Ezr. 5:1.

496 Pace Jacob, ING, 32, and Giesebrecht, DATSGN, 24. Rightly Grether, NWGAT, 23; Bietenhard, "בשם," 260; Besnard, Le Mystère du Nom, 81; Fabry, "םש," 133, 138; Brongers, "Die Wendung "sém jwh," 15; Mehlmann, Der "Name" Gottes, 55; and Niles TNGHW, 50. Jacob maintains that since the Deuteronomist steadfastly denies the existence of other divinities the phrase בשם אבות can’t be taken to imply that the speaker is their representative, and by extension the same must be valid for those passages where the speaker speaks in the name of God. On page 34 Jacob makes the remarkable statement that "…denn bei der Nichtexistenz anderer Götter ist es von vornherein gewiss, dass der Mann liegt und man braucht nicht erst den Erfolg abzuwarten." In spite of the fact that Jacob assumes too much here I will, nevertheless, briefly discuss this point. First, if it so obvious to the people that the so-called false prophet has lied and was thus no prophet at all then why the urgency to admonish the people not to follow him—not to mention kill him? Second, the point here is that the person who speaks in the name of their god naturally believes that that god exists. It is not a question of whether the Deuteronomist believed in their existence, but rather of how Israel was to deal with those who did accept and follow these various gods.

497 Boehmer, BIN, 56.
An example of this type of logic is seen in Jer. 26:9, where Jeremiah is condemned for prophesying against the Temple. Here the Priests accuse Jeremiah as being someone who prophesies falsely in the name of YHWH. This judgment is based upon the belief that YHWH would not, or could not, desire the destruction of His own Temple and thus, Jeremiah must be falsely prophesying in the name of YHWH. In Brongers’ view, as well as mine own, this prophecy of the Temple’s destruction must have been tantamount to blasphemy.498 This passage amply illustrates the idea that the true prophet of YHWH is perceived to be someone who must speak the truth because God has sent them. Of course, if the prophet indeed speaks truthfully in the name of God then the people must take care to take heed to the prophet (e.g., Dan. 9:6). Just how serious this injunction was taken can be seen in the judgment of m San. 11.1, where we find the statement that anyone who prophesies in the name of an idol must suffer strangulation. Similarly, in Jer. 14:14 God decries the false prophets, who He describes as:

The prophets [who] are prophesying falsehood in My name. I have neither sent them nor commanded them nor spoken to them; they are prophesying to you a false vision, divination, futility and the deception of their own minds.

Here the basic meaning of the usage comes into particularly clear focus. Those who legitimately prophesy in the Name are those whom God has commissioned to do so.

A similar result is obtained when we consider the phrase ‘to speak in the name of God’. We find, for example, that Joseph can speak to Aseneth ‘in the name of the Most High God’.499 The same basic meaning can also be seen in Ex. 5:22, where God sends Moses to speak in His Name.

In summary, we can see from these various passages that to speak, or prophesy in the name of God, signified that the speaker was sent from God and that he spoke only those words that God had sanctioned. Thus, he was God’s representative, standing in His place. The Name in a sense represents God. To speak in the name of God means to speak as God would want; that is, as He has commanded.

**BLESS OR CURSE SOMEONE IN THE NAME OF THE GOD**

A related function to invocation is the act of calling upon the Name in blessing. Within the Old Testament one finds that the proper occasion to offer a blessing, as far as humans were

---


499 Joseph and Aseneth, 9.
concerned, was in either greeting another person (e.g. Ps. 129:8; Ruth 2:4), or when one presented a gift to another party (e.g. Jos. 15:19). A blessing, or likewise a curse, could be spoken, or alternatively, it could be written out on amulets and the like.\(^{500}\) But there were important differences, i.e. unlike a curse, people could call a blessing over themselves,\(^{501}\) or as was the case with Abraham, a divinely appointed name could be a blessing for other people (Gen. 12:3).

A blessing could be more than a verbal act, it could also be accompanied by gestures. For example, not infrequently a blessing was accompanied by the placing of the hand upon the one being blessed,\(^{502}\) or was accompanied with an uplifted hand (Lev. 9:22).\(^{503}\)

Historically speaking, it appears that the basis for the view that the calling out of a blessing or a curse in the name of a divinity had a numinous effect appears to have originated in magical conceptions.\(^{504}\) Of greater import for my study is that the role which the divinity played in carrying out either a blessing or a curse in Semitic cultures was quite indispensable.\(^{505}\) We can see the impact of this clearly in those Old Testament passages that speak of blessing in the name of the God.\(^{506}\)

Within cultic contexts, we find that the priest could bless either the people (Ps. 118:26), or the offering (I Sam. 9:13). Some have even maintained that within the Old Testament the

---


\(^{501}\) Ibid., 190.

\(^{502}\) Ibid., 191.


\(^{505}\) For example, Pederson notes that the divinity in Assyrian curses exercised an extraordinary role. In the Assyrian pantheon a lower god would swear by a greater god in order to apply the power of the greater god to the carrying out of the oath. See Jols Pederson, "Der Eid bei Den Semiten in seinem Verhältin zu Verschaun Erscheinungen sowie die Stellung des Eides im Islam" (Strassburg: Karl J. Trübners, 1914), 155, 158.

\(^{506}\) See Num. 6:27; Dt. 10:8; 21:5; II Sam. 6:18 (=1 Chron. 16:2); Ps. 118:26; 129:8; I Chron. 16:2; 23:13; Sir. 45:15d; Joseph and Aseneth 19:8.
blessing of the people in the name of God formed the highpoint and goal of cultic actions.  

Certainly the blessing closed the cultic meal, as well as opened the ritual where the first-born was offered to God.

Now within the Old Testament the *locus classicus* for the priestly blessing is found in Num. 6:22-27, where Moses is commanded by God to speak to Aaron and the people and say:

Then the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, 23 "Speak to Aaron and to his sons, saying, ‘Thus you shall bless the sons of Israel. You shall say to them: 24 The Lord bless you, and keep you; 25 The Lord make His face shine on you. And be gracious to you; 26 The Lord lift up His countenance on you. And give you peace.’ 27 “So they shall invoke My name on the sons of Israel, and I then will bless them.”

At first blush this passage does not appear to raise significant issues but this impression is misplaced. The difficulties lay in the phrase הֵעֵדֶת, a term which is not elsewhere attested to, either in the Old Testament, or in related literature and inscriptions. This lack of comparative material led De Boer to describe this passage as “an erratic boulder, a sliver from a divine statue of Israel’s ancient existence.”

The issue here is whether the phrase should be taken in the manner in which Jerome understood it; that is, as *invocare nomen super*, or as simply placing the name (metaphorically) upon someone or something, much as one might do on a stele. This latter conception carries with it the notion of remembrance. The first interpretation is more attractive, however, because as we shall shortly see, it suggests the notion of ownership and protection. It also suggests that the Name is invoked, and thus it insured the presence of God. Accordingly, this explanation is to be preferred.

Whatever the true state of affairs, the placing of the Name over the people was more than simple symbolism. To the contrary, this passage seems to intimate that the Name offered some

---

508 Ibid.
510 Ibid., 11.
511 Ibid., 13.
protection itself, or at least it guaranteed the protection of God to those who had the Name called out over them.\footnote{512}{Grether, NWGAT, 20.}

In all of these cases the Name functioned both as the source of authority, as well as the reference of, or to, the One who had the power to effect the blessing.\footnote{513}{Pace Boehner, BIN, 56. Boehner believes that the Name is really the subject of the blessing. With specific reference to the notion of blessing in the Name Boehner goes so far as to state that “דָּוִד הְיִנֶּה וְעַל בָּשְׂדֵה הָאָדָם...הוּא הַכְּלָל הַנַּיִם וַתִּסְגַּר הַנַּיִם, והַכְּלָל הַנַּיִם וַתִּסְגַּר הַנַּיִם, והַכְּלָל הַנַּיִם וַתִּסְגַּר הַנַּיִם, והַכְּלָל הַנַּיִם וַתִּסְגַּר הַנַּיִם, והַכְּלָל הַנַּיִם וַתִּסְגַּר הַנַּיִם, והַכְּלָל Hfäh, 56-57. I fail to see the rational for this proposition. I think the evidence demonstrates that the use of the Name in an oath is really similar to an invocation. The god is called upon to witness and secure the oath. Its or her presence, secured via invocation, made the divinity a participant in the oath. Cf. Pederson, Der Eid, 158, 161.}

Beyond this, when the Priest blessed the people during Festivals the authority of the Name granted to the priest the position of standing in God’s place.\footnote{515}{Jacob, ING, 3. This interpretation is given in spite of the fact that Jacob believes that ordinarily the phrase ‘in the name of someone’ does not carry the meaning a representation. See pg. 4.}

This situation is analogous to when a judge passed judgment in the name of the King. Thus, the invoking of the name of an authority, when coupled with its use by an authorized person, passes the authority belonging to the one being invoked to the one doing the invoking.

On other fronts the curse of Elisha, found in II Kings 2: 23-24, is of great interest. In what is perhaps the earliest Jewish example of a malediction, Elisha, in the story of the tormenting children who taunted him by calling him ‘baldy,’ turns toward them in anger and curses them (יִהְיֶה מַלְכָּיו) Immediately thereafter two bears appear from the woods and kill the children. This story reflects, I believe, that the author of this text held that the Name had numinous power.\footnote{516}{Pace Jacob. This particular story provides the rebuttal to Jacob who believes that the Name was never viewed as a numinous object. Here, the malediction carries strong numinous, even magical overtones, as Eissfeldt pointed out. For further reading see Eissfeldt, “Jahwe-Name und Zauberwesen,” 150-152, 154; as well as Jacobs, ING, 18, 48, 64.}

This narrative is also, in my opinion, the one place in the Old Testament that seems to display unmistakable name-magic as a backdrop to the narrative.\footnote{517}{Mehlmann, Der “Name” Gottes, 78. I fail to understand Brongers’ conclusion in this matter that the use of the divine Name in this curse has no magical overtones whatsoever. He maintains that this passage is more in the

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{512}{Grether, NWGAT, 20.}
\footnote{513}{Pace Boehner, BIN, 56. Boehner believes that the Name is really the subject of the blessing. With specific reference to the notion of blessing in the Name Boehner goes so far as to state that “דָּוִד Hfäh, 56-57. I fail to see the rational for this proposition. I think the evidence demonstrates that the use of the Name in an oath is really similar to an invocation. The god is called upon to witness and secure the oath. Its or her presence, secured via invocation, made the divinity a participant in the oath. Cf. Pederson, Der Eid, 158, 161.}
\footnote{514}{So Farby, “דָּוִד,” 132; Mehlmann, Der “Name” Gottes, 76; Brongers, “Die Wendung,” 8; and Horst “Segen,” 192.}
\footnote{515}{Jacob, ING, 3. This interpretation is given in spite of the fact that Jacob believes that ordinarily the phrase ‘in the name of someone’ does not carry the meaning a representation. See pg. 4.}
\footnote{516}{Pace Jacob. This particular story provides the rebuttal to Jacob who believes that the Name was never viewed as a numinous object. Here, the malediction carries strong numinous, even magical overtones, as Eissfeldt pointed out. For further reading see Eissfeldt, “Jahwe-Name und Zauberwesen,” 150-152, 154; as well as Jacobs, ING, 18, 48, 64.}
\footnote{517}{Mehlmann, Der “Name” Gottes, 78. I fail to understand Brongers’ conclusion in this matter that the use of the divine Name in this curse has no magical overtones whatsoever. He maintains that this passage is more in the

\end{footnotes}
HEALING IN THE NAME OF GOD

At first blush we might suspect that the perception that God’s name could bring healing would be completely restricted to non-literary sources, but this is not the case. Within the O.T. certain vestiges of this belief are traceable. For example, in the story concerning the healing of Naaman the leper (II Kings 5:1-14), the prophet Elisha instructs Naaman to go and wash himself in the River Jordan seven times. Naaman’s response reveals something interesting. The text reads (v.11):

But Naaman was furious and went away and said, Behold, I thought, He will surely come out to me, and stand and call on the name of the Lord his God, and wave his hand over the place, and cure the leper.

Here we find possible evidence of the use of God’s name to perform healings. However, it must be said that this passage must be used with some caution. The view of Naaman is cited, not per se, that of Elisha. However, as we have already seen in the story of Elijah cursing the children in the name of God, and his use of the Name at Mount Carmel in his confrontation with the priests of Baal, the Name was used by Elijah in a fashion which suggests that the author thought that the Name had a numinous power all its own. A similar line of thought may stand behind the Elisha narratives also. Naaman should be understood as reacting from previous knowledge of how Jewish prophets acted in similar cases. In any event, this remains an argumentum e silentio and should not be pushed any further.

A similarly suggestive arises when we review the story of the raising of the widow’s son by Elijah (I Kings 17:20-22). In the narrative Elijah is said to have lain over the boy’s body and “called to [invoked] the Lord (ἐπεκάλεσα τὸν κύριον).” Unlike the previous nature of a prayer, and God’s fulfillment of the curse was necessitated because the ridicule of the children (that Elisha was bald), also denigrates God! It is hard to see how this curse constitutes a formal prayer, how the teasing of Elisha by the children for a bald spot insults God, or more importantly why God would answer it unless the author saw God as bound by the use of His Name—a clearly magical conception. Brongers’ claim that God acted because His honor was a stake, in addition to Elisha’s, is hard to swallow. Just how God’s honor was besmirched when the children were teasing Elisha about his baldness remains unclear. And it strikes me as untenable to suggest that God would send bears to maul to death the children based solely on some childhood teasing. Other prophets have been both mistreated and literally terrorized (e.g., I Kings 18:13; 19:1-5 cf. Lk. 11:47-51; Acts 7:52); indeed it is almost a hallmark for the Old Testament prophets, yet in none of these cases do we witness God acting to uphold ‘His’ honor in a manner even remotely similar to what we see in this passage. I think the rejection of magical overtones is fueled by purely apologetic motives by those who wish to preserve the Old Testament as untainted by such magical thinking. For Brongers’ views see “Die Wendung ʾšēm ʾjhwh,” 10.

Nagelsbach does not appear to be willing to see any chance here that the name of YHWH was seen as a source of power. He contends that the very expression מַעַט ṣām is not even a formulaic expression. See, DNGJHS, 23.
example, here it is clear that Elijah invoked God in order to raise the widow’s son from the dead. In this narrative it is clear that the invocation of God insured that God would be present and heal the child.

Another piece of evidence can be gleaned from II Kings 1:1-17. In the narrative Ahaziah had suffered a grievous injury when he fell through the lattice of his room. Seeking a miracle cure, Ahaziah send messengers to consult Baal-Zebub, the god of Ekron. According to the narrative YHWH sends His angel to Elijah and commands that Elijah confront the delegation from Ahaziah and state:

‘Is it because there is no God in Israel that you are going off to consult Baal-Zebub, the god of Ekron?’ Therefore this is what the LORD says: ‘You will not leave the bed you are lying on. You will certainly die!’

Standing behind this narrative is evidently the belief that YHWH could have healed Ahaziah had he only prayed to Him. Of course, this does not necessarily mean that God’s name would have been invoked, but at the least the entire story is suggestive that only YHWH could heal and this in turn suggests that YHWH was invoked to bring about the healing.

Further evidence can be gathered from the Jewish exorcists spoken of in Acts 19. Here we find indisputable evidence that Jewish exorcists used what they thought was an apotropaic name in their exorcisms. I have already pointed out that in the Ancient World illness was widely assumed to be caused by demons and therefore one can conclude that these exorcists were invoking apotropaic names which resulted in certain cases with a healing.

Taken altogether these various narratives lend credence to the notion that Jews prior to the dawn of the New Testament era believed that the use of the name of God in invocation had certain salutary effects in producing healings and the like.

**WRITING OF THE DIVINE NAME**

One of the most remarkable features concerning the divine name was the special scribal treatment afforded the Tetragrammaton. This treatment involved writing the divine name in some specific manner so as to differentiate it from the surrounding text. The nature of this treatment was variegated and there appears to have been no conventionalized method of signifying the Name’s sacred nature. Still, some techniques were more prevalent than others.

In some texts, for example, the Name was written in sacred characters (e.g. paleo-Hebrew script), a practice perhaps derived from Egyptian practice. Josephus, in his narrative about the
vesturing of the High Priest gives us some indication of this practice when he discusses the nature of the priestly diadem and describes it in the following manner:

This calyx...did not cover the forehead, but it was covered with a golden plate, which had inscribed upon it the name of God in sacred characters. And such were the ornaments of the high priest.519

It is of interest to note that the use of paleo-Hebrew characters is attested to in the Qumran documents. Following Stegemann I note the following scrolls in which the Divine Name is recorded in archaic script: 2QExb=2Q3 and 3QThreni=3Q3 (Bible citations without commentary); 4QpIsa=4Q161, 1QpMichah=1Q14, 1QpHab, 1QpZech=1Q15 and 4QpPs³=4Q171 (Pesher texts); 1Qps³=1Q11 and 11Qps³ (apocryphal Psalms).520

Rather striking is Stegemann’s paleographic dating for this practice, which suggests that it first arose in Hellenistic Judaism in the Second Century B.C.E. Stegemann concludes that “Dieser Befund zeigt, daß die Sitte althebräischer Tetragramm-Wiedergabe in einem nicht althebräisch geschriebenen Kontext gar nicht auf palästinischem Boden erwachsen ist.”521

This important observation demonstrates that the same scribal scruples regarding the special treatment of the divine name existed among Hellenistic Jews, as well as their Palestinian cousins, and that the practice was already established well before the advent of the Christian Era.

Other devices employed to signify the singularly sacred nature of the divine name include the later practice of writing the Tetragrammaton in gold letters;522 placing the Tetragrammaton in Hebrew within a Greek copy of the Old Testament, rendering the Name with special modifications such as ‘zz’ with a line drawn through it, or four points,523 or separating the Name from its surrounding text by extra spaces before and after the Name.

The import of this practice is rather clear. It was the scribal method of signifying that the divine name was sacred above all other names. Just as speaking out the divine name was


521 Ibid., 207.

522 So Josephus, A.J. 12.2.10; possibly the Letter of Aristeas 176; and bTalmud. Shabbath 103b.

prohibited, in time its written form became just as sacred, and guarded, as the spoken form. In my section dealing with the New Testament I shall return to this topic and discuss in greater depth the significance of this phenomenon.

THE CALLING OR PLACING OF THE NAME OVER SOMEONE OR SOMETHING

This phrase reflects a legal formulation designed to signify that the object or person over whom the name is invoked is the possession of the bearer of the name, and the phrase is always in the passive (e.g., καταφωνεῖν and ἐπικεκληθησάνθι respectively). This phrase is so formulaic in nature that it could also be extended to such cases as when a general conquered a city and would have his name named over it in order to signify his ownership. In a similar vein, in Ps. 49: 12, we find the statement that the Gentiles call their lands after themselves—no doubt to indicate their ownership.

This concept also stands in the foreground in places such as Isaiah 4: 1, where the text relates the prophetic fate of Jerusalem in a situation where it is said that during the day of calamity seven women will call on the same man to be their husband. The women say, “We will eat our own bread and wear our own clothes, only let us be called by your name (LXX τὸ ὄνομα τὸ σοῦ ἐκεῖκληθῇ ἐφ’ ἧμᾶς); take away our reproach!” Here, clearly in desperation, the women entice the man to become wedded by promising that they would not be an economic hardship. This relationship is signified by the man’s name being called out over the women. Given this context it is significant that the name of YHWH is called out over Jerusalem (Dan. 9:18, LXX; τῆς πόλεως σου, ἐφ’ ἦς ἐπικεκληθή τὸ ὄνομά σου ἐπ’ αὐτῆς), as well as cult objects (i.e., the Ark. See II Sam. 6:2 and I Chron. 13:6).

---


526 Nötcher, “Epiklese,” 222.

527 Jacob, ING, 12, 15. See Farby, “ пу,” 146.
One of the more prominent applications in this respect is the claim that the Temple had the Name called over it (e.g., I Ki. 8:43; Jer. 7:11, 14, 30; 32:34; 34:15; I Ki. 8:43; II Chron. 6:33). This calling of the Name over the Temple meant not only that the place belonged to YHWH, but that it was set apart to and for Him, and was an authorized cult site in which YHWH could be found.

It is worth further considering that ownership claims could also apply to the people of Israel (e.g. Deut. 28:1; Ecclesiastes 47:18; Isaiah 63:19; Jer. 14:9; Dan. 9:19; and II Macc. 8:15). More pointedly, when the Name was called out over Israel it signified their selection for salvation.\(^528\) These are the ones chosen by God and counted worthy to bear His Name and receive His salvation. This owner or property relationship is nowhere more emphatically expressed than in the relationship between YHWH and his people. In Isaiah 63:19 (cf. II Chron. 7:14; Deut. 28:10), it states that Israel belongs to YHWH and has been called by His name (LXX ἐπέκληθη ὁ ὄνομα σου ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς). We read again in Jeremiah 14:9, “You [God] are indeed in our midst and your Name is called over us.” Similar sentiments are echoed in Amos 9:12, where the nations conquered by David are said to be those over whom the name of God had been called (LXX καὶ πάντα τὸ ἐθνὲς ἐπίκληται τὸ ὄνομα μου ἐπὶ ἀυτοὺς), again signifying ownership.\(^529\)

In another capacity the calling of the Name over a person or object signified that they were set apart for the purposes set forth by the discretion of God. We know already that calling the Name over someone or something designated the person or object as YHWH’s possession, but there is a flipside: that is, that this possession meant that the person or object was wholly devoted to Him alone.\(^530\) This sanctification of objects, especially those objects dedicated to cultic activities, is seen clearly in II Sam. 6:2, where the Ark of the Covenant is described as “the ark of God which is called by the Name, who is enthroned above the cherubim.”\(^531\) Here the

\(^{528}\) Mehlmann, *Der “Name” Gottes*, 63. As an example Ps Sol. 9:9 reads, “For you chose the descendants of Abraham above all the nations and you put your name upon us, Lord.”


\(^{530}\) So Heitmüller, *INJ*, 171; Jacob, *ING*, 12; Giesebrrecht, *DNGHJS*, 22; and Grether, *NWGAT*, 25. Grether believes, as do I, that the practice of invoking the name over someone can be traced from prior magical conceptions. See pg. 20.

\(^{531}\) This passage is notorious for the difficulties that it presents. Chief among these is the duplication of the divine name within the narrative. The second reference to the Name is an apparent example of dittography. This

135
meaning is not so much that of ownership alone, but rather the cultic act of calling out the name of YHWH over the Ark during cultic activities. In somewhat similar fashion Josephus claims that when an object or person had the name of a god called over it the object or person then became dedicated to the affairs of the god.

A related area to calling the name over someone is that of tattooing names upon a person. Passages which reflect this theme include Isa. 44:5. Here we read of a ritual sign being written upon the hand of the believer (i.e. ‘Belonging to the Lord’). This sign no doubt signals, among other things, that the bearer of the mark belonged to YHWH. Here the name is not called out over the person, but rather directly placed upon the person. It is this connection between name and possession which also lies behind passages such as Lev. 19:28, 21:5, and Deut. 14:1, which prohibit the practice of tattooing the names or siglas of foreign gods. Heitmüller summarizes this relationship as it is found in the Old Testament as:

Zegehörigkeit zu Jahve, inne Vereinigung mit ihm, seinen Segen und Schutz bedeutet es, wenn Jahves Name über einer Person oder einen Gegenstand genannt wird, eine ähnliche Bedeutung hat der Jahve-Name als Stigma.

A final aspect of this use that I mentioned earlier is that of “placing” ( démarche) of the Name over the people when the High Priest blesses the people (Num. 6:27). Here the Name is called over the people to bless them and to seal them, so to speak. Derived in part from this conception is the complementary notion that the calling of the Name over someone afforded him or her the protection of God.

\footnote{So Mettinger, Dethronement, 128.}

\footnote{AJ 4.207: 16.45. Within the non-canonical literature of the Intertestamental Era we find the continuation of this aspect of the name-concept. In a passage in 2 Esd 4:22-25, a passage dealing with cultic activity, it is stated that the Name was invoked over the Torah faithful: I implore you, my lord, why have I been endowed with the power of understanding? 23 For I did not wish to inquire about the ways above... [but] why Israel has been given over to the Gentiles in disgrace... 24 We pass from the world like locusts, and our life is like a mist, and we are not worthy to obtain mercy. 25 But what will he do for his Name that is invoked over us? (Cf. Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum 49:7).}

\footnote{See Heitmüller, INJ, 174. Interestingly, Heitmüller sees the mark of Cain in the same light. See pg. 174.}

\footnote{Ibid., 175.}
In summary then, calling the name of God over someone or something meant that the person or object belonged to God and was now dedicated to God’s service. The corollary to this was that those who had the name called out over them were themselves called out by the god to be a person devoted to fulfilling the purposes of God. Furthermore, those who are called by YHWH will receive His salvation and are assured of His protection.

‘KNOWING’ THE NAME OF GOD

Another action concerning the Name involved ‘knowing’ it, or as the case may be in the negative, not forgetting the Name. It is said in Isa. 64:2 that the people of God desire that God would make His name known to His enemies. Here the thought of impressing a hostile power that Israel’s God is supreme lies at the door. Of similar interest is 1 Mac 4:33, where the author states, “Strike them down with the sword of those who love you, and let all who know your Name praise you with hymns.” Unlike the previous example, here we encounter the thought of community coherence; that is, all worshippers of YHWH are defined as those who know His name.

In an eschatological context, it is said that on the Day of God’s visitation Israel itself would come to know the Name because God will make His name known (Jer. 16:21; Ez. 39:7 and Isa. 52:6). This knowledge stands in contrast to the goal of the false prophets, who intend through their prophecies to cause the name of YHWH to be forgotten. This claim is found, for example, in Jer. 23:26-27, where the author states:

I have heard what the prophets have said who prophesy falsely in My name, saying, I had a dream, I had a dream ...even these prophets of the deception of their own heart, who intend to make My people forget My name by their dreams which they relate to one another, just as their fathers forgot My name because of Baal? This passage is quite interesting in terms of community dynamics and religious self-identification. Here, the author’s intent is to remind the true worshippers of YHWH that they should not exchange the glory of God, or His name, for the names of foreign gods.

Now in Ps. 44:20-21 we see the same concerns which drove Jeremiah, but with an additional element on display, viz. the notion that (in this context) the Name and God could be seen as synonyms. The Psalmist writes, albeit in an antithetical fashion that:

If we had forgotten the name of our God,

---

556 Heitmüller, IVI, 142 and Nötcher, “Epiklese,” 223. See Heitmüller here for rabbinic texts which claim this function.
Or extended our hands to a strange god; 
Would not God find this out? 
For He knows the secrets of the heart.

Here forgetting the Name signifies falling out of relationship and obedience to God. Concretely then, ‘forgetting’ the Name, or ‘knowing’ the Name, had two facets. The first is that the Name represented God; it was a symbol for Him. In this context it could be used to symbolically represent a relationship with God. To ‘know’ the Name meant that the person knew God, while ‘forgetting’ the Name meant that a person had turned away from a relationship to God. Here, as elsewhere, the Name stands as a symbol for God Himself and for His covenantal relationship.

BEARING THE NAME OF SOMEONE

The phenomenon under review here entails the action whereby one is called (i.e. named) by the name of someone; that is, the person bears another’s name. We see this phenomenon in Ps. Philo 28.4, where God describes Israel as His chosen plant among the populated world (i.e. the “great vineyard”), which God would call “by My Name.”

This passage makes clear that the people of God, those whom He had chosen, are to be called by His name. We see another example of this phenomenon in Isa. 43:7, where the author places in the mouth of God this statement concerning a definition of His people; they are “Everyone who is called by My name. And [those] whom I have created for My glory.”

This concept means that in effect the owner’s name becomes their name too. Unlike similar expressions, which connote only that the person belongs to, or subscribes to, a particular point of view (e.g. Herodians), in these Old Testament cases the use signifies something much more profound-viz., that the person, group or object belongs to God and has been chosen by Him to receive His salvation.

In an interesting juxtaposition of the theme of acting for the sake of the Name and being called by the Name, II Esdras (4: 24-25) states that Ezra asks God about why Israel has undergone so many tribulations and then asks, in less than rhetorical fashion, “But what will he do for His name, by which we are called?” The first part of this passage refers to God’s reputation (=His name) but the latter portion is meant to convey that the persons so named belong to, and are dependent upon, the person whose name they now bear. A related aspect is found in Jeremiah 15:15-16, where the prophet importunes God for His attention, as well as His
protection, and claims that God should respond to him for he has borne the Name. The passage reads:

Thou who knowest, O LORD,
Remember me, take notice of me,
And take vengeance for me on my persecutors.
Do not, in view of Thy patience, take me away;
Know that for Thy sake I endure reproach.
16 Thy words were found and I ate them,
And Thy words became for me a joy and the delight of my heart;
For I have been called by Thy name,
O LORD God of hosts.

This usage signifies that to bear the name of God means to be called by Him, to belong to, and finally, to serve Him. It also means that God knows the people that are called by His name.

In summary, to bear someone’s name means that the object or person belongs to the person that they are named after. This usage also means, in the context of YHWH worship, that the person knows YHWH and serves Him.

‘WALKING’ IN THE NAME

An interesting passage which applies this type of language is found in Micah 4:5, where we read:

Though all the peoples walk,
Each in the name of his god.
As for us, we will walk
In the name of the LORD our God (יְהֹוָה יִשְׂרָאֵל) forever and ever.

The meaning of the passage is that religious conventicles are defined by the name of the divinity in which they walk; that is, the name by which they come into contact with their god, as well as signifying their adherence to the religious code prescribed by their faith system.537 This sense of going in the way of God (i.e., following God’s commandments) is demonstrated in the rendering of this passage by the LXX. Here, the LXX uses the phrase, πορευόμεθα ἐν δόματι κυρίου θεοῦ ἔµοι. This sense is again highlighted in verse 4:2, where the author states concerning the path for those who worship God:

And many nations will come and say,

537 As Brongers observes, the core meaning appears to be to serve or to worship the divinities that a group believes in. This of course would entail following the religious scruples set down by the priests and prophets. For more see Brongers, “Die Wendung יְשֵם יְהוֹה,” 5.
Come and let us go up to the mountain of the LORD...
That He may teach us about His ways
And that we may walk in His paths...
The reference here to walking in God’s path is similar in meaning to the expression ‘to walk in the name of God.’

Another passage that offers the same sense is Zech. 10:12, where God speaks of the gathering of the Diaspora Jews. The text ends with this promise, “And I shall strengthen them in the LORD, and in His name they will walk.”

Yet another similar expression is found in Ps.-Philo 21.10, where Joshua blesses the people and then exclaims his hope that the people “do not depart [walk away] from His name.” Here the meaning is similar to the expression ‘going’ (i.e., walking) in the name of God.

What needs to be underscored is that those people who follow their respective gods will proceed and carry out their lives and religious obligations in the names of their gods, thus they carry out their lives in close relationship to their gods. For Jews, the chosen and covenant-bound people of God, it is mandated that they walk only in His name; just as non-Jews walk in the names of their gods. This great Name distinguished, in part, the people of God from the nations. Of course this adherence carries all sorts of particular religious obligations, e.g., rites and cultus, religious scruples, etc., all of which were to be carried out in the power and authority of the Name.

**PRAISING, BLESSING, THANKING OR GLORIFYING THE NAME**

It is a noteworthy fact that the Israelites were enjoined to make the name of God great, to bless it, as well as honor the Name; for God Himself desires that His name be glorified and sanctified. This elevation of the Name was predicated upon the fact that the Name itself is holy and excellent. Indeed, it could be claimed that the name of the Lord was equal to His

---

538 Boehmer correctly draws attention to this close relationship but fails to note the fact that an additional facet is in view, viz. that the person not only lives in close relationship with their god, but also that they fulfill the obligations mandated by the god. That is to say, it expresses the notion that one lives faithfully within the moral strictures, as well as the prescribed ritual and cultic behavior of their religion. For Boehmer’s take on this expression see BIN, 61.

539 E.g., Ps. 34:3; Isa. 24:15.


541 E.g., Mal. 2:2; Isa. 29:23 and in a similar vein Mal. 3:16.
mighty works. Furthermore, several passages maintain an association between the praise of God and His Name, thus establishing that the Name serves as a surrogate for God Himself. Given this, it is natural that the faithful were commanded to “Ascribe majesty to His name” (Sir. 39:15).

The connection between praising the Name and praising God is clearly seen in several passages. In Ps. 66:4, for example, the Psalmist calls for Israel to sing to the Name, and as a result they glorify God (“All the earth will worship Thee, and will sing praises to Thee; They will sing praises to Thy name”). In Ps. 69:31 we read, “I will praise the name of God with song, And shall magnify Him with thanksgiving.” Again, this time in Dt. 32:3, we find this expression of praise, “For I proclaim the name of the LORD; Ascribe greatness to our God!” And David, in his Psalm of Praise in II Sam. 22:50 says, “Therefore I will give thanks to Thee, O Lord, among the nations, and I will sing praises to Thy name,” while Ex.9: 16 states that the Lord told Moses that His name was to be proclaimed in the entire world. This command comes during the confrontation between God and the Egyptian Pharaoh-and the world power that he represented. Hence, the Name would represent the fame of God as a world conqueror; that is, as the Lord of all the earth. In general, we see that the usage signifies that through the proclaiming of His name God Himself is exalted. Thus this passage is related to those passages which speak of praising the Name.

It is reasonably clear from the parallelism between God’s name and God in these passages that the act of praising the Name was the same as praising God. This powerful cultic

---

543 Sir. 2:17, “Let us fall into the hands of the Lord, but not into the hands of mortals; for equal to his majesty is his mercy, and equal to his Name are his works.”
544 E.g., Ps. 48:11; 72:17, 102:22. This relationship between praising, blessing, or singing to the Name as one of surrogacy is endorsed by Drongers too. See, “Die Wendung b’shem jwh,” 16.
545 Cf. Ps. 18:49 and Ps. Sol. 6:4.
546 Farby, “השם,” 140.
547 So, Mehllmann, Der “Name” Gottes, 72.
548 Niles quotes H.-J. Kraus approvingly in this regard. See, Niles, TNGW, 173. So too, Grether, NWGAT,
act was performed in the congregation and was designed to ‘magnify’ YHWH. Furthermore, we should call to mind that Niles has convincingly argued that this cultic act of proclaiming God’s name is a type of invocation.

In similar fashion the Name could be ‘thanked’ and it is clear from several passages that the Name was used interchangeably for God. For example, the Psalmist responsible for Ps. 106:47 importunes God to gather in the people in order that they might praise His name. The text reads, “Save us, O Lord our God, and gather us from among the nations, that we may give thanks to your holy name and glory in your praise.” This passage makes it clear that in thanking the Name the Israelite was thanking God Himself. In essence, to praise the Name was to praise God and to thank the Name was to thank God.

One way to glorify God was to recount His deeds of glory. The connection between proclaiming the name of God and His deeds is seen in several passages in the Psalms. For example, Ps. 105:1 reads, “Oh give thanks to the Lord, call upon [proclaim] His name; Make known His deeds among the peoples.” This same theme is sounded again in Is. 12:4, where we read:

And in that day you will say, “Give thanks to the Lord, call on His name. 
Make known His deeds among the peoples; Make them remember that His name is 
exalted.”

Another passage, Ps. 22:22, draws upon this same motif when it states, “I will tell [προέξα; BHS, ‘recount’] of Thy name to my brethren; In the midst of the assembly I will praise Thee.”

Once again, this time in Ps. 102:22, we hear of ‘recounting’ or ‘declaring’ the name of God in the context of praising God by an afflicted worshipper who desires, “That men may tell of the name of the Lord in Zion, And His praise in Jerusalem.” Other passages, such as Ps. 106:47, beg God to gather in the people in order that they might praise His name. The text reads, “Save us, O Lord our God, and gather us from among the nations, that we may give thanks to your holy name and glory in your praise.”

In the LXX we read, at Ps. 65:2, that the people should φαλατε δη το δομαιτι αυτου, δοτε δοξαν ανεσει αυτου. When we compare this to Ps. 67:5, where we see the clear placement of the Name and God in parallel fashion, this assures us that the Name is a symbolon for God Himself. We read that:

[549 Ibid., 172.]
This later citation demonstrates rather clearly that the Name was not seen as some sort of hypostasis in these cases, but rather that it served only as a symbolon for God. Here the Name is not being invoked, nor is the action of the verb carried out with respect to the accompanying circumstances of the verb (Grether’s expression), but rather the action of the verb is related to the Name in the same manner as the verbs are ordinarily related to YHWH Himself—the Name symbolizes and stands in for God Himself.\(^550\) It is clear that in the context of thanksgiving, the Name and God could be used interchangeably.

Beyond this, it should be noted that the Israelite even importuned God to perform deeds and services for the sake (יִשְׁפִּל) of the Name.\(^551\) In the broader context the petition to God to act for the sake of His name is given when Israel, or an individual, had entered upon troubled times and felt abandoned by God. These circumstances prompted Israel, or the individual, to honor the special revealed Name that God had revealed to Israel.\(^552\) That God’s honor was at stake should not be in doubt for even God Himself is claimed to act on account of his honor, as Isa. 48:10-11 (cf. Eze. 20:44) makes clear:

For my name’s sake I defer my anger,
for the sake of my praise I restrain it for you,
so that I may not cut you off.
See, I have refined you, but not like silver;
I have tested you in the furnace of adversity.
For my own sake, for my own sake, I do it,
for why should my name be profaned?
My glory I will not give to another.

By way of summary, it is clear that passages which speak of praising or thanking the Name employ the Name as a surrogate for God. Finally, I note the conclusion of Tournay, who has rather well captured the sense of these ‘celebrations’ of the Name:

---


\(^551\) Or in order to facilitate praise for the Name. E.g., Jer. 13:11; 14: 7, 21; Ez. 14:22; 20:9; 20:44; 39:25; Isa. 48:9; 55:13; 59:19; Ps. 48:11; 72: 19; 102:16; 106:47; Neh. 9:15; Ps. Sol. 11:8.

\(^552\) Niles, *TNGW*, 181.
...chaque fois qu'il [i.e., the Name] est prononcé et célébré, le Nom divin «redit»--c'est-à-dire qu'il exprime et révèle—la «gloire» invisible, supra-céleste et transcendante, de Celui qu'il désigne, le Dieu d'Israël, et plus précisément sa «majesté».

REJOICE IN THE NAME

The phrases IKDTn and GVHbbiinn occur rarely within the Old Testament and when found they are located exclusively in the Psalms. Outside of the Canon they occur once in Sirach, and once in Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum 6:18. Jacobs explains these verses as implying that the people did not actually rejoice in the Name, but rather that the joyous speech begins with and is governed by the word YHWH. Although I do not find fault with Jacob's conclusion, I think that this expression means much more to rejoice in the Lord: an interpretation very much in line with my earlier conclusion concerning the command to sing to the Name. In both cases, the Name serves as a representative of God. Essentially, to rejoice in the name of God meant to rejoice in God Himself. This view is reinforced by noting that Isa. 41:16 and Ps. 34:2 (34:3 in the BHS) are ruled by the same verb but with this activity directed toward YHWH. Accordingly, these passages make it clear that the Name is once again a sym bolon for YHWH Himself, and His salvific actions which result in joy among His people.

TO LOVE THE NAME OF GOD

In Psalm 5:11 (BHS 5:12) we find a description of those who worship YHWH as those who "love Thy Name (ר"כ ת' הבש)." Here the meaning seems clear enough, viz. that the Name stands here as a representative for YHWH Himself and to love the Name thus signifies that the

---

554 Ps. 89:16 and 105:3.
555 Sir. 50:20d.
556 Certainly, the thought of the preposition ת serving an instrumental purpose is not in view here.
557 Jacob, ING, 36.
558 Isa. 41:16 reads: You shall winnow them and the wind shall carry them away, and the tempest shall scatter them. Then you shall rejoice in the LORD; in the Holy One of Israel you shall glory. Ps. 34:2 reads, "O magnify the LORD with me, and let us exalt his name together."
559 Cf. Ps. 119:132.
person also loves YHWH.\textsuperscript{560} This connection between loving the Name and loving God is also seen in the Psalms (69:36), where the claim is made that God will save Zion and rebuild it and those who love His Name will inherit the Land. The passage reads:

For God will save Zion and build the cities of Judah.
That they may dwell there and possess it.
And the descendants of His servants will inherit it.
And those who love His name will dwell in it.

And according to Isa. 56:6, the proselytes who come to God are described as those who love the name of the Lord.

We can see that the name of God stands of course for God Himself, but it also represents His salvific actions which engender devotion on the part of the adherent. It represents His glory and love on the part of the people for His revelation.

**TO FEAR OR RESPECT THE NAME**

This command occurs in Isa. 59:19; Ps. 61:5; 86:11; and 102:15. The word is usually πατωσι and it can mean not only fear but also awe or dread. Now according to the author of the Deutero-Isaiah portion of Isaiah (59:19) God will cause His name to be feared in the Day when His redeemer will appear. According to the belief of the Psalmist, those who fear the Name have an inheritance which awaits them. The Psalmist says at 61:5, “...O God; Thou hast given me the inheritance of those who fear Thy name.” In Ps. 86:11 the Psalmist acknowledged that God is the one who can make a person fear His name. The Psalmist prays to this end, “Teach me Thy way, O LORD; I will walk in Thy truth; Unite my heart to fear Thy name.”

These passages demonstrate that the Name functions once again as a surrogate for YHWH Himself.\textsuperscript{561} Just as we have seen concerning loving the Name, fearing the Name means to fear YHWH, and in this case, additionally, His role as judge over all the earth.

**CULTIC ACTS CARRIED OUT IN THE NAME**

This category encompasses those acts of cultic devotion that are carried out in the Name, such as the raising of hands in worship (Ps. 63:5; *BHS* 63:4), or glorying or exalting in the Name (Ps. 105:3; I Chron. 16:10). Included in this group are commands to sing to the glory of the

\textsuperscript{560} Farby, “דָּלָי,” 154.

\textsuperscript{561} Ibid.
Name (Ps. Sol. 6:4). Not surprisingly, the use of the Name appears as an exchangeable concept for God Himself,\(^{562}\) a pattern that I have often mentioned.

One passage of particular interest is Mal. 1:11, which, if taken literally states that the nations offered sacrifice to the Name. The passage is fraught with difficulty, textual and grammatical. Putting aside the textual questions which seem to plague the passage,\(^{563}\) the curiousness of the passage has led some to conjecture that the passage is a later interpolation. The question as to whether the passage serves as the conclusion of verses 6-10, or whether it serves as the changeover to verses 12-14, remains unclear—although some have suggested that verse eleven may consist of an ancient doxology which the author employed in his argument—thus offering a resolution of its awkwardness.\(^{564}\) Be this as it may, we are still left groping for an explanation of the passage itself. I will take up this issue now.

Essentially there are four interpretations that have been offered. The first interpretation maintains that the passage refers to the worship of YHWH by the Jews living in the Diaspora. The second proposes that the verse deals with worship offered by proselytes. The third major view maintains that the passage treats the future worship that will be offered to God by the nations.\(^{565}\) Lastly, the fourth position claims that the passage addresses the then present worship of God by the non-Jew. Although this question is of some interest, for the purposes of my work I need only address how the use of the God’s name functions here. To determine this I must first entertain several factors.

First, it must be noted that the preceding verses (1:6-10) address the issue of YHWH’s displeasure with inferior sacrifices, while the following verses (1:12-14) denounce those who offer these types of sacrifices. Second, the Name plays a thematic role in the text. For example, in the beginning, verse 1:6 speaks of the priests, who by their actions, are demonstrating that

\(^{562}\) So Bietenhard, “\(\text{ναόμαστα},\)” 260.

\(^{563}\) For a discussion of these issues see Th. C. Vriezen, “How to Understand Malachi 1:11,” in Grace upon Grace: Essays in Honor of Lester J. Kuyper, ed. James I. Cook (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1975), 129.

\(^{564}\) Vriezen, ibid., 129.

\(^{565}\) I mention here the views of Rehm who argues that the universality of the offerings to the name of YHWH reflect the promised messianic age when the Gentiles will honor God; indeed, many patristic authors argue that the Church is the fulfillment of this passage. For more see Martin Von Rehm, “Das Opfer der Völker nach Mal. 1,11,” in Lux tua Veritas: Festschrift für Hubert Junker zu Vollendung des siebzigsten Lebensjahres am 8 August 1961, eds. Heinrich Gross and Franz Musser. (Trier: Paulinus-Verlag, 1961), 208.
they despise the name of God. Secondly, 1:11, after speaking about the sacrifice to the Name, the narrative tells of God’s aim that His name should be honored among the nations. This theme is picked up again in 2:2, where the text speaks of the need to give glory to the name of God. In verse 3:16 it describes those who fear God as those “[who] fear the Lord and who esteem His name,” while 4:2 promises to those who fear God’s name that “the sun of righteousness will rise with healing in his wings.” As Swetnam points out, the impure conduct of the Temple officials brought disrepute upon the Name which leads one to suppose that the text may be trying to add to the already noted contrast between pure and impure sacrifice by pointing out that pure sacrifices are directed here toward the Name, meaning that it is honored. This leads one to conclude that when the Name is honored, God is honored, and thus the Name functions here as a symbol for God.

Another item worthy of note is that this passage is sui generis within the Old Testament; no other passage speaks of offering sacrifices to the Name. Also to be noted is that the incense might in fact be a symbol for prayer, just as is the case in Lk 1:10 and Acts 5:8.

Whatever the case may be with respect to the outstanding issues over the text, or its origin, or even how one may collocate verse 11 with the other two complexes, it is sufficient for my purposes to observe how the passage functions within the larger context. In my judgment, the verse serves as the hinge about which the author intends to structure his argument. Given the bracketing passages, the argument may be constructed as follows: The priests have been offering inferior sacrifices (vv.6-10), sacrifices that are despicable in the eyes of YHWH. These sacrifices stand in stark contrast to those of the Gentiles who correctly offer up “pure sacrifices” (v. 11b). Thus, the argument runs along the same lines as that presented by Paul in his condemnation of the maternal incest taking place in Corinth among Christians. There, as here, the more circumspect practices of the Gentiles are cited with an eye toward highlighting the more

---


567 Swetnam offers the suggestion that the Name here represents God revealed and accordingly rejects that non-Jews are in view in this passage for only to the Jews would the self-revelation of God through His name have meaning. See Swetnam, “Malachi 1,11: An Interpretation,” 204.
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offensive practices of the people of God.\textsuperscript{569} In any event, I have so far avoided addressing verse eleven. I shall turn to this verse now.

Given the fact that Israel's neighbors did offer cultus to the names of their deities can we then infer that in light of verse eleven that the author was endorsing a literal offering to God's name? Or are we rather to see in this passage that the Name is used as a symbol for God? Although the offering of cultus to the Name cannot be absolutely excluded in light of Gentile parallels\textsuperscript{570} in my estimation it strains credulity to accept without concrete evidence that Gentiles offered sacrifices to the name of the Jewish deity.\textsuperscript{571} Consequently, I prefer to see here the employment of an authorial device intended to represent God by reference to His Name.

Finally, it is of tremendous import that the name of God represented God in cultic contexts such as that envisioned in Mal. 1:11. This cultic surrogacy is also witnessed in our other passages, viz. Ps. 63:5; and 105:3 (cf. Ps Sol 6:4). This fact highlights what we have learned earlier about a name being so closely interwoven with the bearer of the name that they could not be separated without great difficulty. Thus, the name of God could serve as a surrogate of sorts for God Himself in cultic acts.

**SUMMARY**

What can we glean from this survey? First, there is clear evidence of a line of progression through time of an ever-evolving and multivalent concept of the power and status of the Name.\textsuperscript{572} Also, there is abundant evidence for the increasing use of the Name in magic. From the section on magic we can glean the following: 1) The name of God, and the names of angels and patriarchs, were believed by some to have a numinous and apotropaic quality;\textsuperscript{573} 2) the name

\textsuperscript{569} Vriezen, "How to Understand Malachi 1:11," 130.

\textsuperscript{570} It should be noted that Morton Smith accepts that YHWH was worshiped in various syncretistic cults. Smith draws upon Isa. 56:7, I Kings 8:41f, and Jonah 1:16 to support his views. Whether these passages mean that Yahweh's name was treated in a similar fashion as the names of pagan deities remains to be seen. In any event, see Morton Smith, *Palestinian Parties and Politics that Shaped the Old Testament* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1971), 93f.

\textsuperscript{571} So too Vriezen, "How to Understand Malachi 1:11," 130.

\textsuperscript{572} Jacob has correctly identified this fundamental trend of post-Exilic Judaism. See ING, 18.

\textsuperscript{573} Here I must take issue with Giesebrecht's claim that the preposition b is never used instrumentally. On the whole this is correct, but I am rather wary of adopting this view with respect to the use of the Name in exorcisms and healings where the use can be construed to be instrumental in nature. For Giesebrecht's view see, *DATSGN*, 135.
God could be imparted to very select agents, usually one of his messengers (i.e., the Angel of the Lord); 3) the ‘true’ name of the divine being was the key to gaining control over it, at least in the mind of some; 4) bestowal by God of His name upon human agents transferred to the agent a unique exousia and commissioning; 5) the name of God in certain circumstance could convey His very essence and thus had numinous attributes.

Furthermore, the Name was one medium, if not the supreme medium, of God’s revelation. It is, so to speak, as Grether states, “die dem Menschen zugewandte, die offenbarungsmäßige Seite Jahwes…so ist damit Jahve selbst als unnahbar angesehen. Nur in seinem schem kann der Mensch zu ihm kommen.”

As for the section on the phenomenological use of the Name it reveals the following: 1) the Name could, under proper circumstances, indicate that the one using the Name stood under the authority and commissioning of God. As such he was the representative of God; 2) the primary function of the Name in cultic settings was as a symbolon for God Himself. The fact that the Name could serve this function testifies to its preeminent role in representing God, as His surrogate, so to speak; 3) invoking the name of God was believed to draw God near and insure His presence. Others no doubt believed that the Name carried numinous and apotropaic power and could bring about healing and the warding off of evil spirits.

---

574 Grether, NWGAT, 40-41.

575 Contra Jacob who claims the phrase על נינא never conveys the meaning of representation because no person or thing can by definition represent God. See ING, 38.
CHAPTER FOUR
THE NAME OF JESUS IN EARLY CHRISTIANITY

An die Stelle des shem jahve tritt der Name Jesu als Inbegriff der Offenbarung...er wird...ausgerufen und durch ihn Kraftwirkungen vollbracht. Er wird also ganz ähnlich gebraucht wie der shem in der alttestamentlichen Früzeit.\textsuperscript{576} 

In these next two chapters I shall examine early Christian texts which either place the name of Jesus at the center of speculation and reflection, or where the name of Jesus is used by Christians in various functions, especially in ritual settings. In this present chapter my task is to seek to shed light on various passages which speak of the name of Jesus, or which speak about Jesus having received a divinely ordained name, and additionally to examine what these passages tell us about the early Christian cult and christological developments. In several cases, as we shall see, passages which involve speculation about the nature of the name of Jesus may have something to say about how early Christians used the name of Jesus in ritual settings. In the chapter to follow, I shall have one question in mind: how the name of Jesus was employed in early Christianity. I shall especially be focusing on the role which the name of Jesus played in cultic and ritual actions, and what these actions can tell us about the beliefs of the earliest Christians. We should be mindful, however, in our review of these materials that any analysis must be done with care, for the early Christian movement did not set about to leave us detailed accounts of their cultic behavior. We are left with only telltale clues that are found here and there in the primary sources. Still, careful examination of these sources promises to repay the attention devoted to them.

Another note of caution which should be sounded is that people in the modern era often see members of the Christian faith acting or speaking in the name of Jesus; in today’s world such usage can be laid at the feet of tradition and rarely do modern Christians understand what this usage might have signified to the earliest Christians. We need, therefore, to throw away our modern perspective and try to recover the views of the earliest Christians. We must bear in mind that members of the new movement were made up of people who believed that invoking the name of God, or the gods, could actuate the power and authority of the divinity in a very literal sense. It is worth recalling that the new movement drew its members from a milieu which believed that one used only the name of the one true God, or in a Greco-Roman context, the

\textsuperscript{576} Grether, \textit{NWGAT}, 183
name of the mightiest deity, in order to bring about the spiritual and supernatural changes which they sought.

In this present investigation I shall be looking to lay bare what the earliest Christians believed about the name of Jesus. Additionally, my investigation will seek to draw some conclusions about the nature of the Christian cult and the types of activities which were taken up in the pursuit of Christ-devotion in terms of how Christians employed the name of Jesus as suggested by these selected passages. I shall draw attention to how the use of name of Jesus informs us concerning the very earliest christological beliefs of the earliest Christians. All of the foregoing can be useful in helping to shape our understanding of the process of christological evolution.

As for the structure of this chapter I shall divide it into several sections. My investigation will begin with a review of New Testament passages which concern the claim that Jesus had received a divine name and/or that his name had some special significance. Included in this category will be those passages which claim that Jesus' name was indispensable in bringing about salvation. Essentially, I shall be conducting an 'exegetical tour,' as it were, of some of the most prominent passages which have the name-concept as an integral aspect of their christological claims. I shall entertain not only relevant New Testament texts, but also other early Christian texts which illuminate some particular aspect of my study. My primary focus shall be upon those texts where specific reflection over the name of Jesus is in some manner taken up.

Now, in terms of the following chapter, which deals with the use of the name of Jesus, I shall not delve into philosophical debates involving competing schools of thought about how one approaches, or interprets phenomenological activity. Instead, I intend to look at how Christians used the name of Jesus 'on the ground' so to speak. Beyond that I shall examine what the evidence can tell us about how the early Christian movement viewed Jesus, his place in the divine economy, and his relationship to God.

With the introduction firmly in hand I turn my attentions to those New Testament passages which speak of the name of Jesus in a christologically important fashion, or which speculate that Jesus had received a divine name from God. These passages are important, for they give us insight into the mindset of the early Christians concerning the role and status of the name of Jesus in the divine economy. These passages also demonstrate just how important a role the name of Jesus came to play in early Christianity. Passages which speak of the power of the
name of Jesus, or which detail how Jesus’ name became the preeminent name (especially in light of the belief that God had elevated Jesus’ name to the highest rank) are crucial in seeing how the earliest Christians justified their beliefs; indeed, they felt compelled to believe that the name of Jesus had been elevated above every other name at the command of God. Also, the passages which speak of Jesus receiving a divine name are instructive too, for they demonstrate that the earliest Christians were quite comfortable with name-speculation, and that the development of a Christian Namenchristologie came as easily as speculation over Jesus’ role in the plan of God.

REFLECTION OVER THE PLACE AND FUNCTION OF THE NAME OF JESUS

1) Phil 2: 6-11

This passage is one of the most frequently discussed and controversial in all of the New Testament, with many issues seemingly resisting final elucidation. Furthermore, it can be said that it is difficult to overstate the importance of this hymn in enhancing our understanding of formative christological thinking and early Christianity. In many respects it forms the most crucial piece of evidence which we possess concerning the christological views of the earliest Christians, as well as providing vital information about the primitive Christian cult, insofar as this hymn was almost certainly recited in ritual contexts. It also provides crucial information on the means whereby the earliest Christians incorporated Jesus into the divine identity, all the while endeavoring to keep within the bounds which monotheistic scruples demanded.

In light of these considerations I shall be interested, therefore, to uncover both the meaning of the hymn, as well as its backdrop, but at the same time I shall leave untouched many of the other contested questions. For example, the original language of the hymn, or whether the hymn first existed in three stanzas, or two, or whether verses 8d and 11 were original to the hymn will be bypassed. Furthermore, etymological and semantic examinations of the meanings of the controversial μορφή θεοῦ, ἀρπαγμόν, ἡγήσατο, σχήματι εὐρεθεῖς ὡς ἀνθρώπος and so on are not germane to my study and will not be addressed. I shall assume for the purposes

577 I use the term ‘hymn’ here by established convention. I am aware that the entire question of the Gattung of this passage is controversial. Kennel, for example, has reopened this question once again and come to the conclusion that many so-called early Christian ‘hymns’ were not formed by adherence to an easily discerned fixed set of criteria. See Werner Kennel, Früchristliche Hymnen. Gattungskritische Studien zur Frage nach den Liedern der früh Christenheit, WUNT 71, (Göttingen:Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995).

of my study that the ‘hymn’ does in fact contain an incarnational grounding. In the end, my study will be primarily interested in three major areas.

Among my concerns is the fixing of the original *Sitz-im-Leben* which occasioned the composition of the hymn. Another area of interest is what the bestowal of the name/title signified for the early Christians. Finally, my last interest concerns what the hymn reveals to us about the nature of Christ-devotion, as well as how the name of Jesus functioned therein. At this point the least that can be said is that there are certain features of the hymn which suggest that any attempt to recover the original purpose of the hymn will prove most interesting, for the most striking feature of the hymn is that it contains a “dangerous binitarian view.” In order to unearth the original purpose of the hymn it will be necessary to cite the hymn in full. I shall cite the passage in Greek as there are too many aspects that need to be addressed with reference to the original language. The text reads:

6 ὄς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων
οὐχ ἄρπαγμόν ἡγήσατο
τὸ εἶναι ἱσα θεῶ
7 ἄλλα ἐναὐτὸν ἐκένωσεν
μορφήν δοῦλον λαβὼν
ἐν ὅμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος
καὶ σχῆματι εὐθείᾳ ως ἀνθρώπος
ἐπανείσχυσεν ἑαυτόν
γενόμενος ὑπόκουσος μέχρι θανάτου
(θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ)
9 διὸ καὶ ὁ θεὸς ὑπερψώσειν αὐτοῦ
καὶ ἐγαρίσατο αὐτῷ
Τὸ ὅνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ πᾶν ὅνομα
τί ἐν τῷ ὅνομα Ἰησοῦ
Πάν γόνον καμψή
ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ καταχθονίων
καὶ πᾶσα γλώσσα ἐξομολογήσηται
ὅτι κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός
εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ Πατρός. 580


580 The interested reader should review both Lohmeyer’s reconstruction, and Jeremias’ reconstruction which employs *parallelismus membrorum* as his guide. See Joachim Jeremias, “Zur Gedankenführung in den
It is obvious even at a first read that the cardinal point of the hymn is the enthronement of Jesus in ultimate authority where he receives universal acknowledgement, or possibly, according to some, worship. The hymn sets out to lay down the reasons for the exaltation which it so powerfully depicts. Paul, however, utilizes the hymn to support an ethical point. He uses the hymn to admonish his readers to follow the same selfless, sacrificial path that their master had followed in his pre-temporal and earthly existence (2:6-8). Still, the hymn itself speaks of exaltation and universal acknowledgment and the rationale for it. This exaltation follows from Jesus’ obedience to the will and plan of God, even to the point of accepting crucifixion. This obedience is underscored in the first part of the hymn (6-8), which relates the actions of the finite verbs and participles to the actions of Jesus. Thus, we see that Jesus, although existing in a divine form took on the form of a slave, and emptying himself, submitted to death upon the cross. The author’s desire to stress that this abasement was volitional is reinforced by the use of reflexive pronouns in vv. 7 and 8. This first half is also distinguished from the latter half of the hymn for it employs 5 participial constructions that lend this section a certain conciseness. Also of interest is that we find no proper names in this section, nor any Old Testament allusions.

In contrast to the first half of the hymn, in the second half (vv. 9-11) it is God who is the subject of the main verbs, and it is Jesus who becomes the passive recipient of the divine action of exaltation. In contrast once again to the first half, this section now is full of proper names (e.g. θεός, Ἰησοῦς, Χριστός, and θεός πατρός), and the actions are now conveyed through finite verbs.

When we follow the flow of the hymn in its latter half we see that Jesus is exalted with the bestowal of the divine name being the very highest sign of this exaltation. We see this change of emphasis from the obedience of Jesus to God’s exaltation of him in the phrase διό κατ', which both signals the change of the subject of the action and emphasizes that the obedience referred to in verses 5-8 serves as the justification for his exaltation. Moreover, Διό; or as the case may be διό τοῦτο, is habitually used in contexts of humiliation and abasement with a subsequent


exaltation and vindication.582 The best translation of this would be “that is why”583 and serves to reinforce the belief that the first part of the hymn serves as the rationale for the vindication and exaltation which follow in the latter half of the hymn. In any case, the emphatic nature of this transition is further highlighted in the addition of καί to διό, which serves to strengthen the force of the particle.584 Further reinforcement is found in the position of αὐτόν which is emphatic and also serves to highlight God’s exaltation of Jesus. In addition, the reader should observe that the phrase “...every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord” stands as the apogee of a series of progressive phrases (e.g. 8-10) that speak of the exaltation of Jesus. Indeed, it carries the culmination of the progressive force of the verses 9-10.585

The degree of this exaltation is seen in the fact that the author adds ὑπὲρ to ὑψώ, a compound term only used in the LXX, sans one exception (Ps. 36: 35), for YHWH,586 This would suggest that like YHWH, Jesus was raised above all creation,587 and in fact v. 10b reinforces this perception by adding several terms which denote that the entire cosmos (i.e. ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ καταχθονίων) is subjected to Jesus. This contention is further strengthened by the claim that Jesus had received a name above (ὑπὲρ) every name. This second use of ὑπὲρ serves, when taken in tandem with the clause, ὑπερψωσεν αὐτόν, to underscore that in the author’s thinking Jesus has been elevated above every conceivable being or power. It is also worth noting in this context that in keeping with this stress on exaltation, the word “kyrios” is granted special emphasis by being placed first in the phrase.588


585 Wengst rightly notes that the acclamation of Jesus is both the goal and the highpoint of the hymn. See Wengst, Christologische Formeln und Lieder des Urchristentums, 141.

586 Gnilka. Der Philippbrief, 125

587 Recent studies have tilted toward a superlative understanding of this verb rather than a comparative function. See Martin, A Hymn of Christ, 239-242.

The extent of this exaltation is further seen in the bestowal of the divine name. The high honor of receiving the divine name is evident in the light of Isa. 42:8 (cf. Ps. 83:18), where God says of Himself, “I am the Lord (ἐγώ κύριος ὁ θεός), that is my name (τοῦτο μου ἔστιν τὸ ὄνομά), that is mine and no one else’s.” If we cast about to seek a comparison for the extent of this exaltation we can only look to what the LXX says of God Himself in Ps. 96:9, “For Thou art the LORD Most High over all the earth; Thou art exalted far above all gods (ὑπὲρ πάντας τοὺς θεοὺς).” This text forms an admirable backdrop for understanding the exaltation that Jesus received. Finally, the universal acclamation (note that there is no qualifying “our” in the confession “Jesus Christ is Lord”) follows after the exaltation, and all of these actions take place according to the hymn for the glory of God the Father.\(^{589}\)

If we retrace the hymn’s flow again we see that Jesus was originally existing in a divine state, subsequently consents to become human, obeys God, even to the point of death on the cross, and now at God’s initiative (ἐξαρίστατο αὐτῷ) he is exalted to Lord over all creation, authenticated, as it were, by the bestowal of the divine name, and acknowledged Lord by all creation. Most strikingly, this universal acknowledgement takes place ἐν τῷ ὄνοματί Ιησοῦ,\(^{590}\) and additionally, as Gnilka observes, “In der Akklamation wird der verliehene Name ausgesprochen und so anerkannt.”\(^{591}\) There are, beyond what I have covered already, several other particulars worth mentioning.

First, with respect to the acclamation of Jesus we can discern that it bears many of the characteristics of an enthronement scene from antiquity, such as seen for example in Rev. 5: 1-14 (see especially v. 13) which carries many significant echoes of Phil. 2:9-10.\(^{592}\) Indeed, the entire

---


\(^{590}\) So also Gnilka, Der Philippbrief, 127.

\(^{591}\) Ibid., 129.

\(^{592}\) Erik Peterson, ΠΙΣ ΘΕΟΣ Epigraphische, formgeschichtliche und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen, (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1926), 33-134, 171 fn. No. 3. 156
Deutero-Isaiah section from which the author draws for v. 9 (i.e., Isa. 45:23) depicts, and indeed assumes, an enthronement.593

Given the thrust of 2:9, where it states that Jesus receives the divine name, it is worth a quick reminder that one part of an enthronement was often the bestowal of a new name, a name befitting the new status and rank of the person. Käsemann clarifies the nature of the new exalted name when he states, “Der Name ist für die Antike ja nicht bloß Unterscheidungsmerkmal. Er bekundet vielmehr Würde und Wesenheit aus und macht sie manifest.”595 As Käsemann’s quote makes clear, in the logic of the ancient world a new position of higher rank was often seen as demanding a new name reflective of the new rank. I have already laid the groundwork for seeing in the hymn the claim that Jesus has been elevated to a place next to God. Nonetheless there are other compelling reasons to dig further, particularly with respect to the meaning of the title kyrios. Although I do not favor the notion that the Tetragrammaton was given to Jesus, a point that I shall take up shortly, it would prove fruitful to lay a foundation for the claim that the functional equivalent was given to Jesus.

In support of the view that the name given to Jesus is kyrios (=YHWH) there are several very illuminating texts which seem to offer compelling parallels to Phil. 2:9. For example, Shi ‘ur Qoma §692 states, “May his great, powerful and fearful Name be praised...which, [is] constant, and elevated above the heights.” Another relevant text is Ma‘ase Merkava § 590, where we read, “Your name is holy in the highest heavens, high and exalted over all the Cherubim...”596 Nehemiah 9:5 speaks of the Name as “…exalted above all blessing and praise.” We also encounter this same view in Ps. 83:18, where we read, “Let them know that you alone, whose name is the LORD (יְהֹוָ֔ה) are the Most High over all the earth.” Moreover, in the LXX in Daniel 3:52 (Song of the Three Youths), we find the Name described as:


594 Schmidt, Die Bedeutung des Namens, 22, cites several examples. Also Heitmüller, “Namenglauben im N.T.,” 663, and Jacob, JNG, 51. Examples are found in the Old Testament (e.g. II Ki. 23:34) and in Persian enthronement ceremonies (e.g. Diodorus Bibliothèkē 15.93).

595 Ernst Käsemann, “Kritische Analyse von Phil. 2.5-11,” in Exegetische Versuche und Besinnung: erster Band (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960), 83.

Eulogitós eis, kúrie O théos tôn patéron ἐμῶν, kai aînêtós kai úperephoûmenos eis tous aîónas, kai eulogitméno ton tôn ònoma tôn dôxhs sou ton ágion kai úperephoûmen kai úperephoûmen eis pántas tous aîónas.

Another example is found in Midrash Ps. 9.6 where we read, "I want to praise your Name, You most High, your Name, which has been raised above every name."597 We see from these examples that the name of God is said to be worthy of the highest praise and that it is elevated to the loftiest position. Hofius' observation on this passage in connection to Phil. 2:9 is also of some interest for he notes that for a covenant people the thought that any name other than the divine name (or its surrogate) is meant at Phil. 2:9, can, strictly speaking, be ruled out.598

We have further justification for inferring that the equivalent of the Tetragrammaton was given to Jesus when we turn to the observation of Lohmeyer, who has indicated that the name must be that of God for only God lives and exists above all and thus His Name must be in view here.599 He states in addition that "Es gibt nur einen „Namen über alle Namen“...Der Name trägt hier den gleichen Sinn wie etwa „das Wort oder „der Geist“...oder die „Schechina.“600 Heitmüller adds even more forcefully than Lohmeyer that "Bei dem ὁ ònoma ὑπὲρ πάν ὀνόμα musste der jüdische Leser und Schreiber doch ohne weiteres an den altberühmten heiligen Namen mit seinen Wunderkräften denken."601

Another reference of note is found in Philo in his De Abrahamo 25.124, where he describes the three types of visions which belong to three distinct human states. Philo's description of these states is as follows:

There are three different classes of human dispositions, each of which has received as its portion one of the aforesaid visions. The best of them has received that vision which is in the centre, the sight of the truly living God. The one which is next best has received that

---

597 As quoted in Hofius, Der Christushymnus, 109.
598 Hofius, Der Christushymnus, 39.
600 Ibid., 54.
601 Heitmüller, INJ, 237. It should also be mentioned that if Lohmeyer is correct about the three-stanza arrangement of the hymn than the third line of the last strophe, τὸ ὀνόμα ὑπὲρ πᾶν ὀνόμα, corresponds to the third line of the first strophe, τὸ ἐκεῖνον τὰ ἐπενεχθέντα. Here the name would be tied to equality with God. This connection would also hold for those reconstructions which fall back upon parallelismus membrorum. For example, following Hofius' reconstruction, καὶ ἐγερσίσατο αὐτῷ τὸ ὀνόμα ὑπὲρ πᾶν ὀνόμα, would correspond to οὐχ ἄρπαγμαν ἐγερσίσατο τὸ ἐκεῖνον τὰ ἐπενεχθέντα. The latter prospect of parallelism holds out greater promise for as Gnilka observes καὶ ἔδεικνυε τὸ ἐκεῖνον τὰ ἐπενεχθέντα and this prohibits a three-membered hymn. For Hofius' reconstruction see, Der Christushymnus, 8 and for Lohmeyer see, K.I, 51. As for Gnilka see, Der Philipperbrief, 121.
which is on the right hand, the sight of the beneficent power which has the name of God. And the third has the sight of that which is on the left hand, the governing power, which is called lord.

Here we find that what Jesus is said to have received in his exaltation, the Name and lordship, belongs only to the one who sits, or is at the very side of God.

I think that in the light of these examples that it is reasonably clear that it would have been quite impossible for ears trained to hear the words of Torah, such as the apostle Paul’s would have been, to hear the teaching about the superiority of the name of God and to miscalculate somehow and think of another name apart from God’s very own special name.602

Finally, it is of obvious import that the title kyrios in verse 11 is here used in light of the background of LXX Isa. 45:23. Given that this passage was coined to affirm that no other god exists except YHWH, we may then deduce that this establishes the pedigree of the name—it is none other the divine name—which Jesus now bears.

Although most commentators believe that the name bestowed upon Jesus is kyrios, several scholars believe that Jesus actually received the Tetragrammaton. Recently, Richard Bauckham has drawn attention to the fact that the hymn’s portrayal of Jesus as partaking in the sovereign lordship of the created order must entail that Jesus be included “in the divine identity itself.”603 For the Jews, one of God’s most singular traits is His lordship over all things.

Accordingly, when the hymn claims that Jesus is/will be acclaimed as the kyrios, Jesus must have been seen as sharing in God’s divine prerogatives. Now if this inference is true then the name granted to Jesus must be God’s own name, for no other name could possibly bear up under

602 Wengst thought the transference of the divine name to be unthinkable and instead he endorsed the proposal of Bousset that kyrios was in mind and that this belief could be traced from the mystery cults. In marshalling support for his views he cites for his readers the example of Lucius, who calls Isis kūpēa, in Apuleius’ Metamorphoses 11.25. See Christologische Formeln, 127.

603 Pace Ruck-Schröder. Bauckham notes that the term kyrios is, strictly speaking, a substitute for the divine name and not in itself a name (cf. Justin’ Second Apol. 16 which says as much) and that therefore the Tetragrammaton must be meant. I think that the notion that kyrios is only a title, and therefore not meant in Phil. 2:9, is erroneous. Several passages in the LXX, such as Isa. 42:8 and Ex. 3:15 (e.g., ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ θεός, τοῦτο μοὶ ἐστὶν τὸ ὄνομα) expressly state that “Lord God” is also God’s name. Moreover, Isa. 42:8 comes from the same section of Isaiah as 45:23; that is, the section which seeks to emphasize the claim that YHWH alone is God. Thus, the author of the hymn probably had this passage in mind when he composed the hymn. Accordingly, it is without foundation to say that the Tetragrammaton is in view. In any event, it is clear from the examples cited, that the title kyrios is the functional equivalent of the Tetragrammaton and bears the same weight. As Hofius put the matter “Der Ausdruck „der Name über alle Namen” kann als eine Umschreibung des hochheiligen Gottesnamens, d.h. als eine mit „Kyrios” gleichwertige Wiedergabe des Tetragramms verstanden werden.” So, whether or not we choose to embrace Bauckham’s proposal, the same result is reached making any argument come out to little more than a distinction without a difference. For further views on this from Hofius, see Der Christushymnus, 27. Also, see Bauckham, “The Worship of Jesus in Philippians 2:9-11.” 130-131, and Ruck-Schröder, DNG/INT, 264.
the theological weight which the flow of thought in the hymn places upon the name.\textsuperscript{604} In fact, when one considers Bauckham’s assessment of how the divine identity was reconfigured to include Jesus, it becomes obvious that Jesus, as part of the divine identity, would be counted as being worthy of bearing the divine name.\textsuperscript{605}

Now that I have treated the bestowal of the divine name and its meaning I shall now turn my attention to unearthing the proper \textit{Sitz-im-Leben} for the creation of the ‘hymn.’ As we shall see, unearthing the proper \textit{Sitz-im-Leben} for the hymn will illuminate how the name bestowed upon Jesus was justified by the early Christians. To date, no single explanation has managed to persuade the scholarly world. This opens the door to other explanations than those already offered. In short, since all attempts to explain the background of the hymn have failed to convince, a new model is warranted, as we shall see.\textsuperscript{606}

Any attempt to uncover the proper \textit{Sitz-im-Leben} must take several peculiarities of the hymn into account. Regrettably, this has not been done except in two somewhat obscure attempts. If I may be allowed to hint at what the hymn’s intent was, it can be summarized in the following fashion: the core of the Philippians hymn was \textit{originally} (prior to becoming part of the hymn) a confession intended to justify newly emergent Christ-devotion. Several lines of evidence converge to underscore this possibility.

First, the hymn, especially the latter half, has a quite unmistakable polemical ring to it. As early as 1962 Braumann recognized this quality and correctly noted the following four form-

\textsuperscript{604} Ibid., 131. Parenthetically, although of late vintage I note that a similar notion is found in Memar Maqra at IV.1, where Moses’ own name is made synonymous with that of God’s, “Where is there a prophet like Moses, and who can compare with Moses, whose name was made the Name of his Lord.” According to Macdonald this contention may have its origin in the fact that Moses’ name \textit{יהוה}, contains the same consonants as does the word ‘name,’ \textit{i.e.} \textit{יהוה}. Thus this claim for the Name may reflect this consonantal overlap. In any event, Fossum has shown on independent exegetical grounds that the Tetragrammaton is in fact what is meant here. See Jarl E. Fossum, \textit{The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord}, 89-90. Also, III Enoch 12:15 recalls this same motif when it claims that Metatron, upon undergoing a similar elevation as envisioned by the Philippians hymn, receives the name “lesser \textit{YHWH}.” For particulars on matters relating to Memar Marqah see John Macdonald, \textit{The Theology of the Samaritans} (London: S.C.M., 1964), 184.

\textsuperscript{605} There is an evident tension in this hymn that is often overlooked. Although Jesus is given the divine name, it is nevertheless at the mention of \textit{his} name that the universe bends the knee, rather than the divine name which Jesus possesses. It seems to me that this tension can be resolved only by recognizing that Jesus is now included in the divine identity, and as such, \textit{his} name was worthy of the same acknowledgement ordinarily reserved for the name of God.

\textsuperscript{606} As for the other models which have been suggested they are reviewed, for the interested reader, in Appendix One. The shortcomings which are revealed there serve as justification for my attempt at uncovering the true background to the hymn.
critical considerations which indicated to him the polemical nature of the hymn: 1) Although the hymn is characterized by its brevity and the economy of its expressions the author nevertheless felt it necessary to pair a negative statement with a corresponding positive one even though they treat the same problem (e.g. ὁ ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων being the positive element, and οὐχ ἀρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ ἐναὶ ἱσα θεὸς, constituting the negative element in the case of 2:6; 2) By virtue of the fact that the positive statement is wholly sufficient to convey the meaning and intention of the author, it nevertheless occurs that the negative statement is expressly included; 3) The negative statement is constructed with the chief verb (ἡγήσατο in the case of 2:6); 4) The negative statement is further emphasized through the first words (e.g., ἀρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο in the case of 2:6), which points to a certain condition which has decisive import for the first strophe.607

Braumann envisions the hymn as being composed in order to address “eine Situation, in die der Gegner das Gottgleichsein Jesu bestritten” and further states concerning the many claims of the hymn, “Wir haben möglicherweise in viel größerem Umfang die Sprache des Gegners vor uns...”608

Braumann’s thesis points us toward the correct Sitz-im-Leben and I would add that the use of Isa. 45:23, in a hymn with an astonishing redirection of universal acknowledgement toward Jesus and the climactic bestowal of the divine name, also points to a polemical situation.609 Insofar as I believe that the inclusion of Isa. 45:23 offers the solution to the puzzle it is time to ask just what particular situation might best explain the presence of the Isaiah passage and the granting of the Name.

---

607 Georg Braumann, Vorpaulinische christliche Taufverkündigung bei Paulus, (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1962), 57. At the time of Braumann’s work the prevailing consensus that the hymn was constructed using parallelismus membrorum had not yet taken hold. Braumann followed Lohmeyer’s three strophe reconstruction. Nonetheless, his points remain valid even under the new consensus.

608 Ibid., 60. Other than Nagata, whose work is reviewed below, Colin Brown forms one of the few modern commentators who sees the hymn is a manner that is at least somewhat consistent with Braumann’s observations. Brown states that in his view the hymn is “...a confession of faith in poetic form with its own hermeneutical commitments and interpretations which challenge those of the church’s adversaries.” He says further on that, “What we can say is that Phil. 2:6-11 forms a web of belief...including those of the adversaries of the church.” See Brown, “Ernst Lohmeyer’s Kyrios Jesus,” 24, 31.

609 Interestingly, Schenk is disposed to believe that the text is not reflective of a hymnic background but rather is reflective of a propaganda text that utilizes a basic form of antique rhetoric. See Wolfgang Schenk, “Die Philippierbrief in der neueren Forschung (1945-1985),” Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt, Principat 25,4 (1987), 3300.
It is precisely in regard to this question that I believe that the work of Nagata has offered an interesting alternative to standard explanations of the background for the text. Nagata proposes that the hymn is a robust defense of the emergent Christ-cult. In Nagata’s hypothesis the utilization of Isa. 45:23, and its reinterpretation in light of the Christ-event, signals that the early Christians were eliciting the support of the Old Testament for their worship which they direct toward Jesus. Moreover, the fact that Jesus receives the divine name itself is meant to signify that the redirection of cultus toward Jesus is not the invention of the community, but rather is completely justified because God has granted to Jesus the divine name in consequence of his obedience. Finally, the doxological conclusion, which maintains that all of the preceding exaltation of Jesus is done to the very glory of God himself, subordinates the new Christ-cult within the traditional boundaries of Jewish monotheism. As Nagata expresses it:

If the...discussed literary characteristics of the hymn are taken as a whole, it is clear that the hymn is concerned neither with the ethical exemplary value of the event of Christ, nor with eschatological and cosmic soteriological significance as such. The central concern of the hymn is the theological legitimization and affirmation of the christological claim that Jesus....is the cosmocrator...this identification does not violate the unity of God, but is grounded on God’s own eschatological act and is, at the same time, scriptural.\(^\text{610}\)

In order to advance his conclusions Nagata has introduced a clever proposal. Taking his cue from the work of Segal, Nagata has suggested that the use of Isa. 45:23 is conditioned by a common Jewish hermeneutical twist where passages with either the unnatural repetition of the divine name, or where there are inconsistencies with respect to persons within a sentence (i.e. later third person usage in a sentence where the first person would be expected), allowed the reader to infer that two divine beings are spoken of in a particular text.\(^\text{611}\) Repetition of the name of God, divine mediator figures such as the Angel of the Lord, and unexpected pronoun changes, called for Jewish exegetes to explain these peculiar circumstances.\(^\text{612}\) The point here is that these sorts of passages served as the focal point for those who advocated a ‘two

\(^{610}\) Nagata, *Philippians* 2:5-11, 300. Cf. also pg. 315.

\(^{611}\) Ibid., 331.

\(^{612}\) Besides the examples which I cited in my section on the Angel of the Lord tradition, I also note here Gen. 19:24, Ps. 110:1, and Isa. 45:1, among other examples. One interesting rabbinic example comes from Rabbi Aqiba’s interpretation of Daniel 7, which he maintained meant that a second throne had been set up for the Messiah. See *Sanhedrin* 38b.
powers’ theology. 613 Most interestingly, this sort of exegesis is not restricted to the author of the hymn, for as Glasson has pointed out this same sort of ‘plurality of divine persons’ exegesis stands behind the Old Testament catena found at Heb. 1:6-12. 614 Indeed, it may have been a common device designed to ‘find’ allusions to Jesus in the Old Testament. Perhaps we might even speak of an early Christian hermeneutical convention. 615

Returning to Nagata, it is clear that he believes that a similar hermeneutical device stands behind the Philippians hymn. To follow Nagata’s argument it will be necessary to cite first the LXX of Isa. 45:22-23. The LXX states:

επιστράφητε πρός με καὶ σωθήσεσθε, οἱ ἀπ’ ἑσχάτου τῆς γῆς, ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ θεὸς, καὶ οὐκ ἐστιν ἄλλος. 23 κατ’ ἐμαυτῷ ὅμως Ἠμὴν ἐξελύσεται ἕκ τοῦ στόματος μου

613 For example, Philo treats several passages in an effort to remove their evident inconsistencies and preserve Jewish monotheism. See De Somnibus, 1.227-229 and Questiones et Solutiones in Genesim II, 62. In the first case Philo sidesteps the problem of God’s appearance to Laban with the accompanying statement, “I am the God who was seen by thee in the place of God,” which naturally raised the prospect that there were two gods, by proposing that in the first instance the name of God is accompanied by the article while the second occurrence is anarthrous. Philo states that “What then ought we to say? There is one true God only: but they who are called Gods, by an abuse of language, are numerous; on which account the holy scripture on the present occasion indicates that it is the true God that is meant by the use of the article, the expression being, “I am the God (ho Theos);” but when the word is used incorrectly, it is put without the article, the expression being, ‘He who was seen by thee in the place, not of the God (tou Theou), but simply of God (Theou).’” This fact, according to Philo, conveys that the anarthrous form signifies those secondary figures who are incorrectly conceived of as God. In contrast, the name with the article signifies the one true God. In the latter example of Gen. 9:6 Philo simply invokes the concept of the Logos as the explanation for the unnatural repetition. For further commentary see Alan Segal, Two Powers in Heaven, 59-219, esp. pg. 164.

614 Glasson notes at 1:6 that the author quotes from Deut. 32:43 in its Septuagintal form. The text reads: Καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαι αὐτῷ πάντες ὁ γάγελοι θεου (Let all the angels of God worship him). Also, Heb. 1:8-9 quotes from Ps. 45: 6-7, where it appears that two persons is indicated, “Your throne O God, is for ever and ever... Therefore God, your God, has anointed you with the oil of gladness above all fellows.” In similar fashion Heb. 1:10-12 draws upon Ps. 102: 25-27. If we look at the passage it seems as though there could not possibly be a reference to Jesus. The text reads, “In the beginning you laid the foundations of the earth, and the heavens are the work of your hands. They will perish, but you remain; they will all wear out like a garment. Like clothing you will change them and they will be discarded. But you remain the same, and your years will never end.” When we look a little closer at the Psalm we notice at vv. 20-22 the following statement, καί υἱὸς οὗτος ἐν Σιών τῷ ἄνθρωπῳ κυρίῳ... This verse yields, as Glasson observes, the reading, ‘The Lord looked upon the earth, to proclaim in Zion the name of the Lord.’ For those who were drawn to this sort of ‘plurality of divine persons’ exegesis they would find reinforcement at vv. 24, where the text reads, “he answered...him,” (ἀπεκρήτην αὐτῷ ἐν οἴκοις οὗτων τῷ ἄνθρωπῳ τῶν ἡμερῶν μου ἡμέρας...). Glasson further suggests that at some point vv. 23-24 was thought to be the words of the Son, while 25-28 involves the answer of the Father. Furthermore, at 1:13, the author cites the well known passage in Ps. 110:1 where the Psalm begins, “The Lord said to my Lord.” Although Glasson pulls up shy in pushing this Psalm it is evident that it too fits the pattern of the other Psalms where two persons could plausibly be understood as being referred to. For further details see T. F. Glasson, “‘Plurality of Divine Persons’ and the Quotations in Hebrews I. 6 ff.” NTS 12 (1966): 270-272.

615 This convention no doubt derives from prior Jewish practice. Segal has shown just how indebted contemporaneous Jewish hermeneutical practice was to this sort of ‘plurality of divine persons’ exegesis. See Alan Segal, Two Powers, 161-172, which deals with the example of Philo’s use of this kind of exegesis.
Drawing attention to v. 23 Nagata has astutely noted that an inconsistency exists between the use of the first person pronoun ἐμοὶ and the regular dative prepositional construction of τῷ θεῷ, which, functionally speaking is in the third person. This would allow for the prospect of distinguishing between the speaker, designated by κύριος in v. 18, and ἐμοὶ in v. 23, from the figure designated by θεῷ in v. 23. The sense of the passage would then be “Every knee will bow to me and every tongue confess to God…”

Following this logic we find that the passage allows for the possibility of seeing here a reference to two figures on the part of the first Christians. This proposed distinction allows Nagata to envision that Phil 5: 9-11 is a midrashic rendering of Isa. 45:23, and as such the concluding doxology in Phil 2: 11, εἰς δόξαν θεῷ πατρός, is an expansion of τῷ θεῷ in Isa. 45:23, while the first-person pronoun ἐμοὶ which Nagata proposes implies a second figure, is replaced by ἐν τῷ ὄνοματὶ Ιησοῦ.

Nagata’s proposal has the added value in that it explains several curiosities of the hymn, viz. the fact that the community is nowhere mentioned, and the absence of any summons to praise either on the part of the community or the individual. This unexpected absence of reference to the community or to their praise and worship creates the impression that the hymn’s Sitz-im-Leben is not to be found in the worship of the community, even though it almost certainly came to play a central and indispensable role in the cult. Instead, the hymn bears every sign that it was (or its core confession which had Isa. 45:23 as its backbone) originally a solemn confession, perhaps said at baptism, or in other cultic settings. Now if Nagata’s proposal is correct then the form of the justification for their binitarian pattern of devotion could hardly appear as anything other than a confession (although a confession can also be used in the sense of praise).

616 Nagata, Philippians, 283.

617 O’Brien has correctly noted the exchange of phrases but fails to recognize its import to Nagata’s thesis. See Epistle to the Philippians, 243.

618 Deichgräber, Gottes hymns and Christushymnus, 119. It should be noted that in contrast to Rev. 5: 11-14, we do not see any reference to expressions of praise. Still, the setting could reflect praise in its present form, although presumably the core confession; that is, Isa. 45:23, never had this in mind.

164
Pushing further we observe that another peculiarity of the hymn is its change of tense from the future tense of Isaiah to the aorist subjunctive. It is a curiosity which demands some investigation. First, we need to bear in mind that the change of tenses was obviously done to fulfill a need by the author or community to which the hymn was addressed. It would appear that this need was obviously to bring the future claims of the passage to bear upon the community’s present situation. In other words, some specific event(s) occasioned this change in verb tense. Are there then any clues left which might point the way to a solution? There is one and it that the change from a future verb clearly points out that the hymn is not eschatological in its orientation, but is instead christologically oriented.

Now if we ask just what concrete historical situation occasioned this remarkable reading of Nagata’s, I introduce the possibility that the opponents of the emergent Christ-cult had thrown Isa. 45:23, with its strident affirmation of monotheism, into the teeth of the early Christians. Indeed, as Segal has observed, the very Deutero-Isaiah passage from which the author of the hymn draws for his claims in verse 9 are in fact the very texts upon which the Tannaitic rabbis, and no doubt many scribes in the first century C.E. relied on to defend Jewish monotheism. Isaiah 45:23 also came to play an important role in later Jewish liturgy precisely because this passage contains the most vigorous statement of monotheism in the whole of the Old Testament.

619 Regarding the tenses Martin notes that although the textual evidence is finely balanced with respect to the aorist and future forms of εἰσοδέωσεν Θα, the future form is the lectio difficilior for the aorist form which is readily explained as an attempt to bring conformity in the aorist tense of κατακλισία. Whatever the true state of affairs might be, Martin draws attention to the fact that during the post-classical period η and ε were used interchangeably. Therefore no fixed selection of one of the two forms of εἰσοδέωσεν Θα needs to be made. See Ralph P. Martin, A Hymn of Christ, 266.

620 Ibid. As correctly observed by O’Brien. This is not to say that the author did not envision the future submission of the universe to the victorious Christ, but only that this future submission is made to serve present realities.

621 See Segal, Two Powers, 33f., 57.

622 See for example the “Nismat Kol-hay” hymn.
Every mouth shall praise you
every tongue swear to you
every knee shall bow before you
every form shall cast themselves down before you
and every one shall praise your Name inside
you God in the omnipotence of your power
you Great one in the glory of your Name...
Just how vigorous a defense of monotheism this was can be seen in the fact that in its original context Isaiah 45:23-25 is part of the so-called trial speeches. This section opens with the summons to a trial (v. 20, “declare and present your case; let them take counsel together”), which is meant to depict a courtroom with YHWH as the final arbitrator as to the validity of the case. In all of the trial speeches the concern of the author was to refute the claims of the gods of the nations and to establish the sovereignty of YHWH. This was accomplished by emphasizing the role of YHWH as creator, savior, and redeemer. What these speeches hoped to demonstrate was that YHWH alone is God and indeed this very verdict is pronounced in verse 21. In fact it is YHWH Himself who declares His sole claim to be God. We need to keep this background in mind when we turn to the question of what the early Christians may have had in mind when they penned this hymn.

First, I propose that the opponents of Christ-devotion drew upon Isa. 45:23 as a proof text designed to defend Jewish monotheistic scruples, and subsequently this passage formed the basis for their accusations against the newly emergent Christ-cult.623 This was followed by a counter reaction by the early Christians, who were forced to scrutinize carefully the passage, and subsequently, they uncovered the incongruity between the first person έποίη and the functionally third person τοῦ θεοῦ. This discovery was then used to fashion the hymn in order to buttress the claims of the early Church that directing obeisance to Jesus was both in keeping with God’s will, and well within Jewish monotheistic scruples. This latter aspect goes far in explaining the closing clause, εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πατρὸς, which looks back to the earlier clause διὸ καὶ ὁ θεός and is designed to emphasize that it was God who had exalted Jesus.624 This proposal also helps to explain why the allusion to Isa. 45:23 does not adopt the future tense of the original citation.

And the third prayer of the Qiddish is also relevant, “...how we know YHWH our God, that the Lordship is with you...and your Name is raised over all, what you have created.” For more discussion of these texts see Hofius, Christushymnus, 48-51.

623 I am indebted to Prof. L. Hurtado who first proposed this hypothesis to me. Gnilka adopts a different take on Isa. 45:23 and instead sees here an emphasis upon judgment which extends even to the cosmic powers. See Der Philippbrief, 128.

It is time now to address several other questions. The first involves what this passage tells us about the earliest Christian cult. Strong clues are found in the statement that “in the name of Jesus every knee will bow and every tongue confess that Jesus is Lord.” We have already seen that the hymn claims that the entire cosmos will bow the knee and confess that Jesus is Lord. Here we see indications of the sort of ritual actions that no doubt served as a Vorbild for the Christian cult. Deichgräber has rightly stressed that the terms exhomologein and onoma are signposts that this confession found its rightful place in the cult.\(^{625}\) His own supposition was that it might have been a sort of Psalm that was sung in the cult.\(^{626}\) Another possibility is that originally the confession found a place in the baptismal rite. What speaks in favor for this setting is the fact that during baptism the baptizand confessed that Jesus is the Lord, as well as the conclusion that baptism took place under invocation of the name of Jesus.

Sadly, there are too many gaps in our knowledge, so that we may never know exactly where in the cult, or in which ritual action, this confessional piece had its place. But what does stand out is that the evidence suggests that the early Church saw here the very ideal for confession/praise within cultic settings. Most importantly, it is clear that the name which stood at the very heart of the cultus was (Lord) Jesus (Christ). As Lohmeyer states, “Denn das Entscheidende ist, daß diese geschichtliche Gestalt Jesu ist,...die die vierte Strophe schilderte, ist „dieser Jesus“ Herr, und sein geschichtlicher Name kann gleichen Sinnes und Rechtes mit dem erhabenen Namen Gottes gesetzt werden...”\(^{627}\) Indeed, the establishment of this equal footing rests upon God’s “clothing” the name of Jesus with His own and through bestowal of His name Jesus received the power and authority of God.

When we turn to taking up the question of the time period when this possible Christ-devotion was begun, it would seem that the very antagonism of the Jewish opponents suggests that the Christ-cult was already in full bloom prior to the composition of the hymn. This is an important observation, for as Kramer correctly points out the acclamation itself must obviously

\[^{625}\] Deichgräber, *Gotteshymnus und Christushymnus*, 132.

\[^{626}\] Ibid.

\[^{627}\] *K.J.*, 58.
predate the hymn.\textsuperscript{628} If the hymn actually does go back to the pre-Pauline era, as is commonly supposed, then the acclamational confession must go back to the very earliest strata of Christian tradition.

Furthermore, the bowing of the knee and confessing with the mouth takes on the same shading as Rev. 5: 11-14, which portrays the heavenly worship of Jesus for those who accept him. Some scholars think this suggests that the hymn depicts a universal and heavenly worship\textsuperscript{629} as well as acknowledgement of the Lordship of Christ.\textsuperscript{630} Other scholars think though that in spite of this the hymn means that the cosmos must bow under compulsion and openly confess that Jesus is Lord.\textsuperscript{631} Whatever the real state of affairs, it is clear that every ritual act takes place under the naming of the name of Jesus.

One last consideration remains: what prompts the action of bowing the knee and confessing?\textsuperscript{632} To answer this we need to observe that vv. 10 and 11 have a chiastic abba structure which pairs Κύριος with ἑν τῷ ὄνοματι.\textsuperscript{633} Secondly, the use of Is. 45:23 suggests the possibility that ἑν might be instrumental and this would fit nicely with the ‘compulsory’ sense of Isa. 45: 24, which states that all who have “raged against him will come to him and be put to shame.” Does this suggest that the power of the name of Jesus will cause all unwilling participants to bend the knee? This is a difficult question to answer; it may only mean that the calling out of the name of Jesus provides the cue for the participants to bend the knee and confess. Still, given the context of Isa. 45:23-24, with its implied compulsion by force (i.e., the

\textsuperscript{628} Ibid., 64. Deichgräber thinks that it might be the oldest confessional piece in early Christianity. See Gotteshymnus and Christushymnus, 118.

\textsuperscript{629} O'Brien notes that in the LXX ἐξομολογήσασθαι took on the meaning of worship and confession of praise to God when used to render yādā. See Epistle to the Philippians, 240, 246.

\textsuperscript{630} Indeed, v. 11 makes clear the action is done for the glory of God and this implies that the confession (or worship) was directed toward Jesus.

\textsuperscript{631} O'Brien prefers to see, as do I, the use of the ἐξομολογήσασθαι as being more related to open confession than worship in Isa. 45:23, and by extension it might be argued that confession is more suitable to the Philippians hymn. See Epistle to the Philippians, 248.

\textsuperscript{632} Or as the case may be, worship. Lohfink correctly remarks that this must be directed to Jesus according to the hymn (as it is in Heb. 1: 6 and Rev. 5: 8, 14), and not God, as many exegetes would have it. See Gerhard Lohfink, “Gab es im Gottesdienst der neutestamentlichen Gemeinden eine Anbetung Christi?” Biblische Zeitschrift 18.2 (1974): 169.

\textsuperscript{633} O’Brien, Epistle to the Philippians, 247.
claim that every knee will bow and every tongue confess), it is likely that the ἐν τῷ ὄνοματι phrase is instrumental in meaning.

2) EPHESIANS 1:18-22

For the purposes of my study verses 21-22 are of particular importance. This passage will show just how powerful the name of Jesus was believed to be in relation to the spiritual powers of the cosmos. In the context, the author use verses 20-22 to establish just how exalted and mighty Jesus presently is, and this helps to underscore the blessings and benefits found in verses 18-19. To begin, I shall cite the text in full in order to see the larger context:

I pray that the eyes of your heart may be enlightened, so that you may know what is the hope of His calling, what are the riches of the glory of His inheritance in the saints, and what is the surpassing greatness of His power toward us who believe. These are in accordance with the working of the strength of His might 20 which He brought about in Christ, when He raised Him from the dead, and seated Him at His right hand in the heavenly places, 21 far above all rule and authority and power and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this age, but also in the one to come. 22 And He put all things in subjection under His feet, and gave Himself as head over all things to the church.

Superficially read it would seem that this passage has nothing to do with the name of Jesus. The passage says only that Jesus is exalted above all conceivable powers that can be named. But if Jesus is elevated above every ‘name being named’ does this not mean that Jesus’ name is greater than all other names? This must be true when we recall that in the ancient world a person or thing is tied to their name; indeed, it summarizes their nature and position.

Accordingly, when the author states that Jesus is elevated above all names being named this can be reformulated to read: “Jesus’ name is above every name being named.” Just how momentous this claim is will be seen momentarily.

Now one notices straightaway that this passage carries many formal similarities to passages such as Col. 1:16, 1 Peter 3:22, 1 Cor. 15:24 and Rom. 8:38, in that the reference to ἀρχῇ, ἐξουσία, κυριότητι, and δύναμις serves a similar function in these passages in designating those powers who were subjected to Jesus after his exaltation. The passage also quickly reminds one of Philippians 2:5-11 in that both deal with the enthronement of Jesus above

---

641 An almost similar listing is found in the Slavonic Apocalypse of Enoch 20:1 (see also fn 641), where the heavenly powers which Enoch sees are described as δυνάμεις, κυριότητες, ἀρχαὶ, ἐξουσίαι, and ὅρων.
every other power. A further similarity is found in the fact that it is God who bestows this elevated position on Jesus.635

In order to come to grips with the meaning of this passage, it is necessary to get a handle on the powers that are named in v. 20. We find our most positive indication further on at 6: 12, where the author describes these powers as those which are not “...flesh and blood, but principalities and powers,” who are, “the spiritual forces of evil in the heavenly realm” (cf. I Cor. 15: 24-26). The perception that we are dealing with hostile spiritual forces in 1:20 is reinforced further when 2: 2 is taken into account. Here the author speaks of the enemy of Christians as the “ruler of the kingdom of the air.” A further clue is unearthed by consultation of the PGM, where at I.215 and IV.1193, we find recorded that the word ἔξουσια could be used to signify evil powers.636 Now with respect to the term δύναμις the LXX often employs δυνάμεις to refer to the angelic ‘hosts of heaven,’ but this interpretation might be too narrow for this passage.637 Our last term κυρίοτης is, as Arnold indicates, to be taken in coordination with the other terms and signifies a special class of angels.638 And insofar as the author alludes to Ps. 110:1 in v. 20 this necessitates that these powers include hostile powers.639

As we look closer at this passage the phrase, παντὸς ὑφόματος ὑπομαξομένου, it is obvious that there is more to this phrase than first meets the eye. This phrase carries a significant connotational thrust in the direction of both exorcism and magical incantations.640 This observation helps to reinforce our conclusion that the previously mentioned terms (i.e., πόσης

---

635 Ruck-Schröder, DNG.INT, 99.


637 E.g., II Kings 17:16; 21:3, 5; 23:4f.

638 Arnold, Ephesians: Power and Magic, 54.

639 Ibid., 56. Schnackenberg also understands these terms as relating to cosmic powers of darkness, as does A. Lincoln. See Rudolf Schnackenburg, Der Brief an die Epheser, Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament Band 10, ed. Josef Blank, (Zürich; Einsieden; Köln: Benziger Verlag and Neukirchen-Vlurn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1982), 76-77 and Andrew Lincoln, Ephesians, 63.

640 Ibid., 54.
and a review of the *PGM* shows that the use of ὄνομα instead of a specific name by the exorcist or theurgist, can in certain cases, be used in a comprehensive sense to denote all conceivable forces and powers.642 Indeed, over a century ago Conybeare expressed his conviction that this particular expression has as its most comfortable fit a milieu where exorcisms of the type that we have already seen from the *PGM* were common.643 It is therefore of more than passing interest that Asia Minor, and Ephesus in particular, is portrayed in Acts (19: 11-20) as a center for mavens of Hellenistic magic.644 And it may be of some import to note, as Arnold has done,645 that the only place in either the Pauline Hauptbriefe or the Deutero-Pauline letters which employs the verb ὄνομαζω (three occurrences) are all found in Eph (e.g. 1:21; 3:15; 5:3), and that within all of the New Testament is it utilized elsewhere only by the Jewish exorcists spoken of in Acts 19:13.

Beyond these considerations we should note that the word itself, ὄνομαζωμεν, means in the context that the powers in question were known and named by mankind.646 Thus, the phrase ‘the name above every name that is named’ is meant to convey that Jesus’ name is greater than every name that is invoked by men as either gods, angels, or demons. In essence the passage implies that the name which Jesus possesses is above every other name and this in turn suggests that Jesus’ position as the Κυρίος is in view. In fact, the author has already engaged this theme in Eph. 1:10, where he writes that the goal of God’s work is to bring all things in heaven and earth under Christ, and this signifies God’s rule (cf. 4:5-6). Little wonder then that if one looks at the flow of thought from v. 20f it is God who raised Jesus from the dead; and it is God who

---

641 Ibid. In an oft-quoted portion of the Slavonic Apocalypse of Enoch (20:1) concerning the meaning of the terms we have encountered above I note the following expression, “And I saw...the incorporeal forces (δυνάμεις; cf. 1 Enoch 61:10, and 1 Pet. 3:22) and the dominions (κυριότητες) and the rulers (ἀρχαὶ; cf. Rom. 8:38), and the authorities (ἐξουσίαι; cf. Test. Levi 3:8)...”

642 Arnold, Ephesians: Power and Magic, 55.

643 Ibid., 55. I am indebted here for Arnold’s indication of Conybeare’s opinion on this expression.

644 No doubt this attraction was facilitated by the fame of the so-called Ephesia Grammata. With the possible exception of Thessaly and Egypt I know of no other such magnet for drawing those who dabbled in magical practices.

645 Arnold, Ephesians: Power and Magic, 55.

646 Ruck-Schröder, DNG.INT, 98.
question, it is God who subjects all things under Jesus and installs him as head of the Church (1:22).

In connection with this elevation it is important to bear in mind that being at the right hand of God is not only a place of honor but of power as well (cf. Ex. 15:6; Ps. 89:13; Isa. 48:13). In addition, the author further stresses this elevation when he places Jesus in the heavenly realm (ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις). This spatial placement is obviously designed to express the belief of the superiority of Jesus over all spirits. Furthermore, the author expresses the fact that every conceivable power had been subjected to Christ in his use of, πᾶς ὄνομα ὄνομα ζωμένος, which is an unambiguous statement that Christ now rules over every conceivable power. It is now time to look at what this passage suggests concerning the use of the name of Jesus in ritual settings.

The passage makes clear that Jesus' name is above all other names; that is, it is more powerful (and consequently bears the greatest authority), than any other name. This of course suggests that the readers employed solely the name of Jesus in ritual settings. We have already seen that Greco-Roman religious adherents naturally invoked the name of the most powerful deity. To do anything else was a waste of time. No less can be expected here. Given the preeminent place which the name of Jesus occupied, a fact the Apostles stressed time and again, it seems clear the Jesus' name was employed, both to initiate, as well as to authorize cultic activities in the early Church.

3) Mt. 1:18-25

In the beginning of the Gospel of Matthew we find a remarkable narrative in which the author devotes considerable theological reflection and imagination to the meaning and bestowal of the name 'Jesus.' The text reads (1:18-23):

Now the birth of Jesus Christ was as follows. When His mother Mary had been betrothed to Joseph, before they came together she was found to be with child by the Holy Spirit.
19 And Joseph her husband, being a righteous man, and not wanting to disgrace her, desired to put her away secretly. 20 But when he had considered this, behold, an angel of the Lord appeared to him in a dream, saying, “Joseph, son of David, do not be afraid to take Mary as your wife; for that which has been conceived in her is of the Holy Spirit. 21 “And she will bear a Son; and you shall call His name Jesus, for it is He who will save His people from their sins.” 22 Now all this took place that what was spoken by the Lord through the prophet might be fulfilled, saying, 23 “Behold, the virgin shall be with child, and shall bear a Son, and they shall call His name Immanuel,” which translated means, “God with us.”
At first glance what stands out is the surprising claim that Jesus will be called by two names, viz. the proper name Jesus and the symbolic name Immanuel. The latter name is derived from Isa. 7:14, where God had told King Ahaz that he can ask for a sign as an assurance that Isaiah's original council was to be trusted. This sign was thought necessary because the king was subjected to a threat from the Syro-Ephraimitic war of 734 B.C.E. and he was in need of assurance that his kingdom would not fall to his enemies as Isaiah had proclaimed. In the narrative, Isaiah responds that God Himself will give a sign. The text reads, "Therefore the Lord himself will give you a sign. Look, the young woman is with child and shall bear a son, and shall name him Immanuel (Ἐμμανουὴλ)." This sign was meant to assure Ahaz that God was with him and Judah in this trying time.

Now without doubt this inclusion is a Matthean contrivance, for it is wholly without precedence in other New Testament texts. If nothing else, Matthew's unique adoption of this passage serves to remind us of the importance which he placed on demonstrating that Jesus' birth was supernatural. In point of fact, the Isaiah passage was included in order to serve the purpose of showing that the supernatural birth of Jesus through the Spirit of God was in fulfillment of the Scriptures. It also served the purpose of demonstrating that Jesus received his name through the Spirit of God. This aspect is further reinforced by the claim that it was the Angel of the Lord (v.20) who proclaimed Jesus' name to Joseph. This angelic pronouncement is in keeping with the tradition whereby angels announce miraculous births (or the names of sons; cf. Gen. 16:11, 17:19; Isa. 7:14; 1 Kgs. 13:2; Lk. 1:13,31). The author strengthens this perception further by also utilizing a prophetic motif by which the future greatness of significant persons was often announced.

In addition, the author's adoption of Isa. 7:14 also signals that he is concerned to demonstrate that in Jesus God was visiting His people, and like Ahaz, He would remain with them through their turbulent and sometimes perilous embrace of Christianity. Briefly stated, the

---

647 Quoted from the New Revised Standard Version.


649 Ibid., 207.

650 Ibid., 209.
bestowal of the name Immanuel conforms to the same pattern as that found in Isaiah 7:14; that is, a pattern of deliverance and divine presence. This is seen in the fact that Matthew connects the one name, Immanuel, which demonstrates divine presence, with Jesus, a name meant to establish a link with divine deliverance. No doubt a further concern of the author was to bind the advent of Jesus to the promised presence of God in these latter (messianic) days.

A further link that the author thinks worthwhile to establish is Jesus’ Davidic credentials, which he demonstrates by showing that he stands in the proper genealogical line of the House of David. He shows this concern in the fact that it is Joseph who receives the angel’s proclamation, addressed by the angel as υἱὸς Δαβίδ. The establishment of proper Davidic lineage creates the first basis for legitimating Jesus’ messianic position, as well as his installation as King of the Jews.651

The next aspect which demands our attention is the explanation of the etymology of the name of Jesus in light of the angelic explanation that his name was chosen, αὐτὸς γὰρ σώσει τὸν λαόν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν. This interpretation draws not from the Greek Ἰησοῦς, but rather from the Hebrew יְהוָה, an abbreviation of יְהוָה.652 The name combines two terms and means ‘YHWH saves.’ In spite of the fact that the name means ‘YHWH saves,’ the author makes clear that it is Jesus who will save the people from their sins (v. 20). In the realm of salvation this claim in essence places Jesus on a plane with God, functionally speaking.654 In any event, Matthew is following here the common Semitic conception that a name represents a person as 1 Sam. 25:25 illustrates concerning Nabal, “Please do not let my lord pay attention to this worthless man, Nabal, for as his name is, so is he. Nabal is his name and

---

651 At 2:2, for example, the Magi can ask about the location of the ‘King of the Jews’, while Herod in 2:4 asks about the whereabouts of ‘the Christ.’

652 And it is worth noting that Jesus’ Hebrew name must have contained the shortened form of the Tetragrammaton, a fact that I shall return to in my section concerning the nomina sacra. See Ruck-Schröder, DNGJNT, 123 fn. 9.

653 See also Ruck-Schröder DNGJNT, 123. Interestingly, Philo states in Mis Nom 121 that Jesus (i.e. Joshua) means σωτήρ κυρίου. In contrast to Matthew, Luke is interested only in the fact that Jesus’ name is bestowed by an angel, even though he surely must have understood what the name meant. This accent on the angelic bestowal signifies, as Legrand noted, “que le nom a une origine céleste, et donc une puissance surnaturelle.” See L. Legrand, “On l’appela du Nom de Jésus (Luc II, 21),” Revue Biblique 89 (1982): 486.

654 Ruck-Schröder, DNGJNT, 124. Here I mean in the sense that God had installed Jesus in the position whereby he could forgive sins.
folly is with him...." Accordingly, the author is taking pains to emphasize that Jesus is salvation; simply put, Jesus saves (cf. 8:25; 9: 21-22; 14:30; 27:42). I shall have more to say about this in my concluding section. For now, it is worth keeping this conclusion in mind.

With respect to "Immanuel", we find that the author's emphasis on this name lies in the fact that he provides what the LXX does not; a translation of the Hebrew name which he renders as μεθερμηνευόμενον μεθ' ἤμων ὁ θεός. This rendering makes evident that the author sees Jesus as the personal embodiment of the presence of God with man. The fact that the author has taken the trouble to offer a translation reinforces the perception that he placed great weight upon alerting his readers that Jesus personally embodies the very presence of God with His people. The author's evident care in producing this section, and the emphasis on the name(s) of Jesus, serves in establishing the christological claims which can be followed throughout the rest of the Gospel. As such, the whole of the rest of the Gospel can be read with reference to the dual naming of Jesus.

4) Mt. 18:15-20

This passage has engendered a great deal of attention for its evident allusion to Jewish speculation over the Shekhina. To show this I begin by citing the text:

And if your brother sins, go and reprove him in private; if he listens to you, you have won your brother. 16 But if he does not listen to you, take one or two more with you, so that by the mouth of two or three witnesses every fact may be confirmed. 17 And if he refuses to listen to them, tell it to the church; and if he refuses to listen even to the church, let him be to you as a Gentile and a tax-gatherer. 18 Truly I say to you, whatever you shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatever you loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. 19 Again I say to you, that if two of you agree on earth about anything that they may ask, it shall be done for them by My Father who is in heaven. 20 For where two or three have gathered together in My name, there I am in their midst.

A few observations are in order. First, this logion belongs to the Matthean Sondergut. Within the Matthean Sondergut the use of the expression εἰς τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα is sui generis (sans 28:19). Certain features of the saying lend credence to the perspective that the logion may possibly have its origin in traditional materials that the evangelist has taken up and incorporated into his Gospel. Brooks concisely summarizes the evidence for such a supposition:

---

655 μεθ' ἤμων ὁ θεός comes from LXX Isa. 8:8.

656 Correctly Ruck-Schröder. See DNGJNT, 126.
The vocabulary in v. 19 is not characteristic of Matthew. Symphöneō, “to agree”, occurs only here and in an unparalleled parable in 20.2, 13 in Matthew. Pragmatos, “matter”, is a hapax legomenon in Matthew... The use of synago, “gather together”, for Jesus disciples in v. 20. The verb is used in no other instance of Jesus’ disciples... The use of eis to enon onoma, “in my name”, is found only here in Matthew.

If we turn to the question of charting the exegesis of this passage we find that there are three possible paths. The first sees in this passage a dependence upon the Shekhinu traditions that are documented in later rabbinic Judaism. The second possibility sees in this passage a dependence upon the Old Testament theme of the promise concerning the presence of YHWH through His name. The third option sees in 18:20 the authorization to forgive sins in the same fashion as Jn. 20:23. As we shall see, upon examination, three factors weigh heavily in favor of the Shekhina option.

First, the author is clearly at home in the type of rabbinic thought that comes into play later on in the Second Century (and presumably existed in the First Century) and frames his thinking accordingly. An example of this is found in the immediately preceding v 18 which speaks of the power of the community to ‘bind’ and ‘loose’ the standards of community life and praxis. The term ‘bind and loose’ is a well-known rabbinic terminus technicus. Within rabbinic writings the meaning is that the person who is authorized to perform this (i.e., a rabbinic authority) can either ‘bind’ a behavior (i.e., prohibit the practice in question), or they can ‘loose’ it (i.e., making it legal, sometimes even mandatory). We see this same concern reflected clearly in Mt. 16: 13-19. In this complex Peter confesses that Jesus is the Christ, to which Jesus exclaims to Peter:

Blessed are you, Simon son of Jonah, for this was not revealed to you by man, but by my Father in heaven. And I tell you that you are Peter, and on this Rock I will build my church, and the gates of Hades will not overcome it. I will give you the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven: whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth will be loosed in heaven.


658 There is, strictly speaking, a fourth path, which Hiers advocates. He sees in the terms ‘binding’ and ‘loosing’ a reference to exorcism. However, even he recognizes that this reading is unsuitable to 18:20 and he instead restricts his attention to Mt. 16:19. See Richard H. Hiers, “‘Binding’ and ‘Loosing’: The Matthean Authorization,” JBL 104.2 (1985): 241.

659 L. Fuchs advocates this approach. See Studies of the Historical Jesus (Naperville, Ill.: Allenson, 1964), 152. As cited in Hiers, ibid., 234.
The author is clearly concerned to establish for his readers the fact that Peter has been granted the authority to institute rules of behavior and practice for the nascent Church. The author’s use of this term in 18: 18 in connection with the community’s decision shows quite clearly that he is thinking in a ‘rabbinic’ fashion at this point and applying the same terminology of authorization to the Church in its decision making process on this matter.660

The second factor is that the actual expression “where two or three are gathered” looks for all the world like an allusion to beliefs that became recorded in later rabbinic statements concerning the Shekhina. There are several rabbinic tractates which demonstrate this.

My first text is found in Avoth 3.2,6, which records the opinion of Rabbi Hananiah b. Teradion (ca.135C.E.), and Rabbi Halafta b. Dosa’s commentary (Mek. on Ex. 20:24 and m.‘Avot) on what events or agents could precipitate the presence of the Divine Glory. Avoth 3.2 states:

R. Hananiah b. Teradion said: ‘If two sit together and no words of the Law [are spoken] between them, there is the seat of the scornful,’ as it is written, ‘Nor sitteth in the seat of the scornful.’ But if two sit together and the words of the Law [are spoken] between them, then the Divine Presence (the Shekinah) rests between them, as it is written, ‘Then they that feared the Lord spake to one another, and the Lord took notice and heard, and a book of remembrance was written before him, for them that feared the Lord, and that thought upon His Name.’

And 3:6 reads:

R. Halafta b. Dosa of Kefer Hanania said: ‘If ten men sit together and occupy themselves in the Law, the Divine Presence rests among them,’ for it is written, ‘God standeth in the congregation of God.’ And where [do we learn of this] even of the five? Because it is written, ‘And [He] has founded His group upon the earth.’ And where of three? Because it is written, ‘He judges among the judges.’ And where of two? Because it is written, ‘They that feared the Lord spoke with one another and the Lord noticed, and heard.’ And where of One? Because it is written, ‘In every place where I record my Name I will come unto you and I will bless you.’

These texts establish quite decisively that the author is not leaning upon Old Testament notions of presence, but rather that he is indebted to reflections and traditions that focus on the communal setting of Torah study which guarantee the presence of God. Although we have no proof that mAvot predates, or is co-terminous with, the creation of the Matthean saying, and although evidence of direct dependence is murky, the strong conceptual overlap between both

---

texts displays either that a common tradition stands behind both, or that both texts converge around a common concern to address notions of divine presence within their respective communities.

Although strikingly similar in wording Mt. 18:20 and *Mavot* 3.2,6 have their differences in meaning. Here I am referring to the agent that brings about the divine presence. In *Mavot* 3.2,6, it is the study and reflection upon the Torah, while in Mt. 18:20 it is the Christian community assembled εἰς τὸ ἐμὸν ὅνωμα. How are we to interpret this passage now that we have secured the position that the author has drawn upon common or shared perceptions of the divine presence in sanctified communities?

The first question revolves around the meaning of the crucial phrase, εἰς τὸ ἐμὸν ὅνωμα. The first possibility is that the phrase is meant to reflect the tradition that we witness in later rabbinic use whereby one rabbi speaks in the name of another. This sense appears quite unsuitable. Another possibility is to see here a reference to gathering 'in the name' as reflecting the concern to gather and remember the teachings of Jesus. Those who support this possibility refer primarily to Mal. 3:16 as the background for *Mavot* 3.2,6, and indirectly Mt. 18:20. Mal. 3:16 reads, “Then those who feared the Lord spoke to one another, and the Lord gave attention and heard it, and a book of remembrance was written before Him for those who fear the Lord and who esteem His name.”

The obvious parallels to *Mavot* 3.2,6 lead some to posit that insofar as the Name and God’s attention are bound up with teaching (i.e., the Torah), this is also what stands behind Mt. 18:20. Ruck-Schröder, for example, interprets this verse in light of Mt. 28:19 and sees in the command to baptize in the name of Jesus a clear reflection of the concern to bring the believer to submission to the commandments of Jesus. Ruck-Schröder then attempts to show that this

---

661 I agree here with Ruck-Schröder. See *DNG. INT*, 138.

662 Strangely, advocates of this view have overlooked what is arguably a more suitable background passage, namely Ex. 20:24b, where the text reads, “In every place where I cause My name to be remembered, I will come to you and bless you.”

interpretation also takes into account Matthean theology. In essence, this line of reasoning promotes the thought that the surety of the presence of Jesus is seen as something that occurs because believers have met with an orientation to his teachings. I think this interpretation ignores some vital matters and I cannot, therefore, agree with it.

The whole complex makes it clear that the express purpose of the assembly is to render judgment on a recalcitrant believer. This is the specific Sitz-im-Leben. Here, as I have already shown, the author makes use of very technical Jewish concepts which serve to assure the community that they have the authority to create, and enforce, communal rules of behavior. In other words, the passage takes pains to go beyond the simple adherence to the commandments of Jesus, but rather attempts to show that the community itself has authority to deal with those who did not act in accordance with its rules.

The next verse expresses the conviction that God will respect what they have determined in this matter, because they have been granted the authority to ‘bind’ and ‘loose.’ It is then that the author places in the mouth of Jesus the pledge that whatever they ask will be granted by “my Father in heaven.” This latter promise serves in establishing that the decision of the community, if done is harmony (συμφωνεῖν). accompanied by prayer, will find a willing answer from God. And it is in connection with the certainty of answered prayer that the name of Jesus is brought into play. I would also add that the author has added this promise so that the community would rest assured that Jesus was present to grant the authority and power which the community needed to carry out their decision. Thus, the purpose of this complex appears to be to

---

664 Ibid..

665 I also in part reject the conclusions of Dirks, who sees in the phrase a reference to the power of Jesus, and that it signals the trust which Christians have in Jesus. While I can endorse the former notion, I cannot fully endorse the latter. See Walter Dirks, “Wo zwei oder drei, Überlegungen zu Mt 18,20,” in Die Neue Gemeinde. Festschrift für Theodor Filthaut zum 60 Geburtstag Unter Mitwirung von Walter Dirks und Johann Baptist Metz, ed. Adolf Exeler (Mainz: Matthias-Grunewald, 1968): 23-24.

666 18:15-17 forms a pre-Matthean complex to which 18:18 clearly is related. Indeed, Lührmann has produced weighty arguments in favor of seeing 18:15-18 as a unified complex which the author took over. See Horacio E. Lona, „In meinen Namen versammelt,” Archives of Liturgy 37 (1995): 379-380.


668 Ibid., 381.
assure the assembled believers of two indispensable items: first, the presence of Jesus, and secondarily, the pledge that God has granted them authority and that He will honor their requests which they ask in Jesus’ name. This means that Jesus is promising his presence in order to offer his authority and power in their communal actions.

Now, Billerbeck has suggested that ἐις τὸ ὄνομα shows a rabbinic pedigree (unlike that of Heitmüller’s commercial argot) which suggests in this context that all of the foregoing events are done with regard to Jesus’ name.669 Even if true, this should not be taken to imply that 18:20 precludes an actual calling upon the name of Jesus to begin the assembly, or in carrying out the communal action. On the contrary, I hold it as very likely that Christian assemblies were begun with the invocation of Jesus’ name, and any cultic acts were also carried out under invocation of his name, as I believe a quick examination of 1 Cor. 5:4 will show.

While many commentators have overlooked this possibility, Davies and Allison, although leaving the inquiry untouched, nevertheless remarked when reviewing Matt. 18:20 that “...it is worth considering whether ‘in my name’ is not here used as in 7:22: ‘in the power of my name’ (cf. I Cor. 5.4).”670 Now in some respects this gathering in the name of Jesus to decide a matter of church discipline is reminiscent of the situation in 1 Cor. 5:1-4, where Paul directs the church to turn over an incestuous offender to Satan in the power of Jesus. In both cases the group assembles in the name of Jesus (ἐν τῷ ὄνοματι τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν ἶησοῦ οὐγιαρχέντων ὑμῶν in the case of 1 Cor. 5:4), both have gathered to pass judgment in matters of church discipline, and in both assemblies the Lord is present (cf. 18:20 with 1 Cor. 5:4, “σὺν τῷ διαράμει τοῦ κυρίου...and the power of our Lord Jesus is present”).

In the light of 1 Cor. 5:4 it seems quite possible that the assembly in Mt. 18:20 met under invocation of Jesus’ name. In short, ἐν τῷ ὄνοματι is what is actually said, but ἐις τὸ ὄνομα is how one would refer to this action. Following what we have seen, the expression relates to the gathering which the community undertakes, accompanied by Jesus’ presence, yet it also takes on

---


the shading of the notion that Jesus’ name bears the power and authority to carry out the community discipline.

At this point it is useful to ask just what can be gleaned from this passage concerning the use of the name of Jesus in a cultic context. It suggests that the Christian assembly was begun under invocation of the name of Jesus in order to secure his presence and blessing. It also suggests that the name of Jesus was also periodically invoked during cultic activities at certain crucial junctures, or during certain procedures such as the juridical procedure spoken of in Mt. 18:20, in order to draw upon the power and authority of Jesus.

5) Acts 2:16-38

To begin, I want to point out that in my estimation this passage serves as the most foundational passage for understanding how the name of Jesus came to be used in various ritual and non-ritual contexts. Basically, it was the claim that Jesus’ name was the sole name given to mankind for salvation that began the process which led to all the other uses of the name of Jesus.

Before I look a bit closer at this passage it would be of value to gather some general observations concerning the significance and meaning of the text.

At the outset it is worth observing that seen in the light of the religious conceptions of the New Testament, the giving of the name of Jesus for the purposes of salvation is of equal or greater significance than the revelation of the divine name in Exodus. This is quite a claim and this assertion needs some justification. The key foundation for this claim is that the name of Jesus opened the door of salvation and in its scope this ‘opening’ reached to all mankind. In contrast to the disclosure of the divine name to Moses, the name of Jesus was not restricted to Israel, and it allowed for all mankind to enter into a salvific relationship with God. Another feature which underscores the importance of this claim is that the author makes clear by his use of Joel that calling on Jesus’ name was an eschatological event (2:17 ἐν τῷ ἐσχάτῳ οἰκείῳ ἦρως ηὐδαίρεισ is Lucan), which produces the corollary that those who do the invoking are the eschatological people of God. In this respect one invoked Jesus in part because he is coming again (Acts 22:20). Further developments along these lines are seen in that the early Church

---

671 The claim that many languages were supernaturally manifested underscores the universality which 2:5 expresses, when it states that ‘all the nations who are under heaven’ can reach out to God in Jesus’ name.

672 Jewish expectations were that the fulfillment of Joel 3 was an eschatological event which was expected to save God’s people. See Num Rab. 15:25; Midr. Ps. 14:6; & Acts 2:17.
conflated the Day of the Lord with the promised messianic reign. For the early Church the Day of the Lord and the messianic reign are one and the same.\textsuperscript{673} To lay bare other features I shall need to review Joel 2: 30-32:

And I will display wonders in the sky and on the earth. Blood, fire, and columns of smoke. The sun will be turned into darkness. And the moon into blood. Before the great and awesome day of the Lord comes. And it will come about that whoever calls on the name of the Lord will be delivered; for on Mount Zion and in Jerusalem there will be those who escape. As the Lord has said, Even among the survivors whom the Lord calls.

Several points are worth considering in this text. The first is that Joel has here written about the pouring out of God’s spirit, but interpreted this event in a manner that is different from the promise found in Ezek. 39:29. Joel has set this dispensation in a context where YHWH has manifested Himself (or made His presence known) in the midst of Israel. This outpouring is, in Joel, clearly an event restricted to God’s people, as both the context and 3:1ff. demonstrate. This outpouring is not to be seen as being bestowed in a random fashion, but as v.32 makes clear, this gift is for those whom YHWH calls. Indeed, those whom YHWH calls will be those who in turn call upon His name. This gracious outpouring comes in Joel hard on the heels of a new call to confess YHWH again and to hold firm to His ways (2:12-17). In fact, it is clear that those whom YHWH will call to experience His refuge from the coming distress are those who have responded to Yahweh’s call for repentance and a renewed commitment to YHWH. Now, all of the foregoing renders the transference to Jesus in Acts 2: 38 all the more remarkable.\textsuperscript{674} That the author of Acts saw fit to apply Joel 2: 32 to Jesus in light of the call for a renewed confession to YHWH at 2:12-17 underlines that YHWH was now in the midst of His people in the person of Jesus and his outpouring of the Spirit. When we add that it is Jesus’ name that now is the name of salvation we are led to the supposition that Jesus is performing what YHWH had promised to do.

Another feature is that, unlike the context in Joel, where the signs and wonder take on the shading of a concrete physical event of the outpouring of the wrath of God, Luke situates the signs and wonders in the Christ-event. Thus, the ‘Day of the Lord’ is here not a final catastrophe,

\textsuperscript{673} Ibid., 166.

\textsuperscript{674} If one follows the trail of this thinking one of the earliest literary instances is found in Luke’s Gospel, where in the resurrection appearances the Risen Christ states that forgiveness of sins will be proclaimed in his name (24:47). This retroprojection of the events of Acts 2 into the time of the resurrection appearances on the part of the author hints that the earliest connection between the name of Jesus and ritual acts concerned the remission of sins.
but is instead something grounded in the revelation of God through Jesus. These signs and wonders of Joel, and in Acts, are then God “doing miracles in your midst (Acts 2:22-23).”

Returning to Acts we find another feature worthy of notice. Besnard in his study pursued the meaning of the title ‘kyrios’ and determined that it had a dual meaning. The first was that it represented God. It became a surrogate for the Tetragrammaton. The second meaning, and for our purposes the most important, was that it signified God’s royal rule over the earth. In light of this distinction the transference of the title kyrios to Jesus allowed for, in Besnard’s words “un précieux moyen d’expression à la distinction sans rupture d’unité que la révélation du Christ introduit dans le monothéisme juif.” What Besnard is telling us is extremely important. The transference of ‘kyrios’ to Jesus allowed for a binitarian pattern of devotion to develop. The kyrios-title kept monotheistic scruples from being breeched and yet also made possible the view that Jesus was now the Lord of all things. In effect, God remains theos, while Jesus becomes kyrios (cf. I Cor. 8:4-6). With this perspective in hand, Besnard goes on to state that invoking the name of the Lord is first and foremost a recognition that Jesus has been made both Christ and Lord by God (Acts 2:36). Thus, the use of theos for God, and kyrios for Jesus reveals “la dialectique de la Révélation” and framed all further christological evolution. Pushing further one might say that one of the most significant christological developments can be defined as the story of how Jesus’ kyrios-title (in the sense of royal king) increasingly began to take on the outlines of the theos term. According to Besnard’s thesis, the use of texts such as Joel in early Christianity forms one of the most foundational and important events in post-Easter christological development. The use and appropriation of various kyrios-texts inaugurated the process whereby the Christ-event increasingly began to be interpreted in light of Old Testament

---

676 Besnard, Le Mystère du Nom, 155.
677 Ibid., 159.
678 Ibid., 158
passages which used the term Lord to refer to God. Further implications of this transference are that Jesus, in becoming kyrrios, revealed God to mankind.679

Another aspect which we should note is that the early Christians viewed themselves as a community that called upon the name of Jesus (cf., 1 Cor. 1:2) in terms of the prophecy of Joel. If the author’s understanding is at all reflective of this early period then the community understood itself as, “those who were being saved,” (2:47), as well as those who, “call upon Thy [Jesus’] name” (9:14,21). If the author of Acts has understood this early period correctly, it is fair to say that the earliest church understood itself with respect to Joel 2:32. This observation allows for the inference that since the earliest community saw themselves as being the recipients of the prophecy of Joel,680 it is quite possible that they invoked the name of Jesus from the very first. Having put down roots, this usage was quickly transferred from invoking Jesus’ name during the act of repentance, to other practices involving the name of Jesus, which we observe in the Book of Acts, from baptism to healings, from exorcism to confession. Thus, we find the grounds for my earlier contention that the use of the name of Jesus in calling out to God, as seen in Joel, formed the initial action in the earliest community and became the springboard for all other uses of the name of Jesus.

Beyond these considerations there are other features of the text which deserve to be highlighted. The first aspect is that the author demonstrates in 9:14, 21 and 22:16 that he knows the expression ‘call on the name of X’ as an already fixed formula of some vintage.681 In order to shed light on the meaning of this phrase we must consult the LXX.682

When one looks into the LXX several striking patterns emerge. First, ἐπικαλεῖσθαι is most often associated with calling upon God (e.g. Gen. 4:26; 12:8; 13:4; 2:33; 26:25, just to note its occurrences in Genesis). Secondly, ἐπικαλεῖσθαι occurs in 24 different Psalms, and

679 Besnard, Le Mystère du Nom, 157. In this connection it is worth noting that in the Masoretic text of Joel the Tetragrammaton is used. Thus, the transference of this passage to Jesus and his name is quite startling.

680 Just how early a role Joel came to play is seen in Rom. 10:9-10;13-14, where Paul, drawing upon Joel 2:32, states that those who are to be saved must call upon the name of Jesus.

681 Ruck-Schröder quoting Conzelmann approvingly. See DNGJNT, 170 fn43.

682 The phrase unquestionably derives from Septuagintal influence. Steyn quotes the conclusions of Conzelmann and Parry here. See G.J. Steyn, “To Onoma Tou Kyriou in 1 Cor.,” 482.
almost invariably it is found in the context of saving the petitioner from distress. This sense also comports well with the sense of the verb *mílat* (meaning 'to save') in the Masoretic text of Joel. As the reader may recall from my discussion of the Jewish materials, this verb denotes the sense of saving from physical distress and danger. Further substantiation for the centrality of the notion that God would save during times of physical danger, is found in the Apocrypha where we find time and again that God is called upon as Savior during times of duress (e.g. II Macc. 8:213; III Macc. 1:27; 5:6-9; Ps. of Salomon 5:5, 6:1. 15:1). Similarly, Greco-Roman usage mirrors what we have seen for Jewish convention. In times of duress people called upon the Geot|9ox (assisting gods). Taken altogether, the evidence strongly suggests that generally meant to call upon a deity to secure help in times of need.685

One last matter needs to be reviewed before I move on. I refer to the curiously often overlooked (possible) connection to Zeph. 3:9. This passage promises that in the last days God will “...change the speech of the peoples to a pure speech, that all of them may call upon on the name of the Lord and serve him with one accord.” We notice that the prophecy applies to all the earth (‘all peoples’) and demonstrates that one of the signs of the Last Days is that God’s name will be called upon after God has made their ‘speech pure’ (glossialia?); an event that allows for the reality of service to God ‘in one accord.’ It seems clear enough that the authors of both Joel and Zepaniah are drawing upon a similar tradition. With that said, it is now time for me to begin my analysis of the particulars of the Petrine speech by first rehearsing the flow of its argument.

We should first note that the author’s utilization of Joel does not at first blush actually seem to refer to Jesus, especially when we remember that in its original context the citation about “calling upon the Name of the Lord” refers to YHWH. However, there is no doubt that Jesus is the referent, for elsewhere in Acts Jesus is heralded as the Lord who is to be called upon (e.g. 683 W. C. Van Unnik, “With All Those Who Call on the Name of the Lord,” in *New Testament Age: Essays in Honor of Bo Reicke V.* II, ed. William C. Weinrich, (Macon Georgia: Mercer Press, 1984), 545.

684 Ibid., 548.

685 Rightly Van Unnik. Cullmann however believes that the expression first and foremost means to call the name out over something in order to establish possession. It is only then that one then calls upon the name of God for help. His sequence of events appears rather questionable. In addition, Cullmann derives the phrase from, “eine juristischer Fachausdruck,” an unquestionably incorrect assumption given the Jewish evidence. See Oscar Cullman, “Alle, die den Namen unseres Herrn Jesus Christus Anrufen,” in *Oscar Cullmann. Vorträge und Aufsätze 1925-1962*, ed. Karlfriend von Fröhlich, (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr: 1966), 608 and 612. For Van Unnik, Ibid, 547-548.
9:14; 22:16). Also, the imperative, which concludes the speech, admonishes the hearers to be baptized “into the name of Jesus” (v.38) and would thus signify that the foregoing was written with Jesus in mind. In addition, in Rom. 10:8-13, Joel is once again cited verbatim, and it is clear from the confession in v.9 that Paul is applying the demand of Joel to call upon God's name to Jesus.

To shed some further light I must draw upon Jewish exegesis of Joel, as well as examine Acts 7:59. I shall take up the Acts passage first. In Acts 7:59, Stephen, while undergoing stoning, is said to have called on (ἐπικαλούμενος) Jesus to receive his spirit and after falling on his knees he called out (v. 60, ἔκραξεν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ) to Jesus (v.59). This passage demonstrates that ἐπικαλεῖσθαι is seen as the means of calling upon God (or in this case Jesus) in times of need (spiritual or otherwise). When we turn to Jewish sources, unfortunately we must resort to some late passages from the Talmud (v. Ber. 9.13), which, probably reflect an earlier view. Here we find the same belief that the only acceptable course of action in times of trouble was to call on God alone:

But in regard to God, it is not the same: if a calamity comes on a man, he should not invoke Michael or Gabriel but God who will hear it, as it is written, ‘Everyone who calls upon the Name of the Eternal one shall be saved.’

When seen in the light of Jewish perceptions, the invocation of the name of Jesus signifies that the person recognized that Jesus occupies a place of supreme authority and power; he is now both kyrios and christos (Acts 2:36). Beyond what I have already mentioned, two other observations about the speech itself are in order with respect to the claim of Acts 2:36 that Jesus is Lord and Christ.

First, it is clear that the author’s argumentation implements Ps. 16 as the proof text whereby Peter desires to demonstrate that Jesus was exalted to the position of Lord. In Ps. 16:8-11 it is clear that the person referred to here will not suffer corruption. Clearly, insofar as David is buried, he has ‘seen’ corruption, and perforce, this passage could not apply to him. Within the argument of Acts 2, in light of Jesus’ resurrection, it is now clear that this Psalm can be employed with reference to him. Moreover, v. 34 appends the further observation that David refers to another Lord in Ps. 110, thus making it clear that David is not the subject under review.

---

All of this comes to a crescendo in v.32, where the author comes to the point of his argument and proclaims that Jesus has been raised from the dead in fulfillment of Ps. 16: 8-11.

What does this exaltation actually mean for the use of the name of Jesus? First, the exaltation of Jesus to the right hand of God makes Jesus both kyrios and christos and it is for this reason that the early Church finds justification in using Jesus’ name in baptism.687 This exaltation also suggests that, since it was Jesus’ name which one called upon to be saved, it is to be expected that his name came to be used from the very start of the Christian movement during the baptismal rite. The author indeed makes clear in v.38 that only those who are baptized in his name shall receive forgiveness of their sins. What this signifies is that Jesus’ name is a salvific name. I have still to address the question of the specific christological content of the phrase and I shall turn to this question presently.

It is of utmost significance that in all of the MT the cultic use of the phrase ἐπικαλάσθαι always refers to a deity and never a human, nor any divine principal agent.688 There are rare cases where one can observe the phrase ‘to call someone,’ but with humans it is never utilized with the prepositional phrase ‘in the name of X.’689 Likewise, neither Philo, nor Josephus, applies the full expression (i.e. call upon the name of someone) except when speaking about an invocation of God.690

As for the LXX we find that the various translators employed ἐπικαλαζομαι for ἔργον. Furthermore, in the LXX the use of the middle voice is almost exclusively reserved for invocation of deity.691 This is in keeping with the usage that we have seen in the MT. Outside of

687 Ruck-Schröder, DNGJNT, 171.

688 Or so Davies, Name and Way of the Lord, 107.

689 In Acts 25:11 Paul “calls on Caesar,” but not on his name. In Josephus’ BJ 2.294 Josephus says that the Jews “invoked the name of Caesar” to secure relief from the pillaging of the Temple by Florus. Here we see the meaning of an appeal to someone (not unlike Paul’s appeal to Caesar; Acts 25:11), a function related to invocation, but not exactly the same thing either (in any event the word is ἀνακαλέω and not ἐπικαλέω). In contrast, Dio Cassius can speak in his Historia Romanae (54.24) of θυσίαὶ μὲν τῷ τοῦ Ἀρχίππου δύνα μα, but certainly no invocation is meant here. Thus, ‘calling upon’ either the name of someone or ‘calling upon’ a person, when applied in the middle voice appears to be a terminus technicus reserved almost solely for divine interaction.

690 Davies, Name and Way of the Lord, 117.

691 Ibid. By Davis’ count some 114 cases of the middle occur in the LXX. All but 11 refer to invoking a deity.
the Bible we see that the invocations of the PGM, as well as other magical texts, are almost exclusively in the middle voice.692

With this in mind, it is important to note that all New Testament references to calling upon the name of Jesus employ the middle voice. In this context it is also important not to overlook the fact that the LXX provided the theological thought world from which the early Church formed its christological, ecclesiological, and pneumatological doctrines.693 Given that the early Church cut its teeth on the LXX we must assume that the application of the formula ‘call upon the name of the Lord’ must mean that it carries the same theological baggage as the Septuagintal invocation of the name of God. That is, it is hard to resist the conclusion that the use of phrase by the early Church in relation to Jesus is tantamount to an invocation of a divine being.

Now it is worth noting that the tradition concerning the Day of the Lord depicts this event as the personal coming of YHWH.694 This belief was transferred to Jesus by the early Church and is at the root of Synoptic claim that John the Baptist was Elijah redivivus, the forerunner of YHWH. In short, we can see that Jesus represents God in a manner which suggests that he is part of the divine identity.

A further observation has been made by Turner,695 who suggests that Acts 2:32ff intimates more than a quick read would indicate. The argument which Turner advances here is twofold. First, the text explicitly links Jesus’ resurrection to his exaltation. They are in effect one and the same. In this vein, Jesus’ ascent not only entailed the enthronement of Jesus to God’s right hand, but he also received the promise of the gift of the Spirit. Turner sees Ps 67:19 (LXX) behind the assertion in Acts 2:33 that Jesus had been exalted with a resultant reception of spiritual gifts (i.e. ἄνεβης εἰς ὄψις, ἄρχιαλώτευσας α 오�χιαλὼσιαν, ἐλάβες δόματα ἐν ἄνθρωπο, καὶ γὰρ ἀπειθοῦντες τοῦ κατασκηνώσαι, κύριος ὁ θεὸς εὐλογητὸς).

692 As one exorcistic lamella from Beirut illustrates: ἐπικαλοῦμαι τοῦ καθόμενου. As quoted in Kotansky, “Greek Exorcistic Amulets,” 273. See also the examples of the texts from the Leiden collection which are given in Heitmüller, INJ, 209-10. In the PGM see VII.756 and VIII.26, among numerous other examples.

693 Jacob, ING, 130.

694 Von Rad, Old Testament, V. II, 119.

Now many Jews saw the reception of the Spirit as something reserved for the last days.696 Furthermore, the Messianic Age, which had now been conflated with the Day of the Lord, could have been viewed by the disciples as having ushered in the outpouring of the Spirit, as Isaiah 48:16 suggests, “And now the Lord God has sent me [the Servant of YHWH], and His Spirit.”697 In light of what we have already observed with respect to baptism, we would do well to consider the possible christological ramifications of the dispensation of the Holy Spirit for those who ‘confess the name of the Lord.’

Turner calls upon certain Targumic renderings of Psalm 68:19 (MT) which thrust Moses in the role of the one who ascends on high and receives the gift of Torah, which he then duly dispenses to mankind. In similar fashion, Turner sees this typology behind Peter’s perception that the bestowal of the Spirit was accorded to Jesus as an epiphenomenon of his exaltation.698 Turner’s analysis is also heavily dependant upon the obvious fact that such expressions as, ‘the Spirit of Jesus’ (Acts 16:7),699 ‘the Spirit of Jesus Christ’ (Phil. 1:19), ‘the Spirit of His Son’ (Gal. 4:6), and ‘the Spirit of Christ’ (Rom. 8:9) seem to imply that Jesus also controls the Holy Spirit. He sees these expressions as directly exposing the underbelly not only of the early Church’s pneumatology, but also of an incipient Spirit Christology. As Turner encapsulates the matter, “Pre-Christian Judaism speaks of a Messiah of the Spirit, not of the Spirit of the Christ.”700 Turner posits that Jesus was envisioned as the Lord of the Spirit with virtually sole discretion of the dispensation of the Spirit.701 Consequently, if one can really say that Jesus controlled the Spirit of God then one can also say that Jesus acts as God does.702

696 II Macc. 7: 23, 14: 46.
697 Given the ubiquitous interlacing of the Servant Songs among various New Testament writings it may be that when the essential equation was performed, (i.e. Jesus=The Servant) the disciples could then view passages such as 48:16 as relating to Jesus.
698 Davies has put his finger on an even more obvious connection with Ps. 16:11b, where the author believed that this verse, which promises the resurrected One joy by virtue of God’s presence, should be linked with the Holy Spirit and accordingly Jesus the Messiah was granted the Holy Spirit to pour out on mankind. See Davies, Name and Way of the Lord, 125.
699 No more compelling example of the belief that the Holy Spirit was also the Spirit of Jesus than an examination of the previous verse. At verse 6, the author claims that God’s Spirit prohibited Paul’s group from proceeding into Asia, while the next verse states that the Spirit of Jesus prohibited Paul’s group from entering into Bithynia.
700 Ibid., 183.
What ever else may be said, the Marcan conception that Jesus is the one who baptizes the elect with the Holy Spirit (Mk. 1:8) comports well with Turner’s construct. Along similar lines the author of Acts claims that Jesus promised to baptize them in the Holy Spirit in a way which seems to imply that Jesus is the baptizer (Act 1:5; cf. Lk. 3:16).

Moreover, in the Johannine view Jesus is said to be the grantor of the Spirit (14:26; 15:26; 16:7). Indeed, in Jn. 14:26 the Spirit comes in Jesus’ name, ‘the Helper, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in My name...’. This claim is congruent with the view delivered in the Book of Acts, where those who call on Jesus’ name during baptism receive the Spirit.

In summary, in the context of cultic or ritual practice it is evident that Christians called upon the name of Jesus to receive the benefits of salvation and the reception of the Spirit. Jesus’ name, and his alone, could bestow the benefits of salvation. Accordingly, Jesus’ name is a salvific name.

6) Rev 19.11-16

To begin with, it should appear evident that this passage contains some of the most suggestive and evocative Namenchristologie in all of the New Testament. The passage reads:

And I saw heaven opened; and behold, a white horse, and He who sat upon it is called Faithful and True; and in righteousness He judges and wages war. 12 And His eyes are a flame of fire, and upon His head are many diadems; and He has a name written upon Him which no one knows except Himself. 13 And He is clothed with a robe dipped in blood; and His name is called The Word of God. 14 And the armies which are in heaven, clothed in fine linen, white and clean, were following Him on white horses. 15 And from His mouth comes a sharp sword, so that with it He may smite the nations; and He will rule them with a rod of iron; and He treads the wine press of the fierce wrath of God, the Almighty. 16 And on His robe and on His thigh He has a name written, “KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS.

Before I explore the various titles that are given in this text the overarching theme of this passage must be discussed. In this passage Jesus is portrayed as the conquering Messiah who shall overcome his enemies. This impression derives from 19:14 and 19:15, where Jesus is said to come with heavenly armies (τὰ στρατεύματα τὰ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ), and to have a sharp sword coming from his mouth in order to smite the nations. It is also said that Jesus will rule with an iron rod (19:15b), and tread the winepress of judgment; imagery which symbolizes the

---

Footnotes:

701 In this assertion Turner is supported by Haenchen, Acts, 183.

702 Turner, ibid., 183.
wrath of God (19:15c). Verse 19:15c is an allusion to Isa. 62:2-3, where the notion of treading the winepress functions as a metaphor for the wrath and judgment of God. The statement that Jesus’ garments are red with blood alludes to Isa. 63:1-3. The text reads:

Who is this who comes from Edom, With garments of glowing colors from Bozrah,
This One who is majestic in His apparel, Marching in the greatness of His strength? “It is I who speak in righteousness, mighty to save.” 2 Why is your apparel red.
And your garments like the one who treads in the wine press? 3 “I have trodden the wine trough alone, And from the peoples there was no man with Me. I also trod them in My anger. And trampled them in My wrath; And their lifeblood is sprinkled on My garments, And I stained all My raiment.

These verses, in conjunction with Isa. 62:2-3, portray Jesus as the victorious Lord who triumphs over the enemies of God and ushers in God’s judgment. The author in effect has Jesus play out God’s role. The Old Testament passages of course prophesy that YHWH will carry out this divine wrath, but the author of Revelation replaces YHWH with Jesus. For the purposes of my investigation I need to ascertain what exactly is meant by the ‘hidden name,’ as well as to unpack what the meaning and significance of the names that are stated here (“Word of God” and “King of Kings and Lord of Lords”).

The question concerning the nature of the hidden name admits itself of several conjectural solutions. One conjecture of some interest in my investigation is the proposal that the secret name of Jesus is actually YHWH; at least according to Ulrichsen.703 Ulrichsen states:


In an attempt to corroborate this postulate Ulrichsen notes the same divine predications accorded Jesus are also made of YHWH elsewhere in either the Apocalypse itself or the Old Testament. By this reckoning we observe that Jesus is referred to as “the beginning and the end” (1:17; 2:8; 22:13), just as YHWH is (1:8; 21:6). Jesus’ title in 19:16, “King of King and Lord of

703 Ulrichsen, so too Fossum. See Ulrichsen, “Διαφορωτερον ὄνομα in Hebr. 1:4 Christus als Träger des Gottesnamens,” 68-69 and Jarl Fossum, “In the Beginning was the Name,” 116. One aspect that should be noted is that in 1 Enoch 69:14-29, the ‘hidden name’ of the Son of Man is said to be revealed by his actions in the judgment that is to come. This forms a very close analog to the verses here, since both are bound up with future judgment and a ‘hidden name.’
Lords,” is also attributed to YHWH in Dan. 2:47 (LXX). Further corroboration for the view that the phrase “King of Kings and Lord of Lords” is a title for God can be found by consulting both the LXX and the Qumran documents. At Qumran the phrase is applied to YHWH with some frequency (e.g., 4Q381 Frags. 76-7.7; 4Q403 col. I.34; 4Q511 Frag. 8.12), while within the LXX, II Macc. 13:4 and III Macc. 5:35 refer to YHWH by recourse to this phrase. Moreover, the phrase “Faithful and True” is also an Old Testament name for God.704

Following this trail of overlapping predications between Jesus and YHWH, Ulrichsen’s response to the enigma of the meaning of the ‘unknown name’ is to propose that the key is found at 14:1 where we read:

And I looked, and behold, the Lamb was standing on Mount Zion, and with Him one hundred and forty-four thousand, having His name and the name of His Father written on their foreheads.

Ulrichsen correctly points out that the proper Old Testament hermeneutical horizon for this passage is found at Ex. 28:36, where the high priest wore a golden diadem which was engraved with the phrase נָחַל יֵשׁוֹעַ. Another passage which illuminates this passage is Wis. 18:24 where the text states, “Your Majesty [that is, YHWH] was written on the diadem of his [the high priest’s] head.” In light of what we have seen in this same respect concerning Josephus’ and Philo’s claim that the diadem of the High Priest had the divine Name inscribed upon it, one is tempted to infer that the author, by conjoining the name of Jesus with the Father, has indeed elevated the name of Jesus to equality with the Tetragrammaton. Although tantalizing in certain respects, Ulrichsen’s proposal is not the sole path to a solution.705 Other clues exist which may point us in the right direction.

---

705 Indeed, I side with Ruck-Schröder on this point. She correctly points out that the author of the Book of Revelation consistently differentiates between God and Jesus. Although this would not necessarily prohibit the transference of the Tetragrammaton to Jesus here, I think that in the absence of other corroborative data we should avoid this construal of the meaning of the hidden name.
In contrast to Ulrichsen, Aune puts forth the suggestion that Rev. 2:17 offers the closest verbal parallel to the wording of 19:12, and thus offers some prospect of helping us uncover its meaning.\(^{706}\) Here the text reads:

He who has an ear, let him hear what the Spirit says to the churches. To him who overcomes, to him I will give some of the hidden manna, and I will give him a white stone, and a new name written on the stone which no one knows but he who receives it.\(^{706}\)

Aune also points approvingly to Rev. 3:12, where it is said that Jesus will write his own “new name,” the name of the heavenly Jerusalem, and the name of God, upon triumphant Christians. Aune also notes that the very fact that the rider possess a ‘hidden’ name implies that he is a divine being of some sort (cf. Gen. 32:29; Jud. 13:17-18). Aune also draws attention to the well-known belief in antiquity that the ‘true’ names of the gods were known only to themselves, while humans use either names that derive from human conventions, or for knowledgeable adepts, names received by revelation from the gods themselves.\(^{707}\)

Now, Aune underscores the fact that the phrases “from his mouth comes a sharp sword” and “His name is called the Word of God” reflect the same sort of imagery found in Wis. of Sol. 18: 15-16. The passage, as Aune cites it, reads:

The all-powerful word [ὁ παντοδύναμος σοῦ λόγος] leaped from heaven, from the royal throne, into the midst of the land that was doomed, a stern warrior carrying the sharp sword [ἐιθος ὀξύν] of thy authentic command, and stood and filled all things with death, and touched heaven while standing on the earth.\(^{708}\)

The context in Wisdom is that of the destruction of the first-born of Egypt by God. This fits well with the theme of judgment that frames Rev. 19:11-16. If we take the context of Rev. 19:11-16 as our guide, the name suggests that Jesus, as the Word of God, bears the divine authority and power, in this case to carry out the wrath of God. Other connections are that the phrase “Word of God” means that Jesus is the sword of God to effect judgment. The metaphor of the divine word being like a sword is supported not only by the citation above, but also by Heb. 4: 12 which states, “For the word of God is living and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the division of soul and spirit, and of joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the

---

\(^{706}\) David E. Aune, Revelation 17-22, Word Biblical Commentary 52c, (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Pub., 1998), 1055. Aune regards 12c as a later addition, but this does not impact my investigation. Whenever 12c came to be written, it was certainly within the time frame of my examination.

\(^{707}\) Ibid., 1056.

\(^{708}\) Ibid.
thoughts and intents of the heart.” This metaphor aptly fits into the larger backdrop of judgment. In short, Jesus, as the Word of God, will bring about victory and carry out the divine judgment.

The last title or name which Jesus is said to possess is that of “King of King and Lord of Lords.” As we have already seen this title comes from the Old Testament where it is applied to God. Earlier at Rev. 17:14 this same title/name is applied to Jesus as the One who will be victorious. Interestingly, it is claimed that this name is on his thigh and upon his robe. Aune attempts to draw out the significance of this placement of the name by indicating that several Greco-Roman authors have recorded that several statues were known which had an inscription written upon the thigh of the statue. The relative infrequency of this practice, and the fact that the thigh portion of these statues may have offered the easiest place to record some saying or prayer, not to mention that Aune does not cite any literary parallels, compels one to look for other possibilities.

One possible clue to unlocking the meaning of the placement of the name upon the thigh of Jesus is provided by a fragment from the Orphic Hymns. In an engrossing parallel to the imagery of Rev. 19:16, where the author states that Sabazios is said to have the name of another god inscribed upon his thigh in an apparent effort to signify their unitary existence:

To Sabazios (with offering of styrax): Hear O father Sabazios, son of Kronos, famed spirit who sewed into his thigh [the name] Bacchic Dionysus, the loud-yelling Eraphiotes...come to those who perform the mystic rites.

This fragment might be taken to imply that the title for God is on Jesus’ thigh to demonstrate that God and Jesus are ‘one.’

Another insight may be offered by the strange text in Pistis Sophia (ch. 28), where Jesus has the names of the elemental forces of the cosmos upon his garment, and this causes them to worship. The text reads:

Jesus continued again with the discourse...Hear concerning the things which happened to me among the archons of the twelve aeons, and all their archons and their lords and their powers and their angels and their archangels. Now when they saw the garment of light

709 New King James Version.

710 Sabazios was a Phrygian chthonic god associated with snakes.

711 As quoted in MacMullen, Ramsay, and Eugene N. Lane, Paganism and Christianity 100-425 C.E., (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992): 56.
which was upon me...each one of them saw the mystery of his name which was in the garment of light which was upon me. They all prostrated themselves together and they worshipped the garment of light...For they contemplated the mystery of their name in my garment and they tried to come to worship the mystery of their name in my garment...

Both the Orphic Hymn fragment712 and Pistis Sophia seem to suggest that having the name of another celestial being upon the thigh or garment suggests that the person or being who bears the names upon their thigh or garment has some type of intimate relationship with the beings so named, or that the person who has the names is in a superior position to whose names are found on the garments. Taken together, these texts perhaps suggest that the placement of the name ‘King of Kings and Lord of Lords’ upon Jesus’ thigh and garment implies that Jesus is one with YHWH (or the Father) and has the authority not only to bear his name (cf. Phil. 2:9), but also to reveal it to others (cf. Jn. 17:26).

Beyond the religious-historical background, there is yet another aspect which can illuminate the meaning of the hidden name. Beale draws attention to the fact that 19:12 and 19:16 form a chiastic structure. At verse twelve we read, ἔχειν ὄνομα γεγραμμένον, while at 19:16 we find ἔχει...ὄνομα γεγραμμένον. Further points of contact are that the unknown written name (v. 12) is revealed (as the written name) in verse 16. Verse 13a, represents Jesus as the rider with a bloodstained garment, while v.15b provides the image of Jesus treading the winepress. Finally, verse 13b also states that Jesus is the Word of God, while v.15a completes the metaphor by stating that a sword issues forth from Jesus mouth. The last verse to be dealt with, v. 14, is “The centerpiece of the chiasm...so that the focus is on the saints, whose faith and righteousness will be vindicated by Christ’s judicial activities.”713

Beale’s argument is persuasive and allows us to infer that the ‘hidden name’ is in fact “King of Kings and Lord of Lords.” As for any connection between the name/title ‘Word of God,’ “Faithful and True,” and the ‘hidden name,’ Beale points positively to the fact that both the verses which bear these expressions form an inclusio. The first term, ‘Faithful and True,’ and the last term, ‘King of Kings and Lord of Lord,’ are both introduced by καλέω, and the middle of this complex is formed by the unknown written name. According to this reckoning, the ‘hidden name’ would also include all the other names/titles which are found in this complex. Given that

712 Although late, Plato knows Orphic traditions and Porphyry demonstrates that he was familiar with the actual hymns.

the name/title “Faithful and True” is also an Old Testament description of God, and that Jesus is placed in God’s stead in the fulfillment of judgment of Isa. 63:13, we can infer that the author sees Jesus as functioning in the role of YHWH Himself. And it can be confidently said that the name/title ‘Word of God’ at the least bears divine overtones.

In light of Beale’s work I think that we can dispense with Ulrichsen’s position that the ‘hidden’ name was YHWH. Certainly, it is true that the name/title ‘King of Kings and Lord of Lords,’ as well as ‘Faithful and True,’ were references to God in the Old Testament, and it is possible that these names/titles function here very much like the Tetragrammaton would in other contexts. In this section of Revelation Jesus is portrayed as the ultimate divine warrior, well able to dispense divine justice. The title/name ‘King of Kings and Lord of Lords’ fits nicely into this motif. Nonetheless, the name/title belonged to YHWH no less than did the Tetragrammaton. Only in this sense then; that is, the fact that Jesus is able to carry a divine title upon his person strongly implies that Jesus now shares in the divine identity, a placement that also carries with it the conclusion that Jesus shares, in an unique way, the authority and power of YHWH Himself.

Finally, it terms of ritual acts, it would seem probable that Jesus, as the divine warrior, worthy to bear the divine names/titles and worthy of obeisance (e.g. Rev. 5: 11-14), should also have his name invoked in cultic contexts, for he he alone bore the divine exousia and dynamis.
NON-CANONICAL SOURCES

Beyond New Testament texts we find several works which draw our interest. The first text is found in I Clement, a work that contains several passages that incorporate the name-concept in both liturgical and non-liturgical contexts. It is important to observe that liturgical material is, as a rule, quite conservative. Quite possibly then, given the early date of the correspondence, and the traditional nature of this material, the name-concept displayed here dates to possibly the mid-first Century C.E. at the latest.

We first encounter the name-concept in I Clement, within a hortatory section which exhorts its listeners to “be obedient to His most holy (παναγίω) and glorious (ἐνδόξω) Name” (LXIII, 1). Additionally, within the final liturgical prayer the stanza recounts that, “...we render obedience to Thine all powerful (παντοκρατορί) and most excellent (παναρέτω) Name” (LX, 4).

The author augments this simple admonishment concerning obedience to the Name by summoning his readers to trust in the Name. The author speaks of “trusting (πιστοθέτες) in the most holy Name of his majesty” (LVIII, 1). The next section then contends that God has “called us...from ignorance to the full knowledge of the glory of his Name.” (LIX, 1), and in a move to direct discourse the author writes, “...we may set our hope on your Name, which is the primal source (ἀρχή γυνών) of all creation” (LIX, 3). Now it should be noted that this ‘ἀρχή’ conception has a striking analog in the pre-Johannine Logos hymn (Jn 1:1-18), and the common positioning of Jesus as the medium through whom all creation was brought into being (e.g., 1 Cor 8:6; Heb.1:2 and Col. 1:16.). It also bears comparison with Philo’s conception, at Conf. Ling. 146, where Philo equates the “Beginning” with the name of God.

At first blush none of these passages seem to intimate directly a reference to Jesus. Daniélou, who champions the notion that Jesus’ name stands behind these references, admits as

714 Approximately 95 C.E. following standard conventions.
715 The outline for this review is indebted to the excursus of Daniélou whom I shall follow closely. See Jean Daniélou, The Theology of Jewish Christianity. (Chicago: The Henry Regnery Co., 1964), 149-163.
716 The author may here be reliant upon Is. 50:10. Per Daniélou, ibid., 151.
much. Still, as he points out, the ὄνομα ἀρχέγονον has strong similarities to the Johannine doctrine of the creative agency of the Logos, who also is from the ἀρχή. Moreover, as we shall see in the work of Arai, a similar use of the Name is found in the GT, and in an unambiguous manner which demonstrates, there at least, that the Name is Jesus. Also, we must bear in mind that both documents derive from a milieu influenced by Jewish-Christian speculation. All of these considerations lend some credence to Danielou’s position. This conclusion is strengthened even more when we look for analogs in other early Christian documents for the formula Jesus=Name=Creator.

Looking to other texts we find similar themes as those that we witnessed in I Clement. For example, in the Shepherd of Hermas, the attribute of sustaining the world is attested (Sim. IX, 14.5):

The name of the Son of God is great and infinite and sustains (βασιλείας) the whole world. If then all creation is sustained by the Son of God, what do you think of those who bear the name of the Son of God?

Furthermore, Shepherd of Hermas Vis. III, 3:5 makes the claim that the Church itself is also built upon the name of Jesus. The text reads, “The Tower (i.e. the Church) has for its foundation the word of the Almighty and Glorious (εὐδοξος) Name, and is strengthened by the invisible power of the Master.” One feature of note here is that the Name, just as in I Clement is described as εὐδοξος and παντοκράτωρ. The fact that the Church is said to rest on the ‘foundation’ of the Name, when taken with the previously quoted passage (IX, 14.5), allows for the conclusion that the name of Jesus is here thought of as the Name which, by virtue of its power, sustains the world (cf. Col. 1:17) and forms the foundation for the existence of the Church.

This chorus of examples invites us to take seriously the notion that within some Christian circles either “Jesus,” as the name of God, or alternatively the name of Jesus, had been granted

---

718 Danielou, Jewish Christian Theology, 151.
720 GT 38:9.
721 Jean Danielou, The Theology of Jewish Christianity, 152.
the mediatory role in creation, or in some cases its continuing coherence: a role formerly credited to the Tetragrammaton.

In other texts we find different, but no less striking, claims for the name of Jesus. We note the Christian interpolation in the Hellenistic Synagogal Prayers 1.2, where a makarism is offered to God for “Jesus Christ our savior, on behalf of your holy Name, which you caused to encamp among us.” A direct equation is erected here which equates the name of God with Jesus. An almost exactly similar phrase is found in the Didache ch. 10, where the author gives thanks to God, “for your holy Name that You made to tabernacle in our hearts.”

The next text that will help us track the name-concept in Christian conventicles is the Odes of Solomon (hereafter OS). The text contains abundant evidence that the name-concept was undergoing alteration and adaptation and found expression in the cult of the community which created the document. If, as seems likely, OS was penned independently from any direct reliance upon the New Testament then this text offers prime evidence that the name-concept was evolving in various Christian conventicles.

In OS (8.19, 22) the Odist, speaking ex ore Christi, expresses the claim that the elect ones will not be deprived of Jesus’ name, and then when reverting back to the first person as the speaker he exclaims that the elect shall be found ‘uncorrupted’ forever. In an obvious parallel to both Ez. 9:4 and Rev. 14:1 (cf. 3:12), Jesus places his name upon the (fore) heads of those who belong to him (42:20).

In a particularly fascinating portion of the OS (23) the claim is made that the very thoughts of God “were like a letter” (v. 5) which everyone sought after in order to read, and thereby know the mind of God (v. 10). This ‘letter’ is described as having “the Name of the

---

722 It should be noted, however, that this passage can also be read to mean that Jesus came for the sake of God’s name, a reading quite in keeping with Old Testament notions.

723 So E. Peterson, as quoted in Fossum, “In the Beginning was the Name,” 123 fn. 59. Peterson is probably correct here in seeing a reference to Jesus. Fossum quotes from “Didache cap. 9 e 10”. EL 58 (1944); 6. The rationale for seeing the Name as referring to Jesus is that this thanksgiving prayer comes directly after the Eucharist. Also, the event is conceived of as an internal event, an interpretation in keeping with Christian belief that Jesus lives in the heart of believers.

724 For a brief review of how these cultic hymns functioned and their place within worship see, David Aune, The Cultic Setting of Realized Eschatology in Early Christianity. (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1972), 174-182.

725 This is forcefully argued by Charlesworth and accepted by the present author. For further details see Charlesworth, “The Odes of Solomon,” 726-727.
Father upon it, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit” (v. 22). Here the purpose of the names is to function as a ‘seal’ for the very thoughts of God.

Moving on we find a marked analog to the claim that Jesus is equal to the name of the Father in Justin’s *Dialogue with Trypho* (75), where Justin pours this theologoumenon into a remarkable christological mould. The passage reads:

Now from the book of Exodus we know that Moses cryptically indicated that the Name of God himself (which He says was not revealed to Abraham or to Jacob) was also Jesus. For it is written: ‘And the Lord said to Moses, say to this people: Behold, I send my angel before thy face, to keep thee in thy journey, and bring thee into the place that I have prepared for thee. Take notice of him, and obey his voice; do not disobey him, for he will not pardon thee, because My Name is in him.’ Consider well who it was that led your fathers into the promised land, namely he who was at first named Auses (Oshea), but later renamed Jesus (Joshua). If you keep this in mind, you will also realize that the Name of him who said to Moses, ‘My Name is in him,’ was Jesus. For, indeed He was also called Israel, and Jacob’s name was changed to this also.

We should also carefully note that in this passage Jesus is equated with the Angel of the Lord, who bears the divine Name, and rather interestingly, as we shall see later, the springboard for this claim derives from Justin’s conception that Jesus is a sort of Joshua redivivus.

My final text comes from the well-known text *Gospel of Truth*. I am aware that I might be accused of muddying the waters when I place this text among the beliefs of so-called-orthodox Christianity. Still, there are good reasons for doing so.

Of course the problem of how, or by what criteria, one may distinguish between ‘orthodox’ and ‘aberrant’ belief systems is as old as Baur’s *Orthodoxie und Heresie*. We appreciate a bit more today that the old statement that ‘the victors write the history’ applies every bit as much to the beliefs of the early Church as it does to cultural and military history. Today, scholars such as Michael Williams have demonstrated that the term ‘gnosticism’ is a nebulous term at best and is so ill defined that it is useless.26 I accept Williams’ criticism and will use for the purposes of my study the term ‘non-orthodox’ in the place of the term gnosticism. I do not apply this term pejoratively, but instead only to convey the fact that the text from which I cite did not find its way into later mainstream Christianity.

In the *GT* (37:37-38:38) we find an extremely illuminating text that propounds the doctrine of the Name. I cite it here in full:

---

...the end is the taking knowledge about the one who is hidden, and this is the Father, from whom the beginning came forth, to whom all will return who have come forth from him. And they have appeared for the glory and joy of his Name. Now the name of the Father is the Son. It is he who first gave a name to the one who came forth from him, who was himself, and he begot him as a son. He gave him his name which belonged to him; he is the one to whom belongs all that exists around him, the Father. His is the name: his is the son. It is possible for him to be seen. But the name is invisible because it alone is the mystery of the invisible which comes to ears that are completely filled with it. For indeed the Father's name is not spoken, but is it apparent through a Son. In this way, then, the name is a great thing. Who therefore will be able to utter a name for him, a great name, except him alone to whom the name belongs and the sons of the name in whom rested the name of the Father, (who) in turn themselves rested in his name? Since the Father is unengendered, he alone is the one who begot a name for himself before he brought forth the aeons, in order that the name of the Father should be over their head as lord...  

What should grab our attention is the explicit theologoumenon that displays the conviction that when the author speaks of the Father revealing Himself in the Son, he does so within the context of the significance of the Name. This significance is highlighted by the repeated claim that the name of the Father is the Son (38:38; 39:19-20:39:25-26; 40:5; 40:24f.), a claim that we will encounter in the Church Fathers, and which we will again encounter in my examination of the Johannine materials within the New Testament. Indeed this phrase opens this section (38:6f), forms its middle core (39:19f), as well as serving as its conclusion (40:24f). This observation suggests that for this section the Name and its relationship to Jesus serves as the raison d'être for this composition. To unpack the significance of the claims that are found in this section, I must first examine each individual claim in order to discern the points that the author hopes to make.

The first thing to be noted in the GT, as Untergaßmair correctly does, is that the Name is equivalent to the very being of God.  

In fact, the Name is none other than the Father Himself.  

---


728 Untergaßmair, INJJE, 254. Untergaßmair writes, “...der ‘Name’ wesentlich verbunden ist und zu seinem Wesen gehört.”

729 Ibid. ‘Ja dieser ‘Name’ ist der Vater selbst: wer nun ist es, der ihn (= den Vater) mit Namen nennen kann, ihn den großen Namen, außer ihm selbst, dem der Name gehört... (38:25). Die Wendung ‘ihn den großen Namen’ meint nach dem Kontext den Vater selbst und drückt daher die Identität zwischen ‘Vater’ und ‘Name.’”
Second, it is to be observed that in the text the Son receives the name of the Father (38:7-8; 39:7; 39:18f; 39:23b; 40:9; 40:14-15; 40:27), thus establishing just how closely linked Jesus is with the Father.\textsuperscript{730} or as Attridge formulates this relationship “The revelatory name that the Son possesses is as much his own as it is the Father’s.”\textsuperscript{731} The reciprocity of the terms of this arrangement are seen in that the Son is the Name because he functions in similar fashion as the Name; that is to say, he embodies that truth of the divine nature which lies behind the Name.\textsuperscript{732} This equitability is shown in that the Name in the GT serves as a medium of revelation designed to reveal something about the mystery of the relationship between God and Jesus.

Seen in this light it appears that the name which Jesus received may have been either one familiar to us from the New Testament (e.g., Son, or perhaps Lord), or possibly even ‘Father’ (cf. \textit{Tri. Trac.} 61.14).\textsuperscript{733} Obviously, it is to be expected that no one can express the Name except the one to whom it has been given, and following 39.30-32, it is clear that the Son can express the Name; thus again establishing that the Son bears the Name.\textsuperscript{734} Third, it is to be noted that only the Son is the beneficiary of this Name (39:7; 40:15). Fourth, and perhaps the most riveting assertion is that the Father has given the Son the Name before the inception of the Ages (38:35), establishing the belief in the pre-existence of the Son and accordingly, the Son’s existence prior to the creation of time.\textsuperscript{735}

Beyond this, according to the text, the Name already existed, in some measure, in an embryonic nexus with the Son (39:13-19). It is worthy of note that this claim that the Name was in existence prior to the creation of the hylic realm is consistent with other claims concerning the

---

\textsuperscript{730} So Sasagu Arai in his section III, “Der Sohn als Name”. See \textit{Die Christologie des Evangelium Veritatis}, 67.


\textsuperscript{732} Ibid., 118.

\textsuperscript{733} So Attridge, Ibid., 119.

\textsuperscript{734} Arai, who also draws attention to the comparative background material, also stresses this point. See \textit{Die Christologie des Evangelium Veritatis}, 67.

Name, which we have already encountered in other texts, such as I Enoch. These various conceptions allow us to draw two inferences.

First, the Son is ‘Lord’ of the creation-a concept with evident points of contact to the Johannine doctrine of the Logos. Furthermore, this doctrine appears to have further links to earlier Jewish name-speculation.

Second, I take pains to observe that the same tension that exists here with the acknowledgement that the Father and Son are somehow so close that they share the same power and authority, and yet are nevertheless distinct, is mirrored yet again in the Johannine doctrine of the Logos. Arai has astutely noted that many features of the Logos, as portrayed in the Johannine Prolog, find ready parallels to the Name-conceptions found in the GT. He has produced a useful table which outlines this correspondence which I shall cite here only in brief:

Jn. 1:1=38:9; 1:12=38:28; 1:14b=38:26; 1:14de=39:8,17; 40:22; 1:18b=38:23f.; 39:22; 40:27f. Among other things, the first couplet demonstrates the preexistence of the Son, while other verses show that the Logos, or the Name in the case of the GT, reveals the Father, and demonstrates their relationship. This parallelism is reminiscent of Philo’s concept of the Logos also, as well as the function and high estimation that he assigns the Name. Whatever else may be said about Arai’s proposed parallelism, his suggestion that a particular Namechristologie arose through the baptismal rite in Christianity is not without some interest.

Another document with clear points of contact with the GT is the Epistle to the Hebrews. W.C. van Unnik set forth years ago a convincing demonstration that the author of GT knew the

---


737 Lastly, I draw attention to verses 20-21, where the Name is said to be prohibited to be vocalized. This clearly reflects the prior Jewish belief that the Name was not to be expressed. See Attridge, “The Gospel of Truth,” 120, and Grobel, The Gospel of Truth, 183.

738 As Grobel notes concerning this similar tension, “the same paradox as in John 1:1: there the Logos is with [emphasis Grobel’s] God and therefore distinct from him, but also is [emphasis Grobel’s] God and therefore [is] one with him. Here he came out of the Father (distinct) and yet is the same (identical).” See Grobel, The Gospel of Truth, 181.

739 Arai, Die Christologie des Evangelium Veritatis, 70.

740 Ibid., 72.
Later Søren Giversen extended this research concerning *GT* 38. Giversen’s work pointed out that Heb. 1:5, where the text states, “Thou art my Son, This day have I begotten thee,” is echoed in *GT* 38, 10-12, where the text reads, “He [God] begat [Jesus] as a Son. He gave to him His name which belonged to Him...” In the context of Hebrews the author’s argument is that Jesus receives from God (inherits) the most excellent name because Jesus, as the Son, has obtained a greater inheritance than the angels by virtue of his redemptive work.

Giversen further points out that whereas in Hebrews Jesus inherits the name, in *GT* the Name is Jesus’ “property.” for *GT* 38, 11 says the “name belonged to him.” Another even more significant reflection of the theology of Hebrews can be found when we compare Heb. 1:4 and *GT* 38, 6-7. In the former we read that Jesus is the “effulgence of his glory and the very image of his substance” and it is this expression for the divine reality which helps to justify in the author’s mind Jesus’ inheritance of the διαφωτίωσεν name. When we turn to examine *GT* 38, 6-7, we find that Jesus is represented as the visible expression of deity, as the Son, for the text reads, “It is possible for them to see him, but the name on the other hand is invisible.” This emphasis on Jesus as the revelation of God is again highlighted at 38, 15-17, where the text reads, “For, indeed, they do not name the Father, but He reveals himself by a Son.” Here, we find clear echoes of the same sort of ‘Jesus-as-reflection-of-God’ thinking that forms the basis for Heb. 1:3. Although we possess no evidence of direct literary dependence, the author appears to have in the back of his mind many of the themes and theological concerns of Hebrews, perhaps reflecting a common tradition.

In any event, it is worth noting that this sort of name speculation streams from a Jewish well which dates from the early Hellenistic period, and draws upon that strand of tradition where an angel receives the name of God (3 *Enoch* 12; *Apoc. Abr.* 10, and *PS* 7), and correspondingly,
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743 Ibid., 89.

744 Ibid. This text is that of Giversen.
His authority. Such speculation also appears to lie behind the various early Christian texts that speak of Jesus as having received the divine name. Clearly these non-canonical texts draw upon both Jewish and Christian name speculation.

**SUMMARY**

We have seen that various early Christian texts reflect the belief that Jesus had been given a special name by God, both at birth, as well as after the resurrection. One passage in particular, Phil. 2:9, conveys the sense that Jesus had received the divine name of God. In a related fashion, other texts, such Rev. 19:16, apply names/titles to Jesus which are reserved for God, or apply names/titles which suggest that Jesus was divine. These texts strongly intimate that the earliest Christians felt comfortable applying to Jesus names and titles normally reserved for God.

We have also reviewed texts, such as Acts 2:38, which highlight the belief that the name of Jesus had become a salvific name for all mankind. In addition, we have encountered texts, such as Eph. 1:21, which show that the early Christians believed that Jesus’ name was a name of power and authority, extending over all the created order. Moreover, as texts such as Mt. 18:20 demonstrate, the use of the name of Jesus, such as in invocation, as the name under which Christians met, testify to the belief that the name of Jesus could guarantee Jesus’ presence.

Taken all together, these texts allow us to peer into the past and to glean some sense of how the earliest Christians viewed the name of Jesus—indeed how they viewed divine names in general. It is clear that the earliest Christians were no less familiar with the notion of divine and powerful names than their Jewish cousins, or Greco-Roman neighbors. In fact, they were every bit as convinced as their co-religionists that names could represent the divinity, and carry the divine numen. Accordingly, we have seen that the name of Jesus was viewed as a numinous and salvific name. Indeed, God has given Jesus his birth name as an indication of the type of role Jesus would play in salvation history. Beyond these observations, we have also encountered evidence that Jesus, as the recipient of the divine name, had now been invested with divine authority, and that Jesus’ name was laden with this power, and reflected his divinely bestowed authority. These data allow us to anticipate the findings of the next chapter, viz. that the name of Jesus was used in numerous actions and contexts, especially cultic actions, and this was made
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possible by the belief of the early Church that the name of Jesus had attained an exalted status in the hierarchy of divine names.

Moving on, I shall now turn to the use of the name of Jesus in the first two centuries of the Common Era. I shall partition each use into its respective category. Each category will be placed into a larger subset. What I mean here is that the use of the name of Jesus can be divided into three major camps. The first use is that of drawing upon the power in the name of Jesus. Healings and exorcisms, for example, fall into this group. The next group are cases where the name of Jesus seems to function as a representative for Jesus himself. Practices such as praising, glorifying and thanking the name of Jesus all use the name as a symbol for Jesus himself. Another example is the special scribal treatment given to the name of Jesus in New Testament manuscripts. Here too, the Name symbolizes or represents the person. The final category is where the name of Jesus functions to mediate eschatological salvation and entry into the people of God. Examples here are the calling upon Jesus’ name for salvation both within and without the baptismal rite. After each category is reviewed I shall undertake to compare this use to any corresponding Greco-Roman or Jewish usage of the names of their respective deities and how that compares to the use of the name of Jesus.
CHAPTER FIVE
PHENOMENOLOGY OF THE NAME OF JESUS


In this chapter I shall complete my examination of the Christian materials, but here I shall focus on how early Christians used the name of Jesus. I shall endeavor to establish categories of use (e.g., exorcism, healing or prophesying in Jesus’ name) and to compare these categories to how Jews applied the name of God, and how Greco-Roman society applied the names of their gods. Thereafter, I shall draw my conclusions on how the use of the name of Jesus by the early Christians may reveal to us something of their christological beliefs.

I. The use of the name of Jesus as a Machtmittel.

EXORCISMS IN THE NAME OF JESUS

Various reports in the New Testament (e.g., Acts 19:13-17; 16:18; Mark 16:18; Lk. 10:17-20 and 9:49f.) testify to the belief that the early Church believed that demons could be cast out in the name of Jesus; accordingly, exorcism formed a core element of the Christian mission. We can peer inside this missionary world by consulting several key texts. First, around 140 C.E., Justin Martyr attempts to persuade Antoninus Pius of the truthfulness of the Christian faith by pointing out the success of Christian exorcists. Justin states:

And now you can learn this from what is under your own observation. For numberless demoniacs throughout the whole world, and in your city, many of our Christian men exorcising them in the name of Jesus Christ, who was crucified under Pontius Pilate, have healed and do heal, rendering helpless and driving the possessing devils out of the men, though they could not be cured by all the other exorcists, and those who used incantations and drugs.747

And Irenaeus, in his Adversus Haereses (II.xxxii.4-5), tendered this assessment of the power of the name of Jesus in both healing and exorcism in his day:

Those who are in truth his disciples...do in his name perform [miracles]...For some do truly drive out demons, so that those who have thus been cleansed from evil spirits frequently join themselves to the Church....Nor does she [i.e. the Church] perform anything by means of

746 Heitmüller, INJ, 242.

747 Second Apol., VI. Justin underscores this claim yet again in his Dialogue 76.13.
angelic invocations, or by incantations, or by any other wicked art, but by directing her prayers to the Lord...and calling upon the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, she has been accustomed to performing miracles. If therefore, even now the name of our Lord Jesus Christ confers benefits, and cures thoroughly and effectively all who anywhere believe on Him, but not on Simon, or Menander, or Carpocrates...

This extraordinary claim of authority over the demonic reaches back into the New Testament itself. Lk. 9:1-2, for example, states that Jesus gave authority to the Twelve to cast out demons and then sent them out to preach the Gospel. In similar fashion, Lk. 10: 1 states that Jesus commissioned the 72 to go out into the villages and proclaim the Kingdom of God (v. 9). Later, upon their return, they rejoiced that the demons were subject to them (v. 17). In later tradition (Mk. 16:17) we see that the early Church envisioned itself as an institution ‘equipped’ with the name of Jesus in order to accomplish exorcism. Furthermore, in post-Apostolic times, as the above quotes demonstrate, exorcism became a major mode of demonstration of Christian power—a demonstration which served to fuel Christian conversion.

Now, somewhat surprisingly, the use of the name of Jesus in exorcisms begins, or so it is reported, during Jesus’ own lifetime (Gospel of Mark 9:38-39). The narrative claims that a presumably itinerant exorcist utilized the name of Jesus in his exorcisms. This claim is naturally so unexpected that it deserves to be explored in detail.

The first question to ask is: does this tradition stem from the lifetime of Jesus? Several considerations tend to support the conviction that the tradition behind the pericope does come from Jesus’ own lifetime.

First, the presentation in this narrative, where the disciples are vying for supremacy one against the other, speaks in favor of seeing this as a pre-Easter narrative. Secondly, the general antithesis between the “generosity of spirit [of Jesus toward the exorcist] and the generally
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749 Ibid.

750 As an aside, it is worth mentioning another matter. In Mk. 9:38 the un-known exorcists are said to cast out the demons ἐν τῷ ὄνοματί, while Jesus, in v. 39, when referring to this activity uses ἐνὶ. Ruck-Schroder sees no distinction but I am not so sure. I think it quite possible that v.38 recounts the actual expression that was used to cast the demons out, while Jesus’ statement meant that the exorcists were acting on the basis of, or with respect to, his name. A similar expression is found at Acts 3:16 where Peter explains that the miracles were being done ἐνὶ τῷ πίστει τοῦ ὄνοματος αὐτοῦ τούτου, that is, “on the basis of faith in his name.”
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exclusivist tenor of the early church,751 (in terms of who is authorized to exorcise demons) 
would also indicate a pre-Easter setting. Third, the story’s central interlocutor is John, who 
represents the concerns of the disciples, a position not otherwise elsewhere attested and this is 
slowly unexpected in a post-Easter setting.752 Furthermore, the events seem best suited to a 
Palestinian milieu (the picture of itinerant Jewish exorcists fits well with the general image of 
these exorcists elsewhere; e.g. Acts 19: 11-14; cf. Matt. 12:27, “If I cast out demons by 
Beelzebub by whom do your sons cast them out?”). Finally, E. Wilhelms has noted that Jesus’ 
response is not at all expected. Wilhelms comments:

Man hätte etwas anderes erwartet, z.B. eine Hindeutung, dass der fremde Exorzist ja 
weitreich auf der Seite Jesu und der Kirche im Kampf gegen Satan und seine Dämonen 
stand. Stattdessen heisst es: >>und (dann) bald von mir üb•reden kann<<.753

This unexpected turn of events in the narrative might be argued to support a Sitz-im-
Leben within Jesus’ own lifetime. Put in other terms, if the whole story is a creation of the early 
Church what was it designed to do, if not to make allowance for those who used the name of 
Jesus and yet were not visibly associated with the faith. If this is so, then it is a curious fact 
indeed that the Church did not make a more explicit claim for these exorcists in a fashion similar 
to what Wilhelm expected from Jesus’ response. In any event, it requires no excessive stretch of 
the imagination to envision a scenario whereby one, or even several, exorcists witnessed, or at a 
minimum heard, about the astounding exorcistic prowess attributed to Jesus and then began to 
utilize his name to leverage their own exorcistic attempts.754

Ralph Martin, (Dallas TX: Word Books Publisher, 1993), 34. Jesus’ reaction reminds one of the response of Moses 
in Num. 11:24-30, where we read that seventy elders had the Spirit of the Lord come to rest upon them, and in vv. 
26-29:

Two men had remained in the camp; the name of one was Eldad and the name of the other Medad. And the 
Spirit rested upon them...and they prophesied in the camp. 27 So a young man ran and told Moses and 
said, “Eldad and Medad are prophesying in the camp.” 28 Then Joshua the son of Nun, the attendant of 
Moses from his youth, answered and said, “Moses, my lord, restrain them.” 29 But Moses said to him, “Are 
you jealous for my sake? Would that all the LORD’S people were prophets, that the LORD would put His 
Spirit upon them!”

752 So Joachim Gnilka, Das Evangelium nach Markus. 2. Teilband Mk 8,27-16,20 (Zürich: Benziger 
Gnilka, however, sees in the statement that the exorcist “does not follow us” instead of the expected ‘you’ (Jesus), as 
an indication of a post-Easter controversy. See pgs. 59-60.


754 So also Samuel Eitrem, Some notes on the Demonology in the New Testament, 8. Nügelsbach is also 
inclined to believe that Jesus’ name was used during his lifetime. See, DNGJHS, 29.
Another consideration worth mulling over is that if the story stems from Jesus' time then it is not wholly improbable that at least some early listeners understood Jesus’ apparent lack of placing any specific faith claims on the itinerant exorcist as implying that his name could be utilized ex opere operato,755 and this creates the suspicion that Jesus' name may have been already introduced into magical circles during his lifetime— an unparalleled occurrence if true.756

Now another example of the appropriation of the name of Jesus in exorcisms is found in the narrative in Acts (Acts 19: 13-18) which deals with the itinerant Jewish exorcists who seek to use the power of Jesus “whom Paul preaches.” In this connection it is noteworthy that exorcists generally were rather keen upon promoting their own formula, while oftentimes criticizing the formulas of other magicians (e.g. PGM. IV.2085).757 That the author of Acts nonetheless chose to use the name of Jesus in this narrative illustrates just how powerful the name of Jesus was believed to be.

The report in Lk. 9:49f. brings us to a whole different matter. Here Luke, drawing upon Mk. 9:38-41, also appears to believe that people who were unknown to the disciples could put to good effect the name of Jesus in exorcisms. Does this mean that Luke believed that the name of Jesus could be used ex opere operato?758 To answer this question we need to examine two things: first, the exact wording of the Lucan version at 9:49, and secondly, the reports in Lk. 9:40, Acts 19:13-18, and 8: 9-24 respectively. In the first instance the narrative reports the lack of success of the disciples to cast out demons, while the latter passages treat the unsuccessful exorcism by the Sons of Seeva and the workings of Simon the Magician. Both inquiries should help clarify the matter for us.

With respect to Lk. 9:49 it is very important to notice the subtle difference between the Marcan and Lucan versions of this story. Mark reports that John describes the unknown exorcist as being outside the disciple group διπλα τοῦ οὐκ ἢκολοοθέτη τὴν μυθο. Luke on the other hand emends this to read, διπλα τοῦ ἄκολοοθεί τοῦ θυμίν. Nolland suggests a rendering of Luke’s reading as,

755 Ibid., 2.

756 Ibid., 8.

757 Ibid., 6. In PGM IV.2085 the magician criticizes that some spells can be too verbose.

758 Jacob clearly leaned in this direction, as did Eitrem. Delling, while thinking it possible, nonetheless rejects it in favor of seeing the exorcist as someone who in some fashion related to Jesus. See ING, 47f., 51; Delling, Die Zueignung, 46 and Some Notes on the Demonology of the New Testament, 2.
“Because he does not follow [Jesus] with us.” This, according to Nolland “clarifies the christological focus and makes the issue one of being (permanently) part of the disciple band.”759 If Nolland’s view of this passage is accepted, then this opens up the possibility that the author of Luke probably envisioned the consternation of the disciples as lying in their belief that the exorcist operated outside of some type of faith relationship to Jesus. This reading would weigh in favor of understanding Luke as not endorsing a mechanical use of the name of Jesus.

Another piece of evidence is found at Lk. 9:40, where we have the claim that the disciples themselves failed to exorcize demons in the name of Jesus. How can we explain this failure if indeed the author felt that the name of Jesus could function ex opere operato?760 Now, with respect to the report in Acts 19:13-18, the author also makes it clear that the name of Jesus does not work magically in exorcisms. This is crucial to our understanding of 9:49. Here, the seven sons of Seeva decide to ὀνομάζειν (to name) the name of Jesus, an expression not elsewhere attested to in the NT, and signaling therefore that their operations lay outside normal Christian praxis, and thus outside the Christian faith.760 During the attempted exorcism the Sons of Seeva are reported to have said (19:13) during their adjuration “I adjure you by Jesus whom Paul preaches” (“whom Paul preaches” finds a partial analog in PGM IV, 3019f, which reads, “I invoke you by Jesus, the God of the Hebrews…”),761 an addition by which the author clearly seeks to show that these men have no share in the Christian community. And the very fact that the entire enterprise was a dismal failure illustrates that the author wrote with the conviction that the name could not be utilized ex opere operato.762 But there are yet other indications along these lines.

In Acts 8: 9-25, in a narrative which is often overlooked in connection with how the author thought the name of Jesus was used, we see evident concern over establishing just who is authorized to dispense the power of the Spirit. In this narrative Simon the Magician tries to bribe

---

760 The contexts of Eph. 1:21 and II Tim. 2:19 make clear that these are not really parallels to its use here. Furthermore, one cannot help speculating whether ‘naming’ the name of Jesus does not imply a mechanical use.
761 Perlewitz notes that the PGM expression, “I adjure you by Jesus, the God of the Hebrews,” betrays a non-faith based relationship. In truth then, the similar statement by the Sons of Seeva also demonstrates a non-faith based relationship to Jesus. For Perlewitz comments see, *A Christology of the Book of Acts*, 227.
Peter (vv. 18 and 19) in order to receive the power of the Spirit. Straightaway Peter curses him and his effort (vv. 20 and 21). Does not the author’s view that a non-Christian has no share of the power of God, which is clearly displayed here, speak to the issue of the foreign exorcist? I think that it does and it cements, along with the other observations, that the author viewed only those with some sort of relationship to Jesus as having the ability to access Jesus or God’s power.

Going back to my question concerning Lk. 9:49f., it would seem in the light of the above considerations that for Luke at least the foreign exorcist was not using the name of Jesus mechanically. Eino Wilhelms has rightly pointed out that the key to understanding this whole pericope is verse fifty, “For he who is not against us is for us.” This verse infers that the unknown exorcist was in some fashion on Jesus’ side.

Matthew on the other hand seems to understand the matter quite differently. In 7: 22 Jesus states, at the end of his parable on the Tree and the Fruit, that many would come to him in the Last Days and say that they had cast out devils and performed miracles in his name. Their claim will be made with an eye toward authenticating their relationship to Jesus and hence stake out a share in the world to come. Jesus, however, noting their disobedience (v.23), states that he will disown them. It would appear that in the face of this passage all objections to understanding Matthew as believing in the ex opere operato use of the name of Jesus must be thrown out. Clearly, in the author’s view those who had not received the truth in repentance could use the name of Jesus.

As an aside it is worth mentioning that the Matthean claim that illegitimate people would arise and use the name of Jesus evidently found its fulfillment in later stages of Christianity for
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764 Nägelsbach also sees here a reference to the fact that these exorcists were in some fashion connected to a belief in Jesus. Delling too, comes to a similar conclusion. Ruck-Schröder though thinks that Luke believes that these people were non-Christians. Eitrem also accepts that these exorcists were non-Christians and that Jesus’ leniency toward this group can be imputed to his desire to marshal every force in opposition to Satan. For further discussion see DNGJHS, 35; DNGJNT, 193; Die Zueignung, 46; and Some Notes on the Demonology of the New Testament, 4.

765 Matthew’s view of the Last Days is to be contrasted with the Lucan version. The author puts in the mouth of Jesus this statement at Lk. 21:8-9. “See to it that you be not misled: for many will come in My name, saying, ‘I am He;’ and, ‘The time is at hand’; do not go after them. 9 And when you hear of wars and disturbances, do not be terrified; for these things must take place first, but the end does not follow immediately.” Never does Luke speak of miracles or exorcisms performed in Jesus’ name by ‘workers of iniquity’ as Matthew does.
Origen records that the name of Jesus was supremely efficacious in exorcising demons, even by those who are 'evil.' In C. Cels. (1.6) he states:

Through the influence of some motive unknown to me, Celsus attests that it is by the names of certain demons, and by the use of incantations, that the Christians appear to be possessed of [miraculous] power; hinting I suppose, at the practices of those who expel evil spirits by incantations... For it is not by incantations that the Christians seem to prevail, but by the name of Jesus [emphasis mine], accompanied by the announcement of the narratives which relate to him [historici or commemoration eorum]. . . . Such power, indeed, does the name of Jesus possess over evil spirits, that there have been incidents where it was effectual, when it was pronounced even by bad men [emphasis mine]... it is clear that Christians employ no spells, or incantations, but the simple name of Jesus [emphasis mine], and certain other words in which they repose faith...

Returning to the New Testament, we find that there are other places which combine exorcism and the name of Jesus. Here, under the heading of exorcism I place the controversial passage I Cor. 5:1-5. In this text we read of the case where a man had entered into a sexual relationship with his father's wife. In judgment, Paul declares that the man is to be turned over to Satan, ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι, while the Church is assembled, and when, “the power of the our Lord Jesus is present.” I refer this case to the exorcism category insofar as the rite was evidently designed to counter the works of Satan. How does this then relate specifically to exorcism? Actually it forms a sort of anti-exorcism. I shall make this statement clear momentarily, but first, to address our need for a better understanding of I Cor. 5:1-5 I need to answer just what the phrase ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι means here, and in its broader connection with the expression, σῶν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ. To gain the measure of this passage it will be necessary to quote the passage in full, and from the Greek:

"Ὅλος ἀκούει τιν ὃν πονεία, καὶ τοιαύτη πονεία ἡς οὐδὲ ἐν τοῖς ἐθνεσιν, ὥστε γυναίκα τινα τοῦ πατρὸς ἔχειν. 2καὶ ὑμεῖς πεφυσιμείναι ἐστε καὶ οὐχί μάλλον ἐπεφήμασε, ἵνα ἄρθη ἐκ μέσου ὑμῶν ὅ τι ἔργον τούτο πράξας; 3ἐγὼ μὲν γάρ, ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματι παρὼν δὲ τῷ πνεύματι, ἣν κέκρικα ὡς παρὼν τὸν αὐτὸ τοῦτο κατεγράμμασεν. ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου [ἡμῶν] Ἰησοῦ συναχθέντων ὑμῶν καὶ τοῦ ἐμοῦ πνεύματος σὺν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ. 4παραδοθήσεται τὸν τοιοῦτον τῷ σατανᾷ εἰς ὀλέθρον τῆς σαρκὸς, ἵνα τὸ πνεῦμα σωθῇ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ κυρίου."
Now the passage can be understood, according to common understanding, in five ways. The first looks to the term κέρικα in v.3. Here the connection would yield the meaning, "I have already come to a decision in the name of the Lord Jesus." Here the stress is laid upon the legal authority of Paul to make this decision.

The second option is to see ἐν τῷ ὄνόματι relating to κατεργασάμενον. Here the meaning would be that the offending party had carried out his sexual perversion in the name of Jesus. Those who advocate this view use this connection to explain Paul's uncommonly harsh response. Put differently, if the man had carried out his actions in Jesus’ name then Paul would have just cause in turning him over to Satan. Against this understanding of the passage, Ruck-Schröder has correctly objected that the actions of Paul, much more readily than the actions of the sexual offender, are suitable in the context of the passage in relating to the phrase ἐν τῷ ὄνόματι.

The third option relates ἐν τῷ ὄνόματι to συναχέντων. Of obvious significance here is the sequence of the sentence itself, where συναχέντων is directly followed by ἐν τῷ ὄνόματι. A further support for this interpretation is the fact that Paul defines the Christian assembly as those who call on the name of the Lord (I Cor 1:2) and perhaps this is what is meant here.

The fourth possibility is to see ἐν τῷ ὄνόματι as relating to the power of the Lord (σύν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ). For this interpretation speaks the situation itself, viz. it was an inherently precarious enterprise to turn over to Satan a church member so that the power of the Lord must be present to carry out this operation without undue danger.

The final path is to interpret this passage as relating ἐν τῷ ὄνόματι to παραδοούναι. Proponents of this interpretation suggest that the turning over to Satan forms either a sort of...
antithesis to the very rite that inaugurated inclusion into the community, that is baptism, or that it forms a sort of curse, which can be seen as the counterpart to exorcism.\textsuperscript{770} Indeed, just as baptism takes place upon the calling out of the name of Jesus, so here too, the excommunication takes place during the calling out of the name of Jesus.

Now Ruck-Schröder prefers to see the entire process as having taken place in the name of the Lord. The assembling of the Church, Paul’s judgment, and most importantly the power and presence of the Jesus, allows for the transfer of the offender to Satan, and all are carried out by (under or through) the name of Jesus.\textsuperscript{771} That τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ might relate to ἐν τῷ ὄνοματί is not too surprising, really. How the statement about Paul’s judgment (κέρκικα) relates to ἐν τῷ ὄνοματί however takes a little explaining.

Steyn has noted that when Paul makes his judgment it is very similar to when a magistrate would make a judgment ‘in the name of Caesar,’ that is, when the Emperor was absent.\textsuperscript{772} This understanding opens the way to understanding how ἐν τῷ ὄνοματί might have related to κέρκικα in this legal-like procedure. In effect, Paul carries out his pronouncement of judgment, “in the name of Jesus,” as the authorized representative for Jesus himself. Thus, while ἐν τῷ ὄνοματί would appear to relate readily to παραδοῦναι, συναχθέντων, and σὺν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ, κέρκικα cannot necessarily be excluded.

Frankly, I am in sympathy with Rück-Schröder’s understanding on this passage, but whatever the disposition of the various possibilities one thing stands clear; the invocation of the name of Jesus unleashes the δύναμις of Jesus in this procedure.\textsuperscript{773} and insures Jesus’

\textsuperscript{770} Kramer, following Bultmann’s lead. See Werner Kramer, Christos, Kurios, Gottesohm, 73. Fee begs off this interpretation however and sees only a simple expulsion from the community. See Fee, The First Epistle to the Corinthians, 208-209.

\textsuperscript{771} Ibid., 78.

\textsuperscript{772} Steyn, “To Onoma tou Kyriou in I Cor,” 486.

\textsuperscript{773} So too, Conzelmann, although Conzelmann understands the expression, ‘turned over to Satan for the destruction of the flesh,’ as ultimately signifying death. Surprisingly, no exegete who supports this view, at least to my knowledge, seems to have noticed the possible connection to Acts 5:1-11, where Peter’s condemnation of Ananias and Sapphira resulted in death. Was this the same as turning someone over to Satan with a resultant death? Whether such a connection exists I shall leave for others to decide. For Hans Conzelmann’s views see, Der erste Brief an die Korinther (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969), 117.
presence. 774

In this case the unleashing of Jesus’ power, through his name, brings about the condition indicated earlier. That is, this rite forms the counterpart, of sorts, to exorcism. Expressed differently, this rite is not apotropaic, but seemingly reverses this normal course of action when dealing with dark forces and instead appears to place the offender under Satan’s power.

The last passage which I will delve into is Acts 19:11-18. I have mentioned it a time or two, but there are some aspects of this curious passage which deserve to be tabled in this discussion. First, the claim of the passage that many Christians imported the concept of numinous names from their pagan background can be reasonably assumed, given the narrative in Acts 19:18, where the author claims that so many converts in Ephesus came from magical backgrounds that the burning of their magical texts amounted to 50 thousand drachma. Moreover, verse 17 also supports a belief in numinous names on the part of many, for the passage states that after these events became known to a large number of Jews and Greeks they came to exalt the name of Jesus as a result of hearing of its power. This narrative can be construed as supporting the notion that the name of Jesus was rapidly disseminated in the Greco-Roman magical circles within the first two decades after the death of Jesus. I shall now turn to looking at comparative materials.

ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON TO JEWISH AND GRECO-ROMAN MATERIALS

Within the context of exorcisms it is interesting to note that Jesus’ name could also be invoked in settings where his power was on display in the face of pagan (or demonic) opposition; that is, the power was used to demonstrate that Jesus is the Lord over the powers of darkness—just as Yahweh’s name was used centuries earlier. Loosely speaking, this use of the name of Jesus invites comparison to the use of the name of God by Elijah in his confrontation with the priests of Ba’al on Mt. Carmel. The reader may recall that Elijah made clear that the priests of Ba’al would call upon their god, while he would call upon the name YHWH. The results were that Elijah was vindicated by God’s power while the priests of Ba’al were vanquished. This same

774 So also Jacob, ING, 60 and Heitmüller, INJ, 74. Given the religionsgeschichtliche background it is more than probable that the invoking of the name of Jesus is meant here as the medium through which the power and presence of Jesus is guaranteed. Interestingly, Aune proposes that 1 Cor. 5:3-5 is rather analogous to a magical execration. Nægelsbach rather naively believes that the early Christians could not have been susceptible to magical influences for they had been introduced to a new, “göttlichen Faktor.” Nægelsbach does raise a more concrete objection to name-magic in the New Testament when he points out that at least as far as the name of Jesus is concerned all of the prayers in the New Testament presume that the answer is still contingent on the request being in accordance with the will of God. For more see DNGJHS, 31, 34 and Aune, “Magic in Early Christianity,” 1553.
thought of vindication through displays of power is found in Tertullian, where the christological significance of the use of the name of Jesus in exorcisms is crystallized into particularly clear lines in his argumentation. Tertullian, in a most brazen boast to the various Roman provincial governors declares that:

Let a person be brought before your tribunals, who is plainly under demoniacal possession. The wicked spirit, bidden to speak by a follower of Christ, will as readily make the truthful confession that he is a demon, as elsewhere he has falsely asserted that he is a god... Do you say that it is done by magic, or some trick of that sort? You will not say anything of the sort, if you have been allowed the use of your ears and eyes... Why all the authority and power we have over them is from our naming the name of Christ.

As the passage shows, the name of Jesus was being used in a confrontational, winner-take-all contest of power which bears some similarity to the use of the name of YHWH in his confrontation with the priests of Ba’al.

A similar line of argumentation is encountered in Justin’s Dialogue (30), where Justin maintains that the Christians called Jesus:

Helper and Redeemer, the power of whose name even the demons do fear; and at this day, when they are exercised in the name of Jesus Christ, crucified under Pontius Pilate, governor of Judaea, they are overcome. And thus it is manifest to all, that His Father has given Him so great power, by virtue of which demons are subdued to His name... In like fashion, at Dialogue 49, Justin states, “You can perceive that the concealed power of God was in Christ the crucified, before whom demons, and all the principalities and powers of the earth, tremble.”

Now the repeated claim that the demons tremble at the very name of Jesus sounds clear echoes to the claims of magicians who pointed toward exorcism as evidence that demons understood the meaning of divine names and trembled before them (e.g. ὁ καὶ οἱ δαίμονες ἀκούντες τὸ ὄνομα πτωτοῦτι [PGM XIII.765]). Likewise, it is clear by this rhetoric that Justin intends to demonstrate that the power resident in the name of Jesus, when applied against demons, produced an irrefutable argument that Jesus had been elevated to the supreme position, having been granted dominion and power over every creature and being in the universe.

Utilizing a similar line of argumentation Origen, touching upon the comments made by Celsus about the deification of Antinous, argues that unlike Antinous, who required the
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intervention of Caesar to install him as a god, Jesus in contradistinction received his commandment by God. The evidence for this assertion, according to Origen (C. Cels. III.XXXVI), was the power resident in the name of Jesus. Origen states:

The Architect of the universe Himself, in keeping with the marvelously persuasive power of His words, commended Him [Jesus] as worthy of honor, not only to those men who were well disposed, but to demons also, and other unseen powers, which even at the present time show that they either fear the name of Jesus as that of a being of superior power, or reverentially accept Him as their legal ruler. For if the commendation had not been given Him by God, the demons would not have withdrawn from those whom they had assailed, in obedience to the mere mention of His name.

Regarding the inception of this practice, in accordance with the New Testament evidence we must reckon with the possibility that at an extremely early date groups of exorcists/magicians had already recognized that the name of Jesus seemed to have a remarkable dynamis. Moreover, these magicians/exorcists had also discovered (or at least came to believe) that the name of Jesus could be utilized ex opere operato. Now, if I have properly traced the lineaments of the inception of the use of the name of Jesus in magic/exorcism, then it can be said that the use of the name of Jesus in non-Christian circles began as early as perhaps the late 40’s or early 50’s C.E. and that by this time the name of Jesus was already becoming a well-recognized name of power. What might this use suggest christologically?

First, we should note that, seemingly, the name of Jesus was not dependent upon the names of other gods, nor was it subject to any power. The name of Jesus did not need any superfluous rites, exorbitant rituals, or various nomina barbara to be effective. Its power was not limited to geographic boundaries, nor restricted to any particular social class. It evidently proceeded, quite unattended, to become one of the most potent numinous name among the hierarchy of magical names. Among Christians of course, no other name possessed so much power as the name of Jesus.

Yet another important christological consideration is that the name of Jesus appears to have been seen by believers as the apotropaic medium par excellence in the now dawning eschatological time of deliverance promised by God. It is clear from numerous lines of evidence that the early Church, and Judaism, generally believed that they were at or near the end time. In the thinking of the early Church God was now making war (the eschatological war) against Satan (e.g., Rev. 12:7-9). In this war Jesus played the seminal and central role. This belief is found in summarized form in 1.Jn. 3:8, “The Son of God appeared for this purpose, that He might destroy
the works of the devil.” In the light of this eschatological orientation we can embrace Noack’s conclusion that “...die ganze neutestamentliche Dämonologie durch die Eschatologie bestimmt [ist].”776 There is yet more to consider when we think in terms of Jesus’ victory over demonic forces, viz. that the entire world and all of mankind, as well as the interrelationship between the two, was conditioned by the influence of demonic forces.777 If we add up all of these factors, and recognize the belief in the early Church that Jesus had conquered the demonic realm, then it is fair to say that exorcisms performed in Jesus’ name meant not only liberation for the possessed individual, but also signified a liberation of the world itself. In light of the evidence, mutatis mutandis, we may assert that the name of Jesus was now among the premier effugator daemonum of the Hellenistic world. What might this observation mean in terms of christology?

We have seen how the name of Jesus was used in a fashion similar to what we have observed to in the PGM. Thus, we can surmise that the name of Jesus must have been viewed as having the authority and power reserved for the highest god.778 Seen in these terms, one can say that the exclusive use of the name of Jesus by Gentile converts indicates that they were convinced that Jesus’ name was now the name of power; a name simply unparalleled in its numinous and apotropaic potency. But did this use intimate that they thought that Jesus was divine?

This question is frankly not easy to answer. Invoking the name of Jesus to repeal evil forces is not, per se, a proof that they viewed Jesus as a deity. We must remember that Greco-Roman magicians also invoked angels (=paredroi), so simply invoking Jesus’ name is not warrant enough to justify a positive conclusion. What does, however, suggest that Gentile Christians viewed Jesus as a deity is the exclusive use of the name of Jesus. I have just mentioned that the natural tendency in these situations was to invoke the name of the Demiur, or the Pantocrator. By invoking exclusively the name of Jesus, these early Gentile Christians

776 As Bent Noack notes in his Satanäis und Soteria, 114.
777 Ibid., 125.
778 Todd E. Klutz, “The Grammar of Exorcism in the Ancient Mediterranean World: Some Cosmological, Semantic, and Pragmatic Reflections on How Exorcistic Prowess Contributed to the Worship of Jesus,” in The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism. Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus. Eds. Carey C. Newman, James R. Davila, and Gladys S. Lewis, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1999), 160. Klutz refers here to Jesus himself, and the conclusion which others must have drawn based on his exorcistic powers was that Jesus was a divine being. But, if Jesus appeared to have divine power over the spiritual realm, then perforce it must have appeared the same with his name given its evident use in casting out demons.
testify to the fact that they see Jesus as being at the top of the divine hierarchy. If we then remember that Gentiles viewed numerous ‘inferior’ spiritual beings as being deities, the very fact that Gentile converts used the name of Jesus bears witness to the conclusion that Jesus was seen as the ultimate power—thus we can infer that they thought the exalted Jesus was a deity of some sort.

Now within a Jewish-Christian context, the use of the name of Jesus, instead of Yahweh’s name, seems all the more notable when one considers just how high an opinion the Jews had of exorcism as a tool against demonic forces. It seems to me that we can say that exorcism was probably held in the most exalted status for the Jew in terms of a demonstration of the power of God over Satan. In this light the use of the name of Jesus in exorcisms stands out all the more as a remarkable change over from the pre-Christian period.

Now the simple fact that Jewish-Christians invoked the name of Jesus is not a proof that Jesus was thought to be divine. We should recall at this point that the name of Solomon was thought to be apotropaic and it was at times also invoked. We need something more decisive if we are to believe that the invocation of Jesus’ name implies that he was viewed as divine.

What does speak in favor of seeing in this use an implicit belief in the divinity of Jesus is that Jesus’ name was used as a ‘stand alone’ apotropaic agent. Nowhere, as far as I am aware, is the name of Solomon used alone. It seems to have been used in conjunction with the name of YHWH. In the case of the DSS documents, for example, we saw that the same section which implied that Solomon’s name was used in exorcisms, we find also that the name of YHWH was invoked (11Q11 col. III.1-4).

Similarly, in the lamella that I cited in the Greco-Roman magic section,779 we saw that it bore a crude drawing of the Seal of Solomon, which was however encircled by the Tetragrammaton. The fact that the lamella has both the name of Solomon and the Tetragrammaton implies that perhaps Jews did not consider Solomon’s name alone to be powerful enough to overcome every demon. If this supposition is true, then the exclusive use of the name of Jesus would imply that Jesus was thought of as all-powerful. This, I suggest, strongly hints that the earliest Jewish-Christians thought of Jesus as divine.

779 For further details concerning the lamella see Kotansky, “Greek Exorcistic Amulets,” 267-8.
HEALING IN THE NAME OF JESUS

The claim that the name of Jesus could effect healing is as old as the events said to have occurred after Pentecost, or so we are told in the Book of Acts, and this formed a strand of tradition so vigorous that it left its traces even outside Christian circles.\(^{780}\) When we turn to the Book of Acts we read of several accounts of healings which were accompanied by the pronunciation of the name of Jesus.\(^{781}\) For example, in Acts 3:1ff. we read of the healing of the lame man, purportedly through the name of Jesus. This passage opens a section in Acts that extends from 3:6 until 5:40: a section where the name of Jesus plays a foundational role. Acts 3:6, 13, for example, speaks of healing in the name of Jesus. Acts 3:16 deals with the relationship between faith and the name of Jesus, Acts 4:10, 30 takes up the theme of the name of Jesus and its healing power, 4:12 again points to the central place of the name of Jesus as the sole name which all must call upon so that they might be saved; and, finally, 5:40-41, deals with the theme of suffering for the sake of the name of Jesus. Returning to 3:16, we can discern from the narrative that although the name clearly functions as a source of power (v. 16c), it can evidently be rendered serviceable only when faith is present (v. 16a).\(^{782}\)

\(^{780}\)Jewish attestation to this belief include T. Hul. 12.21-f. (cf. J. Shabb. XIV.4; J: 'Avodah Zarah 11.2 (40d); B: 'Avodah Zarah 27b), while in Greco-Roman circles the comments of Celsus are relevant. And of course, as we have seen earlier, the name of Jesus is exemplified as a numinous name in the PGM. As for Celsus' views, see C. Cels. VI.

\(^{781}\)Interestingly, the compound name 'Lord Jesus (Christ)' is never used, even though it is found in statements involving baptism (8.16).

\(^{782}\)Nägelsbach takes Acts 3:16 as signifying that the power seen in this passage is contained in the Gospel itself, because it has the power to spark faith in Jesus and his name. That the Gospel has power is also seen in Rom. 1:16. I, however, believe that Paul's own testimony in 1 Corinthians 1:18-25 necessitates that we recognize that the Gospel was a scandal for the Jew and foolishness to the Greek. Accordingly, demonstrations of power were needed to stir faith (e.g., 1 Cor. 2:4-5; 1 Thess 1:4; Jn. 10:38). Delling, basing his judgment on a reading of the account of Acts chapter 4 (in which Peter recounts this healing), notes that the name of Jesus and Jesus interchange readily. This means, in his opinion, that no thought of Namenglaubens is conceived of here. In my opinion, however, he fails to appreciate the curious fact that the narrative is couched in terms whereby the name of Jesus plays the central lead. Naturally, the name of Jesus does signify the recognition that it is Jesus who is the crucified and resurrected One (4:12), but more stands behind this use of the name. Still, Delling sees 4:30, where Peter petitions God to perform miracles and wonders in the name of Jesus, as supporting his view that the name represents only a reference to Jesus and his works. On this showing, however, it seems difficult to explain why the Apostles could not just as readily have said to the lame man, "I offer healing by the power and authority invested in me," or "By the power of which the Lord Jesus has," rather than invoking the name of Jesus. In any case, for Delling's views see, Die Zueignung, 49, and for Nägelsbach's views see, DNG/ihs, 59.
With respect to this extraordinary section Ruck-Schroder has noted five facets of the use of the name of Jesus which seem to be a point of emphasis. Two are of particular interest for my study: first, the relationship between name and faith (3:16), and second, the relationship between name, power, and the bestowal of the Spirit (4:7,10). These two aspects together serve to underscore the connection between the name of Jesus and its link to two indispensable components for the acceptance of the Gospel: faith and the action of the Spirit. Another role which the power of the name of Jesus played is that it also served notice to both Israel, and her authorities (4:7-12), that Jesus had indeed been justified and glorified by God. This power served to testify to the glorification of Jesus before unbelievers in much the same way that christophanies, and resurrection appearances, bore witness to the Apostles.

Now, one sees that the power which resides in the name of Jesus is of a type that hitherto had only been thought to reside in God’s name. This exhibition of the power serves to illustrate that Jesus has not only been vindicated by God, but also glorified and exalted to an unprecedented level-literally to the level of co-regent. This theologoumenon is highlighted even further within the narrative at Acts 3:1-10; that is, by the placement of the healing within the Temple area. As we already know from our examination of the Old Testament Deuteronomist materials, the Temple was the place where God’s Name resided and it was where the High Priest spoke out the divine name during Yom Kippur. Just as significantly, the Temple was believed to stand at the center of God’s future salvific actions. With this backdrop in mind, the fact that is was now Jesus’ name which effected the healing must surely have been understood to imply that a profound realignment had taken place in the divine economy.

Perhaps this implied realignment helps to explain why one of the primary objectives of the Sanhedrin was to stamp out any naming of the name in various activities (cf. 4:17ff; 5:28,40). If this is true, then no doubt this action was based upon their alarm that the naming
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783 Ruck-Schroder believes that the name itself produces this faith. See DNG.JNT, 185-186.

784 Ibid., 183.

785 Lars Hartman, Auf den Namen des Herrn, 37.

786 Ruck-Schroder, DNG.JNT, 184.

787 Perlewitz conjectures, rightly in my view, that the prohibition was occasioned by the desire to prohibit the Apostles from displays of power performed in Jesus’ name. That the Sanhedrin was concerned to prohibit the use of name of Jesus in displays of power can be seen in their initial question in 4:7. They ask, \( \text{ἐν πολλῇ ὀνάσει} \)
of the name of Jesus brought about miracles, which in turn helped to fuel early Christian conversion because it inculcated faith. With these considerations in hand it might be helpful to examine if the author of Acts viewed the name of Jesus in a magical sense, or at least as a sort of _Machtmittel_.

Many exegetes have maintained that there is not even the slightest vestige of a _Namensglauben_ in Acts. I find this position untenable. While it is true that the author does not view the name of Jesus as being capable of magical manipulation, he does certainly think of the name as a _Machtmittel_ which can be put into operation with faith. The following points will establish the soundness of this conclusion.

First of all, any notion that the author did not have magical inclinations is incorrect. We see many indications that the author is not at all bashful about including magical thinking in his work. For example, the author states in 5:15 that Peter’s shadow was believed by the crowds to have numinous power. It is also clear from v. 16 that the author believed that Peter’s shadow could heal.\(^788\) In 19:11-12, we read that Paul did extraordinary miracles, so much so that even handkerchiefs and aprons that had touched Paul could, when brought to the ill, effected a miraculous cure. In a similar vein, the author also reports that the Spirit was bestowed after an apostle laid hands upon a believer (e.g., Acts 8: 17; 19:6). In all of these cases we observe that the medium in question required some contact with either Peter or Paul. Now we must ask ourselves why there was a need to make contact to bring about healing? Certainly, these cases appear to be direct instances of so-called ‘contact’ magic. In any case, at no point in any of these narratives does the author signal that he rejects out of hand any of these beliefs.
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\(^{788}\) So also P.W. van der Horst, “Peter’s Shadow. The religio-historical background of Acts V.15,” _NTS_ 23: 205. Although of no direct relevance to this passage, it is nevertheless interesting that surrogate baptism (i.e. for the dead), which the Corinthians practiced (I Cor. 15:29), was also reflective of a magical conception of the rite. Also, it is worth calling attention to the opinion of Kotansky, who notes that the use of clothes to heal the sick in Acts were utilized in a fashion completely in keeping with that of magical amulets. See Kotansky, “Greek Exorcistic Amulets,” 243. See Gerhard Barth, “Taufe auf den Namen Jesu. Kurzbericht über den Stand neutestamentlicher Arbeiten zum Verständnis der Taufe im Urchristentum,” in _Neuzeitgeschichtliche Versuche und Beobachtungen_, (Waltrop Germany: Hartmut Spenner, 1996), 56-57.
Another buttress for my conclusion is found at Acts 3:16, where Peter explains to the onlookers just how the crippled beggar at the Temple had been healed, “It is Jesus’ name and the faith that comes through it that has given this complete healing to him [emphasis mine].” It is a curious fact indeed that the author includes both faith and the name of Jesus, if he held the conviction that faith alone brought about miraculous cures.789

Furthermore, in the immediate aftermath of Pentecost the author relates that when all the believers came together to pray to God for the continued success of the fledgling movement Peter prayed to God (4: 30), “Stretch out your hand to heal and perform miraculous signs and wonders through the name of your holy servant Jesus.” Once again we see the pattern where the name of Jesus surfaces in contexts where wonders and miracles are related. This passage, in my view, suggests that God’s power was seen as operational within Jesus’ name (note too the διά preposition).790

Moreover, there appear to be further indications within the work that suggest that the author viewed the name as a Machtmittel. What I am referring to here is the habitual use of the prepositional phrase ἐν τῷ ὄνοματι whenever a work of power is performed (e.g., 3:6; 4:10; 16:18), in contrast to other activities which are not power related, such as speaking or teaching in the name of Jesus, where the author usually employs the preposition ἐπί (e.g., 4:17, 18; 5:28, 40).791

Now this arrangement of prepositions must be seen in light of the fact that the later half of Acts, and the opening chapter of the Gospel of Luke, make perfectly clear to the reader that the author is quite at home with the Greek language. Given this, it is quite curious indeed to
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790 Delling, taking his cue from the portion of this text which speaks of God stretching forth His hands to act, rejects any hint of Namenglauben. This stance overlooks that fact that these are not mutually exclusive positions. One can believe that God has imbued Jesus’ name with dynamis, yet still fell the need to ask God for His continuing involvement and help. For Delling’s views see, Die Zueignung, 50.

791 Delling acknowledges this grouping of prepositions but is unsure of any instrumental meaning based on 4:12. This overlooks the possibility that the author was purposely recounting what he said for the purposes of emphasizing the source of the healing power, in distinction from simply making reference to the name as the basis for the action. After all, Delling does acknowledge that expression, when used with ἐπί, is best translated as, “auf Grund dieses Namen.” This allows us to see an instrumental use for ἐν. Delling also recognizes that the author does appear to be consciously choosing his prepositions (or at least one can discern a pattern). For Delling’s view see, Die Zueignung, 48, 51-52.
observe that when the crippled beggar is healed in chapter 3, the exact words which Peter speaks are \( \varepsilon\nu \tau\o\delta\omicron\omicron\mu\omicron\alpha\iota \), yet when referring to other activities outside of the miraculous he employs the proposition \( \varepsilon\pi\iota \). Now it is at once obvious that \( \varepsilon\pi\iota \) makes perfect sense in these other passages, conveying the meaning that these activities are done with reference to Jesus’ name; that is, they are done with reference to Jesus himself. Now the author’s familiarity with the Greek language and his proper use of the proposition \( \varepsilon\pi\iota \) implies then that we should make the same allowance for some purpose in his use of \( \varepsilon\nu \) when relating accounts of miraculous deeds. The meaning would be clear: the use of \( \varepsilon\nu \) by the author signifies an instrumental use, and thus, that the name of Jesus was seen as the medium which brought about these miracles.\(^{792}\)

One final indication that the author held to some sort of \textit{Namenglaubens} is found in the account of the mission of the Seventy (or 72), which stems from the Lucan \textit{Sondergut}. Here we find at the end of the mission the statement that (Lk. 10:17), “The seventy returned with joy, saying, ‘Lord, even the demons are subject to us \textit{in Your name} [emphasis mine].’” This sending of the disciples stands in contrast to that of Mk. 3:14-15, where we read, “And He [Jesus] appointed twelve, that they might be with Him, and that He might send them out to preach, and to have authority to cast out the demons.” Here there is no mention of the use of Jesus’ name, yet in a broadly similar sending of the disciples in Luke’s Gospel (or his source) he adds his understanding of the means for this exorcistic success. It is the power of the name of Jesus which subdues demons. This difference between Mark and Luke signals that the latter author was very conscious of the power of Jesus’ name and sought to emphasize this fact. Still, all of the various texts that I have covered never really answer the question of whether the author viewed the name of Jesus as something more than just a \textit{Machtmittel}. That is, could it be used in a magical fashion? I shall turn to this question now.

Against this backdrop it is evident that invoking Jesus’ name in healing has evident points of contact with magic, albeit in this case in a negative sense. Susan Garrett, for example, has demonstrated that one of the primary agendas that the author pushes is that the power of the

\(^{792}\) Although Ziesler does not use my line of argumentation, he too sees the healings in the name of Jesus as taking place with the power which seems to reside in the name. See J.A. Ziesler, “The Name of Jesus in the Acts of the Apostles,” 33-34.
Apostles is superior to magic.\textsuperscript{793} It is as if the author means to say, “You think that divine names have power? Indeed, but the divine name with the real power is ‘Jesus’.” Garrett, although not specifically arguing this point, says of Luke’s intentions, “…in Luke’s narrative world (if not in his social world), the opinion that Jesus’ name is like all the other names used in magic will not be allowed for long.”\textsuperscript{794}

Although Garrett’s view is correct, so far as it goes, I must, at the risk of being accused of putting too fine a point on it, contend that we must differentiate between a magical view of the name (that is, it could be used to control the bearer of the name), and strictly speaking, Namenglauben. By the latter I mean the belief that divine names were numinous and apotropaic. As I have already just mentioned, it would appear that the author intends to demonstrate that this is indeed the case, except that Jesus’ name was at the top of the pecking order. Instead of trying to dispel any notions of belief in numinous and apotropaic names, the author appears to be saying that one such name does qualify in this regard, the ‘true’ numinous and apotropaic name ‘Jesus.’

Now name-magic, as I define it for the purposes of this work, involves in part the belief that a numinous name could be used mechanically, by any and all as it were. Simple invocation of the name could compel the divinity to perform the demand of the invoker. By this criterion, the author clearly rejects a magical use of the name, but not per se its numinous nature.\textsuperscript{795} I think then that one must conclude that the author did adhere to a type of Namenglauben.\textsuperscript{796}

\textsuperscript{793} Susan Garrett, \textit{The Demise of the Devil, Magic and the Demonic in Luke’s Writings} (Minneapolis: Augsburg Press, 1989). This is most amply demonstrated in the response of the Ephesians to the events surrounding the thrashing of the Sons of Sceva in Acts 19: 13-16. When these events became known all those who had taken up magic were disposed to burn their magical books (19: 17-20) and thereafter, “the name of Jesus was held in high honor (19: 17).” This narrative would strongly suggest that the author desires to impress upon his readers that Jesus’ name was the ‘true’ numinous name, superior to all other magical names.

\textsuperscript{794} Garrett, \textit{Demise}, 93.

\textsuperscript{795} That the author of Acts did not himself understand the name of Jesus as a magical medium (i.e., a medium that can be used magically) can be seen from Acts 9:34, where Peter says to the lame Aeneas, “Jesus Christ heals you; arise, and make your bed.” This passage declares that Jesus is not only alive, but that he is present (or at least active) at the moment of the healing. Thus, although others could view the name of Jesus as operating in a magical fashion, the author clearly thinks that the resurrected Jesus is the present source of healing power which resides in the name. Indeed, the use of the name of Jesus in this healing can be understood as an invocation of Jesus, so that he would come and heal the person. Thus, name-presence in this case. Other New Testament authors paint a similar picture.

\textsuperscript{796} For his part, Delling rejects any Namenglauben. He notes that Jesus appears interchangeably with his name in the narrative, and this establishes for Delling that the name is nothing more than a symbol for Jesus. This
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As a comparative, let us look at the case of Paul, who clearly believes that his apostolate was substantiated by his ability to perform miracles such as healing (I. Cor. 2:1-4; II Cor. 12:12), yet at the same time he contends that faith is needed to bring about the effect (Gal. 3:5).\footnote{Delling correctly notes that there is not even a hint of name-magic in Paul’s writings. See Die Zueignung, 72.}

Now, let us look at a related context, James 5:14-15, where the author mentions that when a sick person is brought into the assembly the person was to be anointed with oil in the name of Jesus, with an accompanying prayer of faith. Before I investigate the passage further I need to establish whether the ‘Lord’ is Jesus or God.


Unfortunately, when we turn to the textual apparatus for this verse we find no simple answers.\footnote{The majority of the witnesses read, ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τοῦ Κυρίου, and as Dibelius observes, later witnesses which incorporate the addition, τοῦ Κυρίου Χριστοῦ (with or without Χριστοῦ), are worthless in helping us decide this problem. For more by Dibelius see, James, 253 fn. 67.}

In order to come to any conclusion we shall have to depend on other criteria, and in this case only the broader context, and perhaps authorial habit, offer us any assistance.

If we look at the statistics for this chapter, James utilizes Κυρίος some nine times. Of those, 2 refer unambiguously to Jesus (5: 7-8), while four refer to God (5:4; 10-11; admittedly, in 5:11, the author may have meant ‘Jesus). This leaves two unresolved places; both in verses 14 and 15. One solution is simply to recognize that this interchangeability between Jesus and God in terms of the application of κυρίος raises the possibility that the author had so incorporated Jesus into the divine identity that the word ‘Lord’ was used comfortably for both God and Jesus; that is, they are ‘united’-and this by a possible Jewish-Christian. Still, at the end of the day, it must be

\footnote{Delling correctly notes that there is not even a hint of name-magic in Paul’s writings. See Die Zueignung, 72.}
admitted that we have no sound method for concluding decisively whether Jesus or God is meant in 5:14-15 when we examine authorial habits. It seems to me, that our only path is to consult the comparable New Testament background material concerning healing.

When we look to background material on healing, as we have already seen, it is the name of Jesus which is used in healing and not God’s. In fact, I am unaware of any early Christian text (ca. 150 C.E. and earlier) that uses the word Kupio when referring to healing in an manner that would suggest that God is meant. Following the pattern imposed by this data we are left with Jesus as our only tenable option.801 So, I accept that Jesus’ name is meant at 5:14-15. Having addressed this, let us look at the passage itself.

Now certainly, this passage is pivotal in gaining insight into how the name of Jesus functioned in the early Church and accordingly I need to quote the passage in full:

Is anyone among you sick? Let him call for the elders of the church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord; 15 and the prayer offered in faith will restore the one who is sick, and the Lord will raise him up, and if he has committed sins, they will be forgiven him.

Right away several unusual features leap out. First, in stark contrast to the charismatic gifts of individuals found in I Cor. 12:7, here we read of an eschatological exhibition of power in the service of a particular congregational office.802 Who these elders were is a question for another time; what matters is that they employed the name of Jesus and the fact that evidently their office required them to mediate healing. Also of interest is the use of oil. Oil, in the ancient world commanded an unusual respect in healing, and its use is widely attested.803 As for the question of the nature of the rite and its significance, I shall turn to that now.

In order to answer just what this rite signified we need only remember that in the ancient world sickness was all too often seen as an outgrowth of the action of demons. Seen in this light

801 Several other features point to the fact that the name of Jesus is meant rather than God’s. First, at James 2:7, the Name which is called out over the assembly is Jesus. Secondly, Acts 3:16 strongly intimates that the prayer of faith comes either through Jesus, or through his name (contingent on how one interprets this awkward passage). Third, the phrase expressly states that the name which is to be invoked is the name of the Lord. The kypios title had of course already been transferred to Jesus. Furthermore, Ruck-Schröder points out that any healing of a sick person would naturally presuppose that Jesus’ name would be called out. See Ruck-Schröder, DNG/INT, 235-236.

802 Davids, The Epistle of James, 194.

803 Isa. 1:6; Jer. 8:22; Mk. 6:13; Lk. 10:34; Josephus A.J. 17.172; BJ 1.657; Life Adam 36; Apoc. Mox. 9:3; Sl. Enoch 22:8-9; Philo Som. 2.58; Plato Menex. 238; Pliny HN 23.39-40; Galen 2.10. I borrow here from the list drawn up by Davids. See, The Epistle of James, 193.
we must reckon that the rite was exorcistic in nature. Thus, healing in Jesus' name signified that Jesus was now Lord over the spirit realm. Finally, we come to two last questions: first, what does the name of Jesus seem to represent in this passage (i.e., what function does it play); and second, does the Name produce physical healing as an outgrowth of the salvation which Jesus brought about?

First, it should be noted that the name functions both as an appeal to Jesus, as well as being the source of the healing power which resides in his name. It was also meant to insure both the blessing and the presence of Jesus for the successful completion of the healing, and as such it was required that the name of Jesus be spoken during the anointing.

Beyond these considerations there are also weighty theological reasons for believing that the name of Jesus was thought by the author to be endowed with real δυναμις. The question here is whether the name of Jesus should be anticipated to have healing power given that it was his name alone that was given to mankind for salvation. I think that any reflection on the nature of salvation suggests that physical salvation (i.e., healing) must be included in the greater scheme of things. Pesch has correctly observed in this regard, when he considered the case of the healing of the lame man in the Temple in Acts 3, that physical salvation is bound with spiritual salvation.

804 Pace Davids, correctly M. Dibelius. Davids explains this verse in terms of "an opening to the power of God for him to intervene,..." Dibelius, following the right trail in my judgment, perceives that the rite was apotropaic in nature, while Böcher states that "Da auch Jesus und seine Apostel in den Krankheiten das Werk schädlicher Dämonen sehen, kann Heilung nur die Vertreibung dieser Dämonen bedeuten." Regarding examples I shall cite three. Origen quotes Celsius to the effect that (C. Cel. VIII. LVIII), "Let any one inquire of the Egyptians, and he will find that everything, even the most insignificant, is committed to the care of a certain demon. The body of man is divided into thirty-six parts, and as many demons of the air are appointed to the care of it, each having charge of a different part, although others make the number much larger. All these demons have in the language of that country distinct names; as Chnoumen, Chnachoumen,..., and other Egyptian names. Moreover, they call upon them [names], and are cured of diseases of particular parts of the body." Other examples include 1QapGen xx 26, where the affliction in question is described as "a spirit of putrefaction." And finally, 4QD3 90 5-13, where we find a catalog of minor skin diseases which we as their source various demons. In this context see also Mt. 9:32f. and 12:22. For Böcher's work see Otto Böcher, Christus Exorcista: Dämonismus und Taufe im Neuen Testament, (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1972), 77. For Davids' views see, The Epistle of James, 194. For Dibelius see, James, 252.

805 Delling allows only that this intends to be taken as an action which is carried out under reference to Jesus. I think that more is implied. I believe that it also involves the belief that by invoking the name of Jesus during the anointing the presence of Jesus would be insured. It also signifies, as I just mentioned above, that Jesus' name was seen as a source of power for those who belong to the community. For Delling see, Die Zueignung, 44.

806 Ruck-Schröder formulates the relationship between the name of Jesus and God in 5: 15 as follows: "Diese an Gebet und Krankensalbung geknüpfte Heilszuversicht auf das Handeln Gottes hinzielt... Die Kraft Jesu, die in seinem Namen vergegenwärtigt wird, ist der heilenden und stündenvergebenden Kraft Gottes..." Ruck-Schröder views see DN/JGNT, 237.
He comments, “Die >> Rettung<< (vgl. 2.21.40.47), die an die Anrufung dieses Namens gebunden ist, umfaßt auch da leibliche Heil.” ⁸⁰⁷ The name of Jesus is not only a symbol for Jesus, or a representation of the Gospel. Rather, just as the name of Jesus opens the door to salvation, so too was it is endowed with the δόμασις to bring about physical healing.⁸⁰⁸ In effect, these two qualities are bound together, part and parcel of the same physical reality. It is unjustified therefore to separate these functions and see one as symbolic and the other as real. In point of fact, it is precisely because people could see that the name of Jesus possessed power that the opportunity was then provided to proclaim the Kerygma.⁸⁰⁹ It is in this sense, as I have written earlier, that Acts 3:16 is to be understood when the author writes, ‘It is Jesus’ name and the faith that comes through it.’⁸¹⁰ The evidence suggests the possibility that the author of James understood the case to be one where faith came through the name of Jesus when a miracle transpired after Jesus’ name was invoked.

ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON TO JEWISH AND GRECO-ROMAN MATERIALS

Accepting as an established dictum that the name of Jesus was a medium of healing we must now ask ourselves what the significance was of this function. To begin, we need to


⁸⁰⁸ The connection between physical healing and salvation is at its most visible in Peter’s speech before the Elders of Israel in Acts 4:10-12. Peter connects the dots for us when his speech ends with the following statement, “...let it be known to all of you, and to all the people of Israel, that by the name of Jesus Christ the Nazarene, whom you crucified, whom God raised from the dead by this name this man stands here before you in good health.” “He is the stone which was rejected by you, the builders, but which became the very corner stone.” “And there is salvation in no one else; for there is no other name under heaven that has been given among men, by which we must be saved [emphasis mine].” Here we see healing and salvation tied to the name of Jesus.

⁸⁰⁹ Pesch indicates this too in his treatment of Acts 4:30, where the Apostles ask God to perform miracles in the name of Jesus. See Pesch, Die Apostelgeschichte, 178. Ruck-Schröder, when examining Acts 8:12, 16 comes tantalizingly close to a similar conclusion when she states the following: “Die Verkündigung des Reiches Gottes und die wunderwirkende Kraft Jesu, die in seinem Namen present ist [emphasis Ruck-Schroder’s], gehören im Wirken der Apostel zusammen.” See DNG/JNT, 173.

⁸¹⁰ Admittedly the Greek here, ἐπερέωσεν τῷ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἡ πίστεις ἢ Ἐπερέωσεν τῷ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, is awkward. This has led to two camps when it comes to translation. The first prefers to translate αὐτοῦ as him, and this is reflected in several bible translations. The more natural, and in the context the more obvious translation is to take αὐτοῦ as referring back to τῷ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ. It is also in keeping with Peter’s comments before the Sanhedrin in Acts 4:10 when he claims that it was Jesus’ name that accomplished the healing. Commentators such as Haenchen accept this and also think that the name itself produces faith. See Ernst Haenchen, Die Apostelgeschichte, 5th ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965), 167-168. I should also point out that Ruck-Schröder also takes αὐτοῦ as referring to ‘name’ and not to Jesus, and she also takes this verse as indicating that the name itself produced faith. Certainly, if Jesus’ name is a salvific name, than we might expect that it had the power to create faith to believe for a healing. See her comments in DNG/JNT, 185-186.
remember that within Judaism YHWH is the one who grants life (Amos 5:4f.). Indeed, it is YHWH who, “kills and makes alive; He brings down to Sheol and raises up” (I Sam. 2:6). Isaiah (45: 6-7) even declares:

I am the LORD, and there is no other. 7 The One forming light and creating darkness, Causing well-being and creating calamity; I am the LORD who does all these.

The reader may recall that this section of Isaiah comes from the trial speeches of Isaiah, where God makes His most strident affirmation of His sole claim to divinity. Nestled as it is in this monotheistic section, the claim that God causes healing is really a sign of the sovereign rule of God in the affairs of the cosmos. Not only is this so, but other passages also emphasize that healing belongs to God and that it is bound up with obedience to the Mosaic covenant. In Ex. 28: 58-59 for example we find the following statement:

If you are not careful to observe all the words of this law which are written in this book, to fear this honored and awesome name, the LORD your God, 59 then the LORD will bring extraordinary plagues on you and your descendants, even severe and lasting plagues, and miserable and chronic sicknesses.

The Old Testament emphasizes yet again that YHWH is the one who heals His people as Ex. 15:26 illustrates, “…I will put none of the diseases on you which I have put on the Egyptians; for I, the LORD, am your healer.” (ἐγὼ γὰρ εἰμί κύριος ὁ θεός σέ LXX). A similar promise is attached to the conquest of Canaan where YHWH promises to those who are faithful (Ex. 23:25), “You shall serve the LORD your God, and He will bless your bread and your water; and I will remove sickness from your midst.”

The Old Testament also makes clear that Israelites were expected to seek God for healing as the narrative concerning the diseased feet of King Asa shows (II Chron. 16:12), “And in the thirty-ninth year of his reign Asa became diseased in his feet. His disease was severe, yet even in his disease he did not seek the LORD, but the physicians.” This same belief is again seen in Isa. 38:1-5. Here Hezekiah had fallen ill and immediately he turns to God who then heals him. The passage reads:

In those days Hezekiah became mortally ill. And Isaiah the prophet the son of Amoz came to him and said to him, “Thus says the LORD, ‘Set your house in order, for you shall die and not live.’” 2 Then Hezekiah turned his face to the wall, and prayed to the LORD. 3 and said, “Remember now, O LORD, I beseech Thee, how I have walked before Thee in truth and with a whole heart, and have done what is good in Thy sight.” And Hezekiah wept bitterly. 4 Then the word of the LORD came to Isaiah, saying, 5 “Go and say to Hezekiah, ‘Thus says the
LORD, the God of your father David, “I have heard your prayer. I have seen your tears; behold, I will add fifteen years to your life.

In fact, within the Old Testament almost every place where the verb ṭāḇāʾ (to heal) occurs it is YHWH who is the subject of the action.811 This nearly sole restriction to YHWH serves to underscore the fact that within Jewish piety, as it is expressed in the Old Testament, it was YHWH who was conceived of as the sole source of healing power. Of further importance is the fact that in an eschatological perspective God had promised to bring healing to His people (e.g., Isa. 29:18; 30:26; 35:5).

Now as a practical matter, we have seen in the section on healing in the name of God that Elijah evidently performed healings by invoking God through His name. This is made clear in the narrative concerning the raising of the widow’s son (I Kings 17:20-22). In the narrative it is said that Elijah, ἐπεκαλέσατο ὑπὸ τοῦ κύριου. Also, healing in God’s name is strongly hinted at in the situation of the healing of Naaman the leper (II Kings 5:1-14). We should recall that the prophet Elisha instructs Naaman to go and wash himself in the River Jordan seven times. Naaman then angrily responds (v. 11) that, “I thought [that], He will surely come out to me, and stand and call on the name of the Lord his God, and wave his hand over the place, and cure the leper.”

This same belief in the healing power of God’s name is hinted at in II Kings 1:1-17, where Ahaziah had suffered a grievous injury and then sought a miraculous cure. Ahaziah sent messengers to consult the god of Ekron (i.e., Baal-Zebub). According to the narrative YHWH sends His angel to Elijah and commands that Elijah confront the delegation from Ahaziah and state:

‘Is it because there is no God in Israel that you are going off to consult Baal-Zebub, the god of Ekron?’ ⁴ Therefore this is what the LORD says: ‘You will not leave the bed you are lying on. You will certainly die!’

These narratives strongly suggest that in matters of healing the devout Jew felt that he/she could rely upon the invocation of YHWH to bring about a cure. No doubt in many cases this was the sole option, for little competent medical help could be expected.

With these facts in mind it is rather amazing to see, as an indication of just how thoroughly the early Church had adopted a binitarian view of the divine reality, that they could

---

effortlessly refer to miracles done by the apostles as being both the result of God (Acts 15:12) and Jesus (Acts 14:3). It is also of significance that the Old Testament ascribes to the eschatological age the healing of diseases (Is. 35:5); a promise that the early Church had christologically reformulated to mean that Jesus’ advent was the beginning of the promised eschatological era, replete with healing for those who call upon the name of Jesus.

In this new age Jesus’ name was now the name that brought about healing, as well as mediating salvation. Practically speaking, in ritual, Jesus’ name now functioned as God’s name had functioned previously. In the mind of the earliest Christians, God mandated this changeover. The early Christians felt that their use of the name of Jesus was an act which glorified God, because God had worked through Jesus to bring this salvation to mankind. We have seen how Jewish piety thought of healing in God’s name, but what of the larger Greco-Roman world?

In terms of Greco-Romans conceptions, we have seen that it was a common perception that numinous names could effect many miraculous feats, healing included. What deserves special notice is the belief that one would do well to invoke the most powerful deity. Naturally the most powerful deity had the greatest ‘numen’, i.e. the power needed to force into submission the various spirits and deities. Remember too, that the Greeks and the Romans, no less than the Jews, believed that illness were caused by demons. Given that early Gentile converts invoked the name of Jesus, we can infer that they believed that Jesus was the cosmocrator, able to command all other spiritual forces, inclusive of spirits of illness. The corollary, which these Gentile Christians no doubt drew, was that Jesus, as the cosmocrator, had been elevated to a plane ordinarily reserved for God; in short, Jesus was now co-regent with God. It is truly amazing that a historical figure, especially a crucified Jew, could be seen in this light at any point in history, let alone a scant few decades after his crucifixion. In my view, the only way to account for this development is that people were moved by demonstrations of power, done in Jesus’ name, to believe that Jesus was Lord over all creation, and this belief entailed also the acceptance that Jesus’ name was now the supreme name of power.

II. The name of Jesus as a symbol for Jesus himself.

SPECIAL SCRIBAL TREATMENT OF THE NAME OF JESUS

In this section I shall review the various shards of evidence that will hopefully fill the lacuna in our knowledge of the generative processes that produced the nomina sacra, and their relevance to my study on the use of the name of Jesus. My task shall be to attempt to piece these
fragments together and build a plausible picture of the possible pathways that led to the origin of the nomina sacra. From this starting point I shall then show the christological significance of this development, and finally how this development stacks up against the Greco-Roman and Jewish materials. But before I embark on this task it would be helpful to tender a précis on the material facts about the nomina sacra.812

The ‘nomina sacra’ is the designation conferred upon a select group of approximately fifteen words which are found in various Christian codices. Each word appears to be sacred in nature and this fact was conveyed by the scribe by suspending, or contracting, the word, and concomitantly, placing a superscript line above the word. Unlike some scribal conventions of the time, which simply suspended a common word, the nomina sacra practice was at its inception highly selective in the words that were chosen; that is, the system was applied only to sacred names—not common everyday terms. Accordingly, such common griffonnages can hardly be seen as putative progenitors of the nomina sacra, a conclusion that I shall support shortly.

From a chronological vantage point the fifteen words may be conveniently grouped into three classes. The first group consists of four words which from the earliest manuscripts are treated as nomina sacra, viz. Jesus, Kyrios, God, and Christos. These four are invariably treated as nomina sacra in every extant New Testament manuscript in which the system appears. Indeed, as Roberts puts it “their universality is as striking as their antiquity.”813 To this we may add the important observation that of these four only the name of Jesus is found in suspension. This bimodal distribution may suggest that the name of Jesus was the embryonic name; that is, it was the first to be treated as a nomen sacrum.814

---


813 Ibid., 28. In Roberts’ schema these two observations merge and lead to the conclusion that the system was not built incrementally or without forethought but is the product of some centralization and input from authoritative centers within early Christianity. While the notion of central authoritative centers controlling the process is questionable, the belief that the system had input (i.e. approval) presumably from respected figures, seems possible.

814 Schuyler Brown, who believes that kyrios was the initial nomen sacrum, has not accepted Roberts’ conjecture. Brown proposes that insofar as Jesus received the divine appellation, kyrios, and insofar as this title had previously belonged to God, then when kyrios became the first nomen sacrum it follows that Jesus’ other title christos would be similarly treated. Moreover, since the title ‘Lord’ applied equally to both Jesus and God it then follows that the word theos would be included. However, this proposition can be easily dismissed for one can explain both words if we propose that Jesus’ name came first, and then at a later date other copyists who were unaware of the meaning applied the system to the whole compound name ‘Lord Jesus Christ.’ In fact, within the New Testament “Lord Jesus” occurs by my count 41 times and “Lord Jesus Christ” occurs 62 times. Thus, once
Now the second group is comprised of three words: cross, man, and Spirit. These appear almost as early as the primary four, but scribes were not consistent in their treatment of these three. Nevertheless they are found with some frequency as *nomina sacra*.

The third class comes from slightly later documents and is composed of eight words: Father (God), Son, Savior, mother (incidentally, only employed when used of the mother of Jesus), heaven, Israel, David, and Jerusalem. Within this group we find that the application of the system was haphazard and Roberts is surely correct when he remarks that the problem for the scribe was determining whether any of these words were originally thought to have had a sacred meaning. No doubt this accounts for the lack of conformity with which these words were treated.

It should also be noted that the purpose of this system was not driven by practical concerns. For example, the words most oft rendered by the method are quite diminutive. In other words, the contraction of a four-letter word (e.g. Θεός) to two letters and a superscript line does not lend itself to a considerable conservation of either time or effort. The same argument could be pressed for some of the other words (e.g. Son, man, etc.) . Certainly if space consideration was the aim then it becomes difficult to explain why other highly repetitive names such as Peter, Paul, or disciples, etc., were not treated as *nomina sacra*.

Beyond the facts that have already been highlighted we should take notice of some peculiarities of the system. First, it would seem evident that the choice of these fifteen words was driven by religious concerns. In fact, almost all of the names can readily be fitted into some convenient religious category.\(^{815}\) Even *Basileia* might be construed as having a sacred character for the imminent ‘Kingdom of God’ was a central tenet of Jesus’ eschatology. That is not, however, to deny that some names are more readily amenable to this framework than others. Israel, for instance, is not easily admitted into this group at first glance. Was it perhaps because the Church was now viewed as the Israel of God? The chosen elect? Perhaps, but in any event the preponderance of the names can be easily seen to have a certain sacred character.

---

Jesus had received this treatment other copyists in ignorance of its true meaning simply extended it to the whole name. Later yet, when others simply saw the *nomina sacra* as a system comprising sacred names the next step would have naturally been to extend this treatment to the word *theos*. This would help to explain Brown’s dictum that this first class of names are really *nomina divina* (pg. 19, see reference below). In any event, given what I shall argue shortly, that the name of Jesus was subjected to gematrical processes, we shall see that Jesus is once again to be preferred as the original member of the system. For more on Brown’s views see, Schuyler Brown, “Concerning the Origin of the Nomina Sacra,” *Studia Papyrologica* 9 (1970): 7-19.

\(^{815}\) Roberts, *Manuscripts*, 41.
Now another consideration is the question of why other words were not included? Where is the Logos or Sophia, etc.? Indeed, within Gnostic texts words such as pleroma and bathos are not treated as nomina sacra, but ‘Jesus’ is. Perhaps the answer lies in part in the fact that with few later exceptions the window of opportunity when experimentation was taking place was coming to a close by ca. 150-200 C.E.-but also because such a system was liable to abuse by ever present heterodox groups. Perhaps then, the early Church was not receptive to terms which might be readily pressed into the service of heterodox groups. Whatever the case might be, we need not let this interesting question detain us, for our main objective is to flesh out the main story lines of how the name of Jesus entered into the system.

We should also be aware that this period of experimentation, which as already noted lasted until somewhere in the second century C.E., has implications for any conclusion on how the system arose. This insight has momentous implications for our evaluation, for the nature of this early fluidity prefigures a conclusion that is supported by other lines of evidence, viz. that the lack of a fixed system of terms suggests that the nomina sacra were not derived from any antecedent Jewish scribal ortho-praxis (presumably Jewish scribes would have already selected what type of words should be treated and this would serve as the foundation for Christian practice). Further evidence for independent origins can be seen in the fact that the mode of reverential treatment accorded to the ineffable Tetragrammaton in Jewish circles (e.g. paleo-Hebraic script, or writing the letters in gold, etc.) does not seem to extend to the Christian nomina sacra. In addition, two further items stand out as supporting this conclusion. Before I take this question up, however, I shall review some other differences between the two scribal practices.

First, the Tetragrammaton was evidently never contracted in the first century.816 Secondly, as Schuyler Brown has noted, the Greek equivalent for the Tetragrammaton (i.e. kyrios) was not given special treatment either scribally, or vocally.817

In addition, as Brown also noted, most, if not all, Old Testament Greek manuscripts did not write kyrios in the place of the Tetragrammaton, but rather wrote the Tetragrammaton in


paleo-Hebrew script, or used a transliteration (i.e., πιτι), within Greek manuscripts in lieu of kyrios, to name but a few of the practices. In the one oft-cited case where the word kyrios is found in a liturgical document of the first century C.E. it is abundantly clear that kyrios was not viewed as a proper surrogate for the Tetragrammaton, and accordingly was not so treated.

Moreover, what are we to make of those words that comprise our second and third classes if we cling to a Jewish origins model? In no Jewish liturgical document are they ever accorded, let alone intimated to possess, a sacred character (including even Israel). With this in view Roberts provides decisive evidence by pointing out that of the 184 instances of kyrios (in a sacred sense), and the 109 cases of the sacred use of theos in Greek inscriptions from Palestine (which date from approximately 100 B.C.E. to 130 C.E.), not a single case can be found in contracted form.

Thus, we can concur with Roberts that the introduction of the nomina sacra system appeared in the ancient world as a truly novel scribal innovation. Following Roberts then, let us lay to rest the hypothesis of a Jewish origin and let us turn to other conjectures.

If we abandon a Jewish-origins model we must consequently embrace an independent-origins model. Indeed, several lines of evidence point toward the conclusion that the early Christians invented the practice, and at a remarkably early date. For example, this novelty is never mentioned, or even alluded to, by ancient writers. This silence is probably reflective of an early date for the inception of the nomina sacra, after the advent of the Christian faith. How is this so? If we imagine that the system was thrust upon scribes (or even developed by them) at a later date when professional scribes had taken up copying Christian manuscripts then we might expect some comment (i.e., scholium or marginalia) about what the system means and how it was implemented. The absence of any such notation suggests that the system was probably begun at an early date before the introduction of the services of professional scribes, and that

---

818 As Roberts takes note even at Qumran the Tetragrammaton was evidently almost always, written to the exclusion of Adonai. Roberts, Manuscripts, 30.

819 Ibid., 30-1. In fact, in the one case where the Tetragrammaton is written in Greek the scribe used IAΩ, its Greek equivalent. Accordingly, Roberts posits in light of this evidence that the hallmark of a Christian document is finding kyrios treated as a nomen sacrum.

820 Ibid.

821 Ibid., 34.
these later scribes viewed the *nomina sacra* as something already understood and fixed within Christian circles so that they did not feel the need to explain the system (or alternatively, the meaning of the original logic behind the system had already been lost). In any event, whatever the actual series of events, it would seem that the lack of any literary comment or any scholium is easier to explain as an artifact of an early practice and presumes an early date rather than a late date for the origin of the *nomina sacra*. Now that we have addressed this issue, what about the use of the name of Jesus at an early date?

One line of support for an early date is that so-called incipient Gnosticism presents us with suggestive evidence that the suspended form of the name of Jesus was already a relic by 140 C.E. According to Irenaeus, Valentinus and his acolytes developed a fully fleshed out doctrine seemingly based solely on the suspended form of the name of Jesus, and given the favored date for the origin of the various doctrines that some call Gnosticism, this strongly hints that the suspended form existed earlier within antecedent Christianity. In *Adv. Her.* I.III.2 Irenaeus records:

They [Valentinians] also affirm that these eighteen Aeons are strikingly indicated by the first two letters of His name [\( \text{I} \sigma \rho \text{o} \delta \text{s} \)], namely *lota* and *Eta*. And, in like manner, they assert that the ten Aeons are pointed out by the letter *lota*, which begins His name...

It is difficult to unravel whether the Valentinians developed this doctrine based solely upon the suspended form of the name of Jesus or whether they struck upon this doctrine independently (i.e., the ‘eighteen’ doctrine came first and was subsequently grafted into the gematria of the *lota-Eta* letters in Jesus’ name). There are however some considerations that seem to tilt the balance in favor of dependent origins from prior Christian speculation over the number eighteen.

If in fact the doctrine of the eighteen Aeons was derived independently it is difficult to envision how the numerical equivalence of the first two letters of Jesus name could have served as sufficient corroboration of the doctrine. Without the antecedent knowledge that the name of Jesus was represented in manuscripts by \( \text{I} \eta \), simply claiming that the first two letters of his name equals the purported number of Aeons would have had a highly artificial ring to it. It is not
easy to imagine how such an artifice would have served as a powerful authentication for the doctrine. 822

Why, for example, are there not 218 Aeons if we take the first three letters? Why not 288 Aeons if we take the first four? Without some prior precedent that the name of Jesus was represented by ‘1n any derivative doctrine would appear as a fortuitous coincidence rather than a providential signification that the doctrine was correct. Any hypothesis that embraces an independent origin for the eighteen Aeon doctrine must adequately explain how an initiate would see the cogency in the arbitrary grasping of any numerical combination of letters that coincidentally equaled the number required by the doctrine. Until this is done it would appear that the more parsimonious explanation is that the Valentinians drew upon a well-known example of the suspended name of Jesus. While there is no sure resolution of this interesting question, the most probable explanation remains that they used the suspended form of the name of Jesus as the springboard for their speculation.

Now in order to ferret out the true background for the origin of the nomina sacra I must first address the recent attempt by A. Millard to situate the origins the nomina sacra within antecedent secular scribal practices. Obviously, if Millard has succeeded where others have failed, then perhaps the invention of the nomina sacra was no invention at all.

Now since Roberts publication scant attention has been paid to explicating the origins and significance of the nomina sacra. However, Millard has attempted to clear a fresh trail in an article that tries to solve the question of the origin of the nomina sacra. Millard’s point of departure is his hypothesis that the nomina sacra practice was born and nurtured in neither Jewish nor Christian circles, but instead within secular scribal circles. Millard has unearthed some textual evidence from both Semitic and non-Semitic sources that clearly indicate that on particular occasions a word might be abbreviated, even to the point that it became customary to signify the word in question by this manner. However, Millard’s thesis fails to incorporate

822 Although made in the context of Valentinian exposition on the number 888 as a numerical cipher for the name of Jesus, Irenæus’ comments seem poignant in our context also, and might indicate evidence against my reasoning. Irenæus states, “The forced character of their calculations respecting the rest becomes clearly manifest. For choosing out of the law whatever things agree with the number adopted in their system, they thus violently strive to obtain proofs of its validity” (ad Haer. II.XXIV.2,3). If Irenæus is accurately reflecting their practices, perhaps then, the Valentinians did strike upon this doctrine independently and then seized upon the name of Jesus to corroborate it.
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satisfactorily several pivotal material issues. I shall now enumerate these various shortcomings in Millard's treatment of the data.

One problem that plagues Millard's work is that his data have been collated from disparate eras and provenances. The span of these disparities is enormous.\textsuperscript{823} He cites examples from Ebla of a contraction of the words used to signify the numbers one hundred and one thousand respectively (no doubt oft used numbers.)\textsuperscript{824} Then, Millard adduces evidence that scribes in the Old Babylonian period sometimes contracted the name of the king. Even in the Gilgamesh epic, the hero Gilgamesh, often has his name contracted to $^d$GIS from the full $^d$GIS.GIN. MAS.\textsuperscript{825}

Millard cites other examples of contraction that are to be explained as having also arisen from utilitarian considerations. For example, Millard himself notes that the predominant number of his examples taken from Punic and Phoenician texts are abbreviations of names on coins.\textsuperscript{826} It is self evident that abbreviation of a name on this medium is governed by the simple concern to fit the name within the circumference of the coin. Millard notes the paucity of similar examples on the more spacious lamellae and other tabular media used for inscriptions—a fact which strikes even the casual observer as running counter to Millard's own hypothesis.\textsuperscript{827} In fact, contraction is not even the predominant mode for rendering a reduced name. Only on coins from Byblos, and some Punic earthenware, is true contraction found. And in the case of the latter each contraction was recognizable to only the owner and several of his or her acquaintances.\textsuperscript{828}

\textsuperscript{823} Millard's work spans no less than four different eras-covering two millennia in all. The evidence is, as he puts it, "very fragmentary as no standard legal deeds, letters, administrative lists or documents...survive outside Egypt." (pg. 221) Thus, his examples are highly selective and do not constitute a formal proof for the establishment that any particular scribal school regularly practiced, let alone formalized, this process in or around the first century C.E.

\textsuperscript{824} Ibid., 221. To equate this type of numerical notation with the nomina sacra is tantamount to comparing scientific notation (e.g. $10^3=1000$) to the nomina sacra. Their functions are diametrically opposite. One is religious in nature, the other is simple arithmetic shorthand.

\textsuperscript{825} Ibid. Given the length of this name one might surmise that this name was abbreviated due to an effort to save space and time in its recording. Again, this is not a suitable model to explain the origin and function of the nomina sacra.

\textsuperscript{826} Ibid. Evidently Millard has ignored or forgotten Robert's admonition that coins by their very nature do not produce good witnesses to manuscript practices. See Roberts, Manuscripts, 31.

\textsuperscript{827} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{828} Ibid., 222.
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As a final blow against the theory, Millard has overlooked the fact that frequently the *nomen sacrum* was written with a space both before and after it in New Testament documents—hardly a practice intended to save space, and this clearly contravenes his theory.829 Thus, Millard has taken a few non-literary examples and attempted to transform them into the exemplar of our *literary nomina sacra*. Given Millard’s treatment of these examples two observations are in order.

First, what one may readily glean from these examples is that Millard has only demonstrated that scribes have on occasion resorted to contracting a name if it was so oft used in their manuscripts that it would save considerable time simply to abbreviate it. We have already seen that the use of abbreviations, following simple considerations of trying to reduce the amount of time it takes to write common words, do not explain the words that were selected for the *nomina sacra*. He has also not produced a formal solution as to how such practices transcend this utilitarian concern of the scribe, and then from this point explain the deployment of select *sacred* terms as *nomina sacra*.

Now, by the dawn of the era of our concern abbreviations were almost always by suspension, and usually produced on diminutive objects such as coins in a simple, and apparent, effort to save space.830 Within literary texts it is noteworthy that the practice is unattested before the first century C.E., and thereafter it is exceedingly rare.831 The examples which Millard adduces demonstrate several pivotal facts. The two most important for my analysis are: first, the practice was restricted to common words that the scribe was likely to encounter time and again in his transcription of his texts (thus cohering with our earlier observation that expediency was the motive for this practice); second, no systematization of any sort had taken place among scribes by the dawn of the Christian Era.832

In light of this insufficient treatment I think it best to demur from accepting Millard’s thesis. His work, while helpful in uncovering the use of abbreviations generally, has nevertheless

---

830 Ibid.
831 Ibid.
832 Ibid.
not offered either a plausible means, nor, and this is the most important omission, the religious rationale for creating the *nomina sacra*. I would maintain that the first four *nomina sacra*, viz. Lord, God, Jesus, and Christ, signal us that the motivation was strictly religious in nature, not pragmatic. Clearly, the *raison d’être* of the *nomina sacra* must be sought within the religious ambit of early Christian communities, not per se, within secular scribal circles. On any front, to begin our quest for the origin of the *nomina sacra* I must first unravel the significance of the use of the onomatomantic encryption of the name of Jesus.

That this procedure might help explain the origin of the *nomina sacra* was noted by Roberts who conjectured that perhaps the stimulus for abbreviating the name of Jesus arose through the use of gematria, as evidenced in the Epistle to Barnabas (ca. 130 C.E.). Roberts argues that the number 318 in Genesis (9:8), reflective of the number of Abraham’s household, represents both Jesus’ name (i.e. by its first two letters Ιη which equal 18), and salvation, as evidenced by the letter Τ (which equals 300), which as we know was symbolic of Jesus’ cross (and hence salvation). The passage reads:

What, then, was the knowledge given to him in this? Learn the eighteen first, and then the three hundred. The ten and the eight are thus denoted—Ten by I, and Eight by H. You have [the initials of the, name of] Jesus. And because the cross was to express the grace [of our redemption] by the letter T, he says also, “Three Hundred.” He signifies, therefore, Jesus by two letters, and the cross by one. He knows this, who has put within us the engrafted gift of His doctrine. No one has been admitted by me to a more excellent piece of knowledge than this, but I know that ye are worthy.

In a helpful commentary in the *Stromata* VI. XI Clement comments on this tradition:

They say, then, that the character representing 300 is, as to shape, the type of the Lord’s sign, and that the iota and the eta indicate the savior’s name; that it was indicated, accordingly, that Abraham’s servants were in salvation who having fled to the Sign and the Name...834

Now the very fact that the author employs gematria with the sure-footedness of someone who has the self assurance that his audience will already understand the Τ and Ιη *symbola* suggests that it was already viewed as conventional by the date of the composition of Barnabas.

---

833 The author conflated 17:27 which speaks of all of Abraham’s household being circumscribed and 14:14 which gives the number of this company as 318.

834 Another example of gematria can be gleaned from *T. Sol.* 6:8, 11:6, and 15:11, where we find gematria played out with respect to Emmanuel. Here the name yields the number 644.
(the first quarter of the second century C.E.).\textsuperscript{835} Moreover, it would be implausible to believe that the suspended form of Jesus’ name was derived from this exegesis originally. The argument is simply too arcane and would require us to believe that the early Church came up with the equation $\eta=18$ by teasing it out of this passage. It would seem much more plausible that the early Church already dabbled in onomatopoeic procedures and they had already come across the numerical significance of this abbreviation of Jesus’ name. As we shall now see, there is much more to the association between the number eighteen and Jesus’ name than we have seen here.\textsuperscript{836}

L. Hurtado has taken Roberts’ line of argumentation one step further and demonstrated that the superscript line over the \textit{nomen sacrum} follows scribal convention in designating that a word (or letter) is to read as a \textit{number}.\textsuperscript{837} Now, we have seen earlier that the earliest \textit{nomen sacrum} is probably the suspended form of the name of Jesus. The two letters together (i.e. \textit{Iota} and \textit{Eta}), as we have observed, yield a number of 18. Hurtado conjectures that the number 18 was reflective of the numerical value of the Hebrew word \textit{n}, (i.e., the word for life).\textsuperscript{838}

\textsuperscript{835} This estimation is derived from taking into account the accepted date for the epistle of ca. 100 to 140 C.E. This is to be taken in conjunction with the apparent ease and comfort with which the scribe places Jesus’ name within the system. Therefore, these findings clearly merit our taking seriously an early date for both the system itself, and Jesus’ name in particular, as the first of the \textit{nomina sacra}. It should also be noted that the Egerton Papyrus also employs a suspended form of the name of Jesus. Its date has, however, recently been reevaluated and pushed back to ca. 200-250 C.E. Still, Barnabas, corroborates Roberts’ basic premise concerning the time of origination and the order of the names as they entered into the system.

\textsuperscript{836} Further evidence for this tradition can be found with Valentinus. Later Valentinians in fact suggested that the number eighteen was reflective of the fact that Jesus’ last stay on earth lasted 18 months. Dornseiff cites Usener as his source for this information. See \textit{Das Alphabet}, 131. Dornseiff does not cite a page number but he quotes from Usener’s \textit{Weihnachtsfest} just before this, citing page 23. It is not readily apparent from Dornseiff’s quotation exactly what these later Valentinians had in mind but the example that it furnishes suffices to illustrate the abiding interest in the number eighteen.


\textsuperscript{838} So Erich Bischoff, \textit{Die Mystik und Magie der Zahlen} (Berlin: Hermann Barsdorf Verlag, 1920), 225. Of possible interest is Bischoff’s claim that the name of David was rendered as 18 in kabalistic gematria in spite of the fact that the Vav normally counted as 6 and not 10. If the roots of this variant reach into the first century then perhaps the number 18 came to symbolize a Son-of-David christology, as well as life. As for the general import of the concept of life in both biblical and non-biblical religions of the Near East see Ernst Percy, \textit{Untersuchungen über den Ursprung der Johannistheologie: Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Frage nach der Entstehung des Gnostizismus} (Lund: Gleerupiska Universitetsbokhandeln, 1939), 307-340. Further insight on what a “life” theology may have involved comes from the Mandaean religion. Here, as in Judaism, the concept of life was sacred and the word itself came to designate the Lord of the world of light. This is clearly seen in the numerous Mandaean incantation bowls where the adherent performs the rites in the name of Life. In this context, it is most interesting to observe that the Mandaean baptismal ect held cultic acts to be the fountain of salvation—a belief not generally in keeping with Gnostic
In summation, we have viewed several possible avenues for the origin of the nomina sacra. When all is said and done, it seems to me that the gematria model put forth by L. Hurtado holds the most promise. While Roberts’ conjecture of ΑΩ imagery underwriting the practice of writing the contracted form of the name of Jesus is interesting it leaves unanswered both why the suspended form arose, and more telling, it fails to explain the fact that the first nomen sacra was, as far as we can tell, the suspended form of Jesus’ name. These same shortcomings are found in the other options I listed. Also, only a numerical model can explain the bi-modal distribution of Jesus’ name (i.e. suspended and contracted). I shall now turn to my analysis of the significance of the special scribal treatment of the name of Jesus.

**ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON WITH GRECO-ROMAN AND JEWISH MATERIALS**

We have covered several different pathways which might explain the origin of the nomina sacra. But what does this special scribal treatment mean? And how does it compare with Greco-Roman and Jewish materials? This latter question needs to be addressed first before we can come to any conclusions about the meaning and function of the nomina sacra.

In terms of Jewish practices, we saw in the section on the Jewish materials that God’s name was accorded special scribal treatment. The methods by which this special treatment was achieved were variable however. At times the divine name was written in paleo-Hebrew, sometimes it was offset and written in gold letters. Other techniques included separating the divine name from the sentence by adding extra empty spaces before and after the Name, abbreviating the divine name (נ) or by substituting dots for the Name. As variable as these treatments were, their meaning and function were not. Basically, these special scribal methods were designed to signify that the divine name was holy, and, correspondingly, it was not to be treated in a cavalier fashion. In the case of the use of paleo-Hebrew, another concern may have been to write the Name in a form that was not readily discerned by the common person and this thought but completely harmonious with Jewish beliefs especially its emphasis on water baptism and lustrations. This has led Rudolph, among others, to suggest that Mandaeism’s roots can be traced to Jewish soil. This is not surprising as the Mandaeans derive from a milieu rife with Jewish and Jewish-Christian baptismal sects. See Hermann Lichtenberger, “Synkretistische Züge in jüdischen und judenchristlichen Taufbewegungen,” in Jews and Christians: The parting of the ways A.D. 70 to 135, ed. James D.G. Dunn, (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1992), 95 and Kurt Rudolph, Gnosis, The Nature and History of Gnosticism, Trans. Robert McL. Wilson, (San Francisco: Harper, 1987), 360. For insight into the role which the term ‘life’ plays in Johannine theology see Percy, Untersuchungen über den Ursprung der Johanneischen Theologie, 307-340.

For the interested reader I include some other conjectures in Appendix Seven.
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in turn would prohibit the proper articulation of the Name in cases of misuse (especially in magic). Of course, this is nothing more than speculation. What remains certain is that scribes treated the divine name in a fashion, which signified its holy and exalted status. Having brought to mind these basics facts, let us turn to the *nomina sacra*.

It should be clear that the impetus which generated the creation of the *nomina sacra* were quite different from the factors which drove the scribal treatment of the divine Name. Moreover, the actual system was a *de novo* invention by the early Church. Hurtado, in fact, has drawn attention to the fact that the system was the first tangible material evidence for an emergent Christian material culture. Additionally, the factors which underwrote this system were different from the Old Testament scribal practices concerning the name of God. In the case of the latter, the concern which fueled its use was that of sanctification of the Name. In short, the scribes put up a ‘hedge’ around the Name so to speak, to keep it from being profaned. With respect to the name of Jesus we find an altogether different situation. In the case of Christianity, there was no prohibition concerning the articulation of the name of Jesus. Nonetheless, if Hurtado is correct about the numerical significance of the name of Jesus, then it was onomatomantism (which has as one of its manifestations gematria) which brought about the creation of the *nomina sacra*, not per se any attempt to put up a hedge around the name of Jesus’ along the exact same lines as the Tetragrammaton, but perhaps this is a difference without a distinction. Was not Jesus’ name seen to be special, if not divine, *because* (in part) of the ‘truths’ uncovered by gematrial treatment? Let us look a bit closer at this now.

Clearly, the earliest Christians believed that they had uncovered a profound truth about Jesus himself in the ‘numbers’ of Jesus’ name, both in its suspended *nomen sacrum* form, and its full form (i.e., the name ‘Jesus’ equals 888). Now since the first *nomen sacrum* derives from Greco-Roman numerological conventions, I will need therefore to look a bit deeper into the meaning of the number which Jesus’ name signifies in order to uncover just what some of these truths were.

As regarding the number 888, in order to apprehend correctly its significance we must take into account the structural framework that makes up the backbone of the Book of Revelation. More pointedly, I refer here to the purposeful antinomies that the writer constructed

---

840 Hurtado, “The Origin of the Nomina Sacra,” 672.
between Jesus and the beast. A schematic will allow us to rapidly comprehend the antithetic parallelism.

**BEAST**

1) The beast is killed, but is resurrected (13: 3; 12)

2) The beast comes in his parousia (13:1)

3) The beast, “was and is not and will come” (17: 8)

4) The beast will place his name upon the forehead of his followers (13:16-17:14:11)

5) The beast has ten diadems (13:1) and each head had a blasphemous name.

**JESUS**

Jesus died and was resurrected (1:5)

Jesus comes in his parousia (19:11-16).

Jesus is described in similar fashion (1:4 )

The name of Jesus and the Father is to be placed upon the forehead of the elect (3:2; 14:1; 22:4).

Jesus wears many diadems which have a secret name written upon them (19:12).

What do these antinomies indicate? Well, first, we need to observe that the well known, but cryptic reference in Rev.13:18 “[this] calls for wisdom: let anyone calculate the number of the beast, for it is the number of a person. Its number is six hundred sixty six” seems to suggest the possibility of the application of *isopsephism* given the apposition between these two figures.841

Now, it is widely recognized that the number of the beast is probably a numerical cipher for Nero.842 The name Νερός Καίσαρ, when written in Hebrew characters, equals 666. Bauckham, however, trenchantly noted that the name of the beast (θηρίων), when translated into Hebrew (יַזְרָה), and then subjected to onomatopoeic procedures, yields the number 666—the same number as the man.843 Thus, the number of the beast is the number of the man.

If this position is correct then the writer is saying, *in nuce*, that Nero, and all that he represents (i.e. Roman power, the pagan system of worship, etc.) is ‘beastly’; that is, he belongs to the present evil world. If this is true, what then are we to make of such a conflation? To answer this we must first recognize that the parlance of the author, and most probably his readers, was derived from the rich symbolic palette that is the imagery of the Old Testament, and

841 *Isopsephism* is the procedure whereby two words are shown to be connected (or even the same) because they share the same numerical values.


843 Ibid., 389.
this is where we need to look to find our answer. Others though, such as Richard Bauckham, propose other backdrops to this narrative. I shall look at this now.

Bauckham proposes that the symbolism comes from a complex association of Pythagorean number symbolism.\textsuperscript{844} It is at this juncture that I must part company with Bauckham, for while Bauckham finds meaning in these tangled numerical complexes, his construct rests upon the proposition that John, or his audience, were well versed in Pythagorean number theory. It seems to me that it is improbable that at this most foundational connection in the author’s narrative web (signaled no doubt by this crucial linguistic hinge; ὅ ἐξ ὁμοῦ νοου Ἰησοῦ τοῦ τῷ Ἀποστόλου τῷ Ἰησοῦ) the author suddenly leaps from the primary colors of the Old Testament, with which he paints his picture elsewhere to the darker, or should I say murkier colors of Pythagorean mathematical theory. Given this conclusion, I must turn instead to the more proximal realm of Jewish number symbolism.

At this point I must submit that it is no mere coincidence that the number of the beast (i.e., 666) is so appropriately aligned with the name of Jesus (which equals 888). Perhaps these numerical equivalents are intended to function over and against one another in a sort of inverse isopsephism. Such an antinomy comports well with what we have already seen of the author’s narrative style. With this in mind let us take a quick inventory of Jewish and Christian number symbolism and what it might tell us about the meaning of the numbers 666 and 888.

The number six is the number associated with the first creation. It was on the sixth day that God rested from His creative endeavors (Gen. 2: 2). Philo, who is otherwise enamored with Pythagorean number symbolism, nevertheless reverts to Genesis when he speaks of the creation and says, “And the world was created under the number six.”\textsuperscript{845}

In contrast, the number eight is symbolic of the new creation.\textsuperscript{846} What is really being expressed here is that Jesus was, by the reckoning of the Jewish calendar system, raised on the

\textsuperscript{844} Ibid., 390-4. Bauckham finds corroboration for his theory in v. 17:11, where Nero is, ‘of the seven,’ but is also ‘an eighth.’ Bauckham proposes that since 666 is the eighth “doubly triangular” number in Pythagorean number symbolism, the text therefore, speaks of Nero as an ‘eighth.’ It seems to me that a more parsimonious explanation is that the Nero redivivus legend would make the resurrected Nero ‘the eighth’ Caesar although originally he was “of the seventh.” In any event, for further details of Bauckham’s views see Bauckham, The Climax, 395-6.

\textsuperscript{845} Quae. et Sol. Gen., 2.17.

\textsuperscript{846} See Willy Rordorf, Sunday; the history of the day of rest and worship in the earliest centuries of the Christian church, trans. by A. A. K. Graham from the German, (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1968), 276 and 247
eighth day. As the first-fruits of the new creation, Jesus represents the incorruptible new era: its resplendent glory and holiness, which are traits of the new age. Mimicking Philonic phraseology, we might say that the number eight is the number under which God has created the new creation, and Jesus’ name, is the ‘true name’ which symbolizes the new creation for its number is 888.\textsuperscript{847}

We find further evidence for this belief by the end of the first century C.E. when the so-called Lord’s Day was also metaphorically named ‘the eighth day’ for precisely the reasons cited above.\textsuperscript{848} Its deep symbolic significance is made clear in The Epistle to Barnabas (15:8), where the author pushes the idea that God had annulled the old dispensation with the new order, whose metaphysical siglum was the number eight. God begins his comparison with the Sabbath:

Your present Sabbaths are not acceptable to Me, but that is which I have made, [namely this] when, giving rest to all things, I shall make a beginning of the eighth day, that is, a beginning of another world [emphasis mine]. Wherefore, also, we keep the eighth day with joyfulness, the day also on which Jesus rose again from the dead.

Justin (Dialogue 41.4) also conceives of the eighth day as symbolic of the uprooting of the old order, in this case, however, he targets circumcision and says:

The command of circumcision bidding always circumcise the children on the eighth day, was a type of the true circumcision, by which we are circumcised...through him who rose from the dead on Sunday ...For Sunday, remaining the first of all days, is called however the eighth...and [yet] remains the first...

And again, at Dialogue 24, Justin says:

Now, sirs,...it is possible for us to show how the eighth day possessed a certain mysterious import, which the seventh day did not possess, and which was promulgated by God through these rites. [circumcision]


\textsuperscript{847} The symbolic significance of the number eight must surely come from Jewish mystical circles. Attempts to derive its import from contemporary Greco-Roman numerology seem doomed to frustration. As Staats has pointed out, with the possible exception of one reference in Plato (Resp. 10.616), the only Greco-Roman authors who discuss the symbolism of the number are Theon of Smyrna (ca. second century C.E.) and Macrobius (ca. fourth century C.E.), and both of these are too late to serve as sources. Moreover, Pythagoras thought that arithmetic and the musical scale taught that the number eight was not a ‘complete number’ (Problem, 2.47; Ideler., 1.65)! Given the paucity of any citations concerning the number eight, combined with the chronologically late examples which are extant, we must conclude that this evidence seems to imply that efforts to derive its significance from Greco-Roman speculation will prove fruitless. For further insight see Reinhart Staats, “Ogdoas als ein Symbol für die Auferstehung,” Vigiliae Christianae 26.1 (1972): 37-38.

\textsuperscript{848} Ibid., 277.
Justin later on (Dialogue138), makes the comparison between the salvation which Noah experienced and its symbolic representation of the saving day of the Resurrection and the number eight. He writes:

By this which God said was meant that the mystery of saved men appeared in the deluge. For righteous Noah, along with the other mortals at the deluge, i.e., with his own wife, his three sons and their wives, being eight in number, were a symbol of the eighth day, wherein Christ appeared when He rose from the dead, for ever the first in power. Of further interest, in a very cryptic passage in the *Stromata* (VI. XVI), Clement attempts to unpack non-orthodox (i.e. Gnostic) exegetical techniques which employ number symbolism.

After addressing the Transfiguration, Clement quite abruptly takes up the theme of the incarnation and says that some of the non-orthodox maintain that:

...while He [Jesus] by His birth, which was indicated by the sixth conspicuously marked [being born in the old order?], becoming the eighth [the resurrected Jesus?: emphasis mine], might appear to be God in the body of flesh, by displaying his power being indeed numbered as a man [emphasis mine], but by being concealed as to who he was.

Ignatius in his *Epistle to the Magnesians* IX, where he unfolds his understanding of the significance of the eighth day and Jesus’ resurrection, writes:

And after the observance of the Sabbath, let every friend of Christ keep the Lord’s Day as a festival, the resurrection-day, the queen and chief of all the days [of the week]. Looking forward to this, the prophet declared, “To the end, for the eighth day,” on which our life both sprang up again, and the victory over death was obtained in Christ...

This same line of reasoning also crept into Valentinian theology with the introduction of the Ogdoad, which was also considered synonymous with the ‘the Lord’s Day.’

The fact that both heterodox and orthodox groups produced doctrines which coalesced around the Ogdoas seems to indicate a date for the origin of the Ogdoas doctrine at a relatively early date. If this tentative conclusion is correct then the Ogdoas doctrine must have arisen by no later than the last half of the first century C.E. within Christian circles.

---

849 Cf. 1 Peter 3: 20-21.
850 Clement’s *Excerpta ex Theodoto*, 589.
851 A quick perusal may lead one to posit that the Ogdoas doctrine was given birth in Gnostic circles. But this conclusion is marred by the utilization of the Ogdoas doctrine in the heavily anti-Gnostic polemical work, *Epistula apostolorum* where it is said that Jesus claims, “I have been in the Eight-ness, which is the Κύπρος.” As quoted in Staats, “Ogdoas als ein Symbol für die Auferstehung,” 36. Staats does not cite the passage, but rather Carl Schmidt’s, *Gespräche Jesu mit seiner Jüngern nach der Auferstehung*, TU 43, (Leipzig, 1919), 61. The line that I cite is my English rendition of the German translation given in Staats.
In any event, if we are in fact following the correct trail then the juxtaposition of 666 to 888 reflects the various antinomies that the author has erected between the beast and Jesus. 1) Unlike Jesus, the beast belongs to the first creation, and thus he cannot, and will not, be resurrected. Although some fancy him as an “eighth” (Rev. 17:11) after his resurrection, he is but of this creative order and thus he is a “seventh,” and accordingly, he is not the inaugurator of the divine Kingdom; 2) Because the beast is a creature he is not worthy to be worshipped, whereas Jesus, being the first born of the new creation (cf. Col.1:18; 1 Cor. 15:20, 23) is worthy of obeisance.

Moreover we can also add, and this would be of signal importance to Greek proselytes to Christianity, that the numerical equivalent for the name of Jesus 888 shows it to be a “true” name—a name which has been enfranchised with potent (magical?) dynamis. As an aside, it is interesting to note that all of this is reminiscent of the latter speculation in Talmudic Judaism where Metatron was ‘shown’ to be a sort of ‘lesser’ God because the numerical rendering of his name equaled Shaddai (i.e., 314). With this said, I will summarize the meaning and significance of the special scribal treatment of the name of Jesus.

One reason why the name of Jesus was thought to be worthy of special scribal treatment is due to the birth of a resurrection christology. This christology was first rooted in the ministry and position, as well as the resurrection itself, and then ‘discovered’ in the very name of Jesus. This christology maintained that since Jesus was the first born from the dead, and subsequently raised to God’s right hand, he was now the Lord of life—including eternal resurrected life. The gematria (i.e., 18), and the christology which it supported, conferred upon the name of Jesus a special sacred character. Although the process may have begun in gematrial speculation which revealed a distinct christology; a christology rooted in the belief that Jesus was divine, it nonetheless quickly lost its gematrial moorings and ended up mimicking the intent of the Jewish scribal treatment accorded to the Tetragrammaton; that is, Jesus’ name was simply seen as sacred quite apart from gematrial maneuvers and it was treated accordingly. Likewise, the gematria on the full name of Jesus (i.e. 888), although not a part of the nomina sacra, also suggests that the...
name of Jesus was seen as divine and worthy of special scribal treatment. Thus, the name of Jesus was treated with the same reverence that the divine name received, and this suggests that Jesus was believed to be part of the divine reality.

**CONFESSING OR DENYING THE NAME OF JESUS**

Another striking use of the name of Jesus can be seen in the contention of the early Church that the name of Jesus was to be confessed or acknowledged. The obvious counterpart to this is denying the name of Jesus. As Justin makes plain (*Dialogue with Trypho*, 30), the Christian is one who is made manifest by “…the fact that…threatened with death, we do not deny his name.”

Now before I take up the individual citations it would be worthwhile to look at the meaning of the term “confession.” I shall adhere, with some loose alterations, to the outline delivered by Neufeld in his now classic work *The Earliest Christian Confessions*.\(^{855}\)

In essence, a confession, at least as it is found in classical Hebrew sources [i.e. ננ] connotes agreement or correspondence between persons or things.\(^{856}\) In similar fashion, in the Greek world the noun form [ομολογία], as early as a Herodotus and Thucydides, also conveyed the meaning of agreement, including, within political contexts, the meaning of a compact (i.e. treaties).\(^{857}\) In the papyri the word group often takes on legal outlines and means essentially the making of a legal contract or agreement.\(^{858}\)

Now the use of the term *homologein* within the Septuagint, where it occurs 23 times, is hardly fixed. Within the Septuagint the term is rather fluid and was used to translate four different Hebrew words.\(^{859}\) New nuances, such as to make a vow or create an oath, were coined using the word *homologia* or its compounds. Among its compounds *exhomologia* becomes

---

854 Other Christian texts also attest to confessing the name of Jesus. Justin, in his *Dialogue* (39), describes Christians as those “who confess the name of Christ until he come again.”


856 Ibid., 13.

857 Ibid., 14.

858 Ibid.

859 Ibid.
increasingly used to signify praise or thanksgiving when suitable. In spite of this, there are significant exceptions where in certain texts homologia means to confess openly or proclaim (e.g., Tobit 12: 22; 13: 3; II Macc. 7: 37). As Neufeld points out, the new meaning of praise or thanksgiving is derivative in nature; coming as it does from the basic meaning of 'acknowledge' or 'admit openly,' a meaning implied also in the Hebrew word פִּגְרָה. In point of fact, Neufeld states that "the meaning of εὐχαριστοῦν is basically to declare openly, as seen predominantly in the Septuagint."

Not surprisingly, the religious nuances of the word rarely entered into non-Jewish or non-Christian literature.863

We find that within early Christian literature all the expected semantic baggage from the Septuagint has been carried over but with one important difference, viz. the term increasingly is utilized with specific reference to expressing a particular emphasis on "confessing Christ."864 and, "the homologia represented the agreement or consensus in which the Christian community was united, that core of essential conviction and belief to which Christians subscribed and openly testified. The homologia was the admission and acknowledgement of the individuals' loyalty to Jesus Christ, and as such represented a personal testimony of his faith. The homologia was the confession of Jesus with specific reference to his person or work, and was therefore christological in character [emphasis mine]."865 Not unexpectedly, this christological orientation led to the development where the word group became deeply associated with the term 'martyr,' for the Christian confession itself led to persecution. Even early on, according to Jn. 9:22, the Jews expelled those who publicly confessed Jesus as the Messiah. This sense of 'confessing' in the face of hostile witnesses is even claimed to have taken place in the trial of Jesus, for as I Tim. 6: 13 states concerning Jesus' behavior during his trial, "Christ Jesus, who testified the good confession before Pontius Pilate."

860 Ibid., 14. Indeed it occurs in over 100 instances with the meaning of praise or giving thanks. See also Pg. 15.
861 Ibid., 15.
862 Ibid., 16.
863 Ibid., 7.
864 Ibid., 20.
Yet another type of confession was ‘to bear witness’ in a legal or religious sense. Found in the Gospel tradition, and highly nuanced there, it occurs in Lk. 12:8 and Mt. 10:32. For example, Jesus demands confession of himself, and in turn Jesus will confess to the Father those who confess him; in short, he becomes their eschatological witness to the Father at the end time judgment.

Given the stated intent in several New Testament passages that Christians should identify with Christ in his suffering, and bear up under the same abuse that he suffered, we can see that this call to suffering accords well given the historical fact that the mere confession of the name was a source of persecution directed toward Christians. On any showing Neufeld’s conclusion that “the homologia has the function of promoting or preserving faithfulness in a time of difficulty and persecution” has repercussions for how we understand those confessions which have the name of Jesus as their object.\(^{86}\)

Another use was in the making of solemn statements of faith; that is, to confess something in faith. For example, Rom. 10:9-10 (cf. Dt. 30:14) links faith and confession (cf. 2 Cor. 4:13). Confession and proclamation stem from faith. In the view of the early Church, confession is an eschatological responsibility of Christians (e.g., 1 Cor. 4:14) and holds out the promise of eschatological salvation (Rom. 10:9-10; cf. Acts 23:8).

Yet another type of confession is where a person confesses sins (1 Jn. 1:9; cf. the opposite action in 1:8). Similarly, in Rom. 14:11-12 Paul develops this use of confession when he says:

> It is written: ‘“As surely as I live,” says the Lord, every knee will bow before me; every tongue will confess to God.”

So then, each of us will give an account of himself [confess their actions or sins] to God.

Indeed, before Jesus, the message of the Baptist involved public confession of sin as an integral component of conversion (e.g., Mk. 1:5; par.; cf. James 5:16; Acts 19:18).

Of all the uses of confession, none were more significant than its adoption in the cultic sense of ‘to confess’ (e.g. Phil. 2:11; Rev. 4:8, 11; 5:9ff.; 12:10). This cultic and religious sense is very prominent in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and it would be helpful to take a look at how the concept of confession functions in this Epistle.

\(^{86}\) Ibid., 137.
Neufeld has observed that *homologia* serves a different function in Hebrews than the rest of the New Testament. Neufeld notes that in the Epistle to the Hebrews *homologia* is not to acknowledge something presented in the Epistle but it is rather adherence to a *homologia* which was already known to the readers.\(^{866}\) Indeed, the expression, ‘to cling to,’ in 4:14 and, ‘to hold fast to’ in 10:23, signify something that they already adhere to; not something that they are to begin to believe in. It is interesting to note with reference to the Epistle to the Hebrews the extraordinary significance that the term “confess,” and its variants, play. For example in 3:1 the author speaks of Jesus as the “object of our confession (ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν),” while in 4:14 the term confession stands for the entire Christian faith and is something that they must cling to (Ἐχόντες οὖν ἀρχιερέα μέγαν διελκυθώτα τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, Ἰησοῦν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, κρατώμεν τῆς ὁμολογίας). Although interesting, these passages do not directly show us what confession of Jesus' name means, so I shall take up this issue now.

Interestingly, the expression ‘confess the name of Jesus,’ is nowhere found in the New Testament.\(^{867}\) One of the earliest references (although it speaks of the name 'Christ') is found in Justin's *First Apologia* 45, where we find that confessing the name of Christ is not only the boundary marker which indicates those who belong to the Christian community, but also serves as a cause of persecution. Justin states that the believing community everywhere both embraces, and teaches, confession of the name of Christ. Here there is little doubt that Justin's reference should be read in light of the earliest Christian confession, viz. Jesus is Lord (Rom. 10:9).

Another instructive passage, albeit in a completely different fashion, is found in Irenaeus' *Adv. Haer.* 4.17.6. Irenaeus picks up a line of argumentation that is strikingly similar to that employed by the author of the Gospel of John. Unlike John, however, Irenaeus contends that the name of the Son belongs to the Father and demonstrates unification between the Father and the Son (whereas the author of John, at 17:26, states that Jesus ‘knows’ the Father’s name; another way of saying that Jesus and the Father are unified). In the case of Irenaeus, he claim’s that the Father also confesses the name of Jesus to be his own: a claim in keeping with the traditions of

---

\(^{866}\) Ibid., 136.

\(^{867}\) It is not clear whether Rom. 10:9 should be taken to imply confession of the *name* of Jesus, rather than confess his lordship over creation. The text reads: ὅτι ἐὰν ὁμολογήσῃς ἐν τῷ στόματί σου κύριον Ἰησοῦν καὶ πιστεύσῃς ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου ὅτι ὁ θεός αὐτῶν ἤθελεν ἐκ περιφρών αὐθήσῃ. It seems to me that the natural sense is to confess the lordship of Jesus, rather than his name. Of course, to confess the Name, is to confess Jesus’ lordship, so perhaps some connection exits. Might the confession in Rom. 10:9 form the springboard for the later confession of the name of Jesus?
the Church. The Father does so because the name of Jesus is actually His own. Here Irenaeus, co-opting the passage in Malachi which speaks of sacrifices to the divine name, points out that offerings in the form of prayers are offered to God, based in part on the rationale that “the name of the Son belongs to the Father.” Given the conflation between Jesus and the Tetragrammaton in the claim that the name of Jesus is God’s very own name, then the passage in Malachi can be construed as meaning that the name of Jesus is not only the medium through which sacrifices are offered to God but also the accepted symbolon for God himself. Irenaeus states:

But what other name is there which is glorified among the Gentiles than that of our Lord, by whom the Father is glorified…because it is [the name] of His own Son, who was made man by Him. He calls it His own. Just as a king, if he himself paints a likeness of his son, is right in calling this likeness his own, for both these reasons, because it is [the likeness] of his son, and because it is his own production; so also does the Father confess the name of Jesus Christ, which is throughout all the world glorified in the Church, to be His own [emphasis mine] both because it is that of His Son, and because He who thus describes it gave Him for the salvation of men. Since, therefore, the name of the Son belongs to the Father, and since in the omnipotent God the Church makes offerings through Jesus Christ, He says well on both these grounds, "And in every place incense is offered to My name, and a pure sacrifice." Now John, in the Apocalypse, declares that the "incense" is "the prayers of the saints [emphasis mine]."

With these examples and definitions in hand let us turn to analyzing this act of confession in light of comparative examples.

ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON TO JEWISH AND GRECO-ROMAN MATERIALS

Within a Jewish context acknowledgement or confessing the name of YHWH is paralleled in several interpertestamental Jewish texts. For example, the Ladder of Jacob 7:35 speaks of “those who acknowledge His name will not be ashamed.” Although derived from the Christian interpolation portion of II Esdras, a similar thought concerning the name of God is found at II Esdras 2:45, which states the following concerning those who have cast off their mortal coil and now praise God:

He answered and said unto me. These be they that have put off the mortal clothing, and put on the immortal, and have confessed the name of God: now are they crowned, and receive palms…

The reader may recall that Josephus speaks of confessing God in the legal sense, over and against a similar confession for Caesar. Josephus was referring here to the Jewish martyrs who, though wracked with pain and subjected to untold horrors, refused to confess that Caesar was
Indeed, it is exactly in this same sense that the passage in Isa. 26:13 rings out, "O LORD our God, other masters besides You have ruled us; But through You alone we confess Your name." By refusing to confess the name of Caesar, the martyrs were confirming that they belong to YHWH (=follow) alone. The name functions here as a symbol for God as well as the religious beliefs of the community. By confessing the Name, the Jew was confessing his allegiance to YHWH devotion, and to the covenantal relationship which God had instituted.

In a more polemically tainted passage, Josephus (BJ 7.417-418) refers to the Jewish refusal to acknowledge Caesar as Lord (cf. 2 Macc. 7:37). He describes them as those:

Whose courage, or whether we ought to call it madness, or hardiness in their opinions, everybody was amazed at; (418) for when all sorts of torments and vexations of their bodies that could be devised were made use of them, they could not get anyone of them to comply so far as to confess or seem to confess, that Caesar was their lord; but they preserved their own opinion, in spite of all the distress they were brought to, as if they received these torments and the fire itself with bodies insensible of pain, and with a soul that in a manner rejoiced under them.

Now something similar stands behind the narrative in Acts 19:28, where Paul the apostle is confronted in the theatre of Ephesus with the chant, "Great is Artemis of the Ephesians!" This chant is certainly a religious confession in its fullest sense. We can see here, that a religious confession can encapsulate in some fashion the beliefs of a group concerning some aspect of their deity.

Further uses of the term are seen in cases where one confesses-sometimes in the name of another-that one had transgressed in some manner and now seeks repentance and reconciliation. This usage was framed in such a fashion so as to emphasize the role which the divine name played in such confessions. For example, in 1 Kings 8:35 we read of Solomon interceding for Israel, and he asks God to hear His people when they pray toward the Temple because it is the place "which you said, My Name shall be there." Solomon then goes on to importune God to forgive Israel when they repent and confess His name:

When the heavens are shut up and there is no rain, because they have sinned against Thee, and they pray toward this place and confess Thy Name [emphasis mine] and turn from their sin.

---

868 BJ 7.417-418; cf. 2 Macc. 7:37.
Similar examples of this phenomenon are found, as we have already seen, in II Chron. 6:24 and I Ki 8:33, to name but a few. We know also that in later Judaism confession of sin was paired with penitential prayer. Great men of the past publicly confessed their guilt (e.g., Dan. 9:1ff.; Jdt. 9:1ff., etc.). This confession was naturally a function of repentance before God.\(^{869}\)

Finally, we should recall that Intertestamental Judaism claimed that only those who confessed God’s name would receive divine power (e.g., Psalms of Solomon 15.2). Here, the Name serves as a symbol for God Himself. It also symbolizes the power which resides within God. Moreover, because the person who confesses God’s name belongs to God he/she can be authorized to receive God’s power (cf. Jn. 1:12). Within early Christian texts there are no passages that I am aware of which state explicitly that only those who confess Jesus’ name will receive power. As a practical matter, however, as the miracles in the Book of Acts demonstrate, only those who confess Jesus (=confessing his name) receive power from God. Such confession contains within itself the objective of acknowledging the power and the exclusive salvation of Jesus.

Taken altogether, it is clear that for the Torah-faithful the Name was the preeminent source of authority, forgiveness and access to God. Indeed, it was a symbol for God Himself. Not surprisingly then, these various functions placed the Name at the very heart of cultic activities. By mediating access to God, the Name had to be placed, by necessity, at the very core of the cultus. For the very essence of the cultus is to be a setting whereby God and man are brought together. This placement makes it all the more remarkable that the name of Jesus came to play this same role in the Christian cult. Replacing God’s name with Jesus is very surprising given the place of confession in monotheistic religions. Let us look at this side of the question briefly.

In a monotheistic context, the central role of confession in establishing the foundations of monotheistic scruples cannot be overstated. Gladigow, in his review of confession in polytheistic religions, comments that “Der Gedanke der Konversion (und Konfession) ist den Polytheistischen Religionen grundsätzlich fremd.” This stands in contrast to so-called universal (=monotheistic) religions where Gladigow makes note that:

\(^{869}\) The most salient example of this is the example in Joseph and Aseneth 15:7, which was cited earlier in the Jewish section. Here confessing the Name (=repenting in the Name) for the expiation of sins is couched in very mythopoetic language, with Repentance depicted as a particularizing manifestation of God who petitions God on behalf of those “who repent in the name of the Most High.”
Als Universalreligionen...prophetische Universalreligionen-werden dann Mandaismus, Israelitische Religion, Christentum und Islam aufgeführt; sie alle besassßen...confessorische Formeln, die den 'Wesenkern' der Religion zusammenfassten.\textsuperscript{870}

In a society where a multiplicity of gods was thought to exist, to confess but one god as 'true' is the essential transition point from polytheism to monotheism. I do not go too far in claiming that in some respects confession is a hallmark of monotheistic religions. Such religions formulate their confessions to encapsulate their core beliefs. How striking then, that the earliest Christians could shift the focus from confessing God's name to Jesus (or even Christ)! With these facts in mind, I shall turn now to some particular Christian uses of confession.

One particularly powerful aspect of confessing the name of Christ was that the believer insured his/her salvation. According to Irenaeus (\textit{Adv. Haer.} 3.18) Jesus will confess before God only those who confess his name:

For He promised to confess before His Father those who should confess His name before men; but declared that He would deny those who should deny Him, and would be ashamed of those who should be ashamed to confess Him.

This passage makes clear that confessing the name of Jesus can be a \textit{salvific} act. By confessing Jesus' name the confessor insures that Jesus will acknowledge him/her before God in the eschatological judgement. Given that Jewish piety had always maintained that only the name of God should be confessed, the use of Jesus' name in Christian confession means that Christian confession takes on a powerful christological hue. By confessing Jesus' name one confesses that the name of Jesus is the name which fulfils the promise of Joel 3:5 (LXX).

In conclusion, we can say that confessions, by their very nature, define, organize, and summarize, sacred perceptions and affiliations. Given this truth, the early Christian practice of confessing the very name of Jesus takes on a highly significant \textit{christological} character. Of great interest is that never in my own research did I find an example of this phenomenon directed toward any other mediator figure in Second Temple Judaism. In effect, to confess the name of Jesus (or Christ) is a phenomenon unparalleled in Second Temple Judaism with respect to any other being except God.

Now in terms of group dynamics, confession binds the community and allows for its cohesion. It is the highest form of religious discourse and distils and linguistically codifies the truth claims of the community. Phenomenologically speaking, it usually finds its home at the very center of the cultus. Indeed, the fact that the early Church confessed the name of Jesus rather than YHWH constitutes an undisputable formal proof that the earliest Christians had taken up a binitarian pattern of cultic devotion in their ritual practices. Indeed, to "confess" the name of Jesus was one mode whereby they confessed God.

And, of course, the act of confessing the name of Jesus was a christological act which was as significant in the Christian cult, as confessing the name of God in the Jewish cult. This decisive break from prior Jewish scruples concerning confessing only the name of YHWH demonstrates the christological significance of this phenomenon.

III. The name of Jesus in salvific contexts.

'CALLING ON' OR INVOKING THE NAME OF JESUS (SALVATION IN THE NAME OF JESUS)

Invocation of the name of Jesus was literally the hallmark of early Christians. Bousset, for one, thought this to be the case when he noted that early Christianity could best be described in the context of how they utilized the name of Jesus. He observes that this use "...ist das Charakteristikum der Christen überhaupt, daß sie den Namen Herrn anrufen." Heitmüller has added a further note concerning the importance of the practice in terms of our understanding of the Christian cult, he states, "Der Ausdruck ist ungemein bezeichnend und auch für das Verständis der christlichen Kultusterminologie beachtenswert." Examples of this practice abound.

Take for example, the author of Acts, who, in his description of the activities of Paul during his time in persecution of Christians states, "Is this not he who in Jerusalem destroyed those who called on this name, and who had come here for the purpose of bringing them bound before the chief priests?" (Acts 9: 21). Indeed, Ananias, in his petition to the risen Jesus, says of Paul the persecutor, "Lord, I have heard from many about this man, how much harm he did to Thy saints at Jerusalem; and here he has authority from the chief priests to bind all who call upon

---

871 Bousset, Kyrios Christos, 85.
872 Heitmüller, INJ, 213.
Thy name” (Acts 9:13-14). The author furthermore declares in his depiction of the conversion of Paul that Paul is said to have been summoned by Ananias to “Arise, and be baptized, and wash away your sins, calling on His name.” Now Paul himself, in I Cor. 1:2, describes the people of God as “…those who have been sanctified in Christ Jesus, saints by calling, with all who in every place call upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ…” Another passage which might possibly intimate this practice is the reference to ‘names’ in Acts 18:14-15, where in reference to Jesus’ name the Roman proconsul Gallio says:

If it were a matter of wrong or of vicious crime, O Jews, it would be reasonable for me to put up with you; but if there are questions about words and names [emphasis mine] and your own law, look after it yourselves; I am unwilling to be a judge of these matters.

The disputation, which appears to have involved ‘names’, quite possibly is a reference to the controversy about calling upon the name of Jesus for salvation. In any case, we have other examples, such as the later Deutero-Pauline II Tim. 2:19, where Christians are exhorted to abstain from evil and are described as those who “…name the name of the Lord.” I have already indicated the significant passage in Micah 4:5 where religious conventicles are defined according to the name they invoke or upon which they call. It is clear that the invocation of Jesus’ name lends the early Christian movement its most distinct trait. Given this self-labeling, I need to examine the early Christian movement in light of the influence which invoking the name of Jesus came to have in the development of christology.

The importance of calling upon Jesus’ name for salvation is reflected in Rom. 10:13, where Paul, taking up Joel 2:32, writes that “all those who call upon the name of the Lord will be saved.” In the immediately preceding verses Paul takes up the question of how both Jew and Greek will be saved. In this section, Paul discusses the importance of confession (10:9), as well as the centrality of faith (10:8), and then Paul crowns this section (e.g. 10:5-13) with the citation of Joel.873 Paul forms this section in order to show by recourse to the Old Testament that Jesus is the goal and fulfillment of the Law (v.4, “Christ is the end of the Law”). Paul’s desire is to show by the scriptures that salvation comes through faith (Isa. 28:16), and calling upon the name of the Lord Jesus (Joel 3:5 LXX).874

873 Besnard reports that Cerfau was of the opinion that the reference to Joel in Romans is proof that Paul had received the tradition of the use of Joel from the earliest community and his citation of it here establishes its enduring relevance for Christian thought. See Besnard, Les Mystère du Nom, 165.
In Rom. 10:13 the act of calling upon the name of Jesus signifies that Jesus is being acknowledged as the kyrios, and it is his name which one must call upon to be saved, in conformity to Joel 3:5 LXX. This linking of Joel 3:5 (LXX) and Jesus' name clearly signals that the earliest Christians felt that God had installed Jesus, and hence his name, as the sole means whereby salvation could be obtained.

This same belief is found again in Acts 4: 5-12, where Peter is brought before the High Priests for healing a man in the name of Jesus. At the end of his defense Peter boldly declares (v. 12) “And there is salvation in no one else; for there is no other name under heaven that has been given among men, by which we must be saved.” This passage is a restatement of Acts 2:21, which quotes Joel to the effect that those who will be saved are those “calling upon the Name of the Lord.” In 4:12 we find an exposited version of the Joel-inspired passage of Acts 2:21.

Another passage along these lines is Acts 10:43, where Peter declares that all of the prophets testify to the fact that all who believe in Jesus find forgiveness of their sins “through his name” (διὰ τοῦ ὄνοματος αὐτοῦ). In the greater context of 38-43 it is verse 42 which provides the key to understanding how the name of Jesus functions here. In v.42 Jesus is said to have been installed by God as the judge of the living and the dead. This latter expression, ‘judge of the living and the dead,’ bears closer inspection. This phrase essentially signifies that since Jesus is the judge it is his name which can function as a salvific medium. The author at the end of this section further brings out this sense at 10:48. It is here that Peter commands that the house of Cornelius be baptized in the name of Jesus.

We find a similar, yet fuller passage in I Cor. 6:11, where we read Paul describes his charges in the following manner, “... you were washed, but you were sanctified, but you were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and in the Spirit of our God.” Here we find clear

873 There can be little doubt that the name in question here is Jesus. Davies has persuasively argued that this reference must refer to Jesus rather than God. For a fuller accounting see, The Name and Way of the Lord, 129-130.

875 The use of the genitive with ὄνομα conveys the meaning of medium or agency. See Friedrich Blass, Albert Debrunner and Friedrich Rehkopf, Grammatik des neuestamentlichen Griechisch, 16th ed., (Göttingen, 1984), § 223.3. As quoted in Ruck-Schroder, DNGJNT, 175 fn. 67. Ruck-Schröder does not cite a publisher.

876 Ruck-Schröder sees the entire complex of 38-44 as determining the function of the name of Jesus. DNGJNT, 175.
echoes of the baptismal rite and the name of Jesus is linked yet again to salvation and forgiveness of sins.

On other fronts, the invocation of the name of Jesus in the Eucharist played a central role by guaranteeing Jesus' presence and authority. Looking at several examples, we find (in the admittedly late) Acts of Thomas (225 C.E.) that the author recites his understanding of the procedure during the Eucharist in his day, “And the apostle standing by it, said: Jesus Christ, Son of God, who hast deemed us worthy to communicate of the Eucharist of Thy sacred body and honorable blood, behold, we are emboldened by the thanksgiving and invocation of Thy sacred name; come now, and communicate with us.” Here we see that the name of Jesus was invoked during the performance of the Eucharist, no doubt to secure Jesus’ presence during the rite.

An equally instructive example is found in Justin’s description of the Eucharist in I Apol. 65, where he describes the established protocol in his day in the following manner:

There is then brought to the president of the brethren bread and a cup of wine mixed with water; and he taking them, gives praise and glory to the Father of the universe, through the name of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, and offers thanks at considerable length for our being counted worthy to receive these things at His hands.

We also find, in a Eucharistic framework, the words of Clement of Alexandria where he states in his Excerpta ex Theodoto that “The bread and the oil are sanctified by the power (δυναντί) of the Name.” The connection between the Eucharist and the name of Jesus again surfaces in the Apostolic Constitutions IV.42, where God, it is said, will use the name of Jesus to “sanctify the oil in the name of the Lord Jesus, and impart to it spiritual grace and efficacious strength, the remission of sins.” Therefore, one directed the Eucharist to God, but the name of Jesus was invoked to insure his presence; thus, demonstrating once again the binitarian pattern of early Christian devotion.

What we can conclude from these examples is that in all probability similar invocations using the name of Jesus were used during the Eucharist in the first century and were evidently designed to guarantee the presence of Jesus in the cultic meal. With these considerations in hand I shall turn to several other particulars.

877 All of these examples demonstrate the invocation of the name of Jesus within the Eucharistic setting centers around the epiclesis to God as Daniélou recognized. See Daniélou, Theology, 156. Cf. Dom Gregory Dix, The shape of the liturgy, (New York : The Seabury Press, 1982; First published January 1945), 218-224.
First, we need to look at the use of the phrase ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τῷ ὄνομα. The significance of this phrase is illustrated by the following considerations. First, ἐπικαλεῖσθαι, as we have seen, is a terminus technicus; a fact which should signal us that Jesus was being invoked in a fashion that was most commonly afforded to a divinity, and a first century petitioner most certainly would have recognized this fact. It is also worth noting that this expression, when used in the Greek magical papyri to invoke a divinity, is the deponent form ἐπικαλεῖσθαι.878

Secondly, Mowinckel notes that cultic acts obtain their power because they are wholly sanctified acts; that is, because they are sanctified they are also powerful.879 Clearly, in the context of invocation of Jesus' name, the observation of Heitmüller and the entire History-of-Religions School that the name of the divinity stood as the very foundation of, and had been the most crucial element in, cultic activities has implications for our conclusions.880 Simply put, it was the name of the divinity which sanctified the ritual act and the carried the indispensable numen, the ingredient needed to empower the act. And in Christianity the name which carried this power was Jesus.

In this regard the statement made by Irenaeus, in his Ad. Haer. 2.32.5, has thought-provoking implications. Irenaeus argues that invoking the name of Jesus was qualitatively different from calling upon an angel. No wonders, nor issues of power, were done, he claims, by invoking the angels. Potency resided in the name of Jesus alone. And presumably, as Jesus is now the name of power and carries the most exousia, it also became a name of cultic import, and thus while there are no cultic settings seemingly appropriate to the invocation of principal agents, this was not the case for the name of Jesus.881

Concerning the inception of the ritual is seems probable that it was instituted from the earliest period of the Church—almost certainly it began in the primitive Palestinian Urgemeinde. Our sources attest to a widespread usage at a relatively early date. This leads one to speculate that the practice must reach back into the earliest period of the Palestinian mother Church. In my

878 Heitmüller, INJ, 212.
879 Mowinckel, Religion und Kult, 99.
880 Heitmüller, “Namenglauben im NT,” 662.
881 Hurtado, One God-One Lord, 83-85. Hurtado makes the useful distinction between simply calling upon or summoning a angelic being for help, and the more pregnant action of positioning Jesus at the center of Christian worship. The former is simply a utilitarian necessity, the latter a breach of normative Jewish religious scruples.
final section of this chapter I shall have more to say on this observation. I shall now press on to review what the invocation of the name of Jesus may have meant.

Having stated the use of invocation to call up the god we need to ask: does the phrase have other connotations? Some commentators, such as Robertson-Plummer, have seen in the phrase the meaning of ‘to worship.’ This is certainly true in most cases, but if the Book of Acts is to be believed, generally speaking, at first invoking Jesus’ name was done with reference to Joel 2:32 in the sense of calling upon Jesus for protection from the wrath to come. This of course is a cultic act, but whether it constitutes actual worship is more difficult to answer.

Another nuance is the notion of invocation as a confession that Jesus has been raised from the dead and will come again. This belief stems, as I have already noted, from the early Church’s interpretation of Joel in the light of the events of Pentecost. Given that the early Church felt that the last days were dawning, we may describe invocation of Jesus as an eschatological act, for Jesus was coming again and this is acknowledged by the act of invocation. Another use is found in liturgical settings. Here the purpose was to celebrate the life and ministry of Jesus, as well as offer worship and thanksgiving.

If we move from strict invocation to the topic of the role of Jesus’ name in salvation several passages of note crop up. First is Jn. 20:31, where the author states that he has written his Gospel so that his readers may believe that Jesus is the Son of God, and that through this they might have ‘...life in his name.’ This passage forms the end of the original gospel and it summarizes the contents, claims, and goal of the Gospel as a whole. Here Jesus’ name represents the salvation which came from the ministry and death of Jesus, the ‘oneness’ of Jesus and God, and the belief of the person in this mission. The author wishes his readers to realize that ‘life’ (i.e., spiritual life=salvation) is available through the name of Jesus.

Yet another passage of relevance is Mt. 12:21, where the author takes up the prophecy of Isaiah 42:1-4 to declare that “In his name the nations will hope.” This passage presages Mt. 28:19, where the nations are commanded to be baptized in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. The hope of the nations is outlined in verses 18 and 20; that is, they will be excluded from
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882 Nägelsbach takes this passage to mean that the person belongs to Jesus. This is in keeping with his overall attempt to explain almost all the name statements as signifying possession to Jesus. See, DNG.JHS, 69.

883 Ruck-Schröder takes the promised life ‘in his name’ as signifying life in the recognition of who Jesus is; that is, as the χριστός ὁ Υἱός τοῦ Θεοῦ, as 20:31 states. See, DNG.INT., 208.
Thus we see once again that Jesus' name is a salvific name; a name that was promised by the prophets.

Another passage which takes up this theme is Lk. 24: 46-47, where the Risen Christ says to his disciples, “Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer and rise again from the dead the third day; 47 and that repentance for forgiveness of sins should be proclaimed in His name to all the nations, beginning from Jerusalem.” Now Ruck-Schröder takes this passage to mean all the actions which the Apostles will do in the name of Jesus for the promulgation of the Gospel. In contrast, I take this passage to mean that the name of Jesus is referred to here as representative of the authority of Jesus as the savior; that is, the one whose name was to be called upon in order to receive salvation (Acts 2:21), although this does not deny that the passage does look toward Jesus’ entire messianic works, as well as the power which Jesus possesses to bestow eternal life on those who believe (cf. Jn. 1:12). This eternal life comes through the forgiveness of sins in the name of Jesus (Acts 10:43): by calling upon the name of Jesus as well as being baptized in his name (Acts 10: 48). Jesus’ name obtains this function for he is the judge of the living and the dead (Acts 10:42). This sense is in good keeping with the claim made in the Johannine Prolog 1:12 that faith in the name of Jesus ‘authorizes’ those who believe to become “children of God.”

We have seen several passages which echo the sentiment that Jesus’ name brought about salvation when it was called upon. This belief has significant implications for christological studies and I shall turn to analyze this material in light of comparative materials.

ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON TO JEWISH AND GRECO-ROMAN MATERIALS

The motif of salvation and name is found bound together in the Old Testament in numerous places. In Ps.79:9, for example, the Psalmist states, “Help us O God, our Savior, for the glory of your name; deliver us and forgive our sins for your name’s sake.” In stark contrast the author of the Book of Acts (4: 12) informs us that “There is salvation in no one else, for there
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884 Ruck-Schröder, leaning upon Luz, notes that this term cannot mean justice, for this sense is not attested to in profane Greek usage. See, DNGJNT, 136 fn. 86.

885 Ibid., 167.

886 Ibid. Ruck-Schröder correctly notes that οὗτος points back to τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

887 It should be noted that διόνυσία is never found in John, only ἐγκοιτία.
is no other name [Jesus' name] under heaven given among mortals by which we must be saved.” The strong resemblance to the statement in Joseph and Aseneth (15:7), where Repentance is depicted as a particularizing manifestation of God who entertains God on behalf of those “who repent in the name of the Most High.” By the illumination shed by this passage Jesus’ name is clearly a salvific name and it is also clear that Jesus’ name has taken over a function reserved solely for God.

This invoking of the name of Jesus is rendered even more remarkable when one considers that Ex. 29:45 (LXX) states that:

And I shall be invoked (ἐπικληθήσομαι) by the sons of Israel and I will be their God. And they shall know that I am the Lord their God, who brought them forth out of the land of Egypt that I might be invoked by them: I am the Lord their God.

This passage naturally carries with it the notion of covenant. Bound by the Mosaic covenant, Israel could only invoke Yahweh’s name. Furthermore, God for His part, is committed to reveal Himself to those who call upon Him by invoking His name. The invocation of the name of Jesus in the early Church is most striking when viewed in this light. In addition, there are no examples that I am aware of where the names of a principal agent or a patriarch, or any intermediate being, were invoked to bring about salvation. Also, unlike invocation of other Jewish mediator figures, Jesus was invoked in liturgical settings. This is quite different than what was allowed for other figures, who could be called upon to secure immediate physical assistance, but which have not found a place in cultic settings, or to forgive sins.\(^{888}\)

In the light of this statement Ex. 3:15 bears repeating. God, it is claimed, had revealed His name to Moses and states that He this so that future generations will be able to call upon Him. The passage reads, “God...said to Moses, “Thus you shall say to the sons of Israel, ‘The LORD, the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, has sent me to you.” This is My name forever, and this is My memorial-name to all generations.” In a similar vein, Zeph. 3:9 states that “For then I will give to the peoples purified lips. That all of them may call on the name of the LORD, To serve Him shoulder to shoulder.” These passages demonstrate that the invocation of Jesus’ name has strong christological underpinnings. Indeed,
Acts 2:32, 38 essentially shelters the petitioners from the coming wrath. It is an eschatological plea for inclusion into the coming Kingdom of God.

Another aspect worth considering is that in the Old Testament the Psalmist could declare at Ps. 124:8 that Israel’s help is “...in the name of the Lord.” Correspondingly, the claim found at Acts 2:36 is remarkable. No longer is God’s name called upon for salvation, but rather Jesus’.

This changeover is all the more remarkable when seen in the light of Isa. 12:2-4, where it is said that in the age to come God will dramatically gather the Diaspora Jews together in Israel in one great eschatological act (Isa. 11:6-16). The prophet then says:

Behold, God is my salvation, I will trust and not be afraid; For the LORD God is my strength and song, And He has become my salvation.”
3 Therefore you will joyously draw water From the springs of salvation. In that day you will say, “Give thanks to the LORD, call on His name [emphasis mine], Make known His deeds among the peoples; Make them remember that His name is exalted.”

These passages highlight various important aspects of Israel’s view of God. The first aspect is that God has brought Israel out of Egypt in order to develop a relationship with her, whereby they were to invoke Him. Furthermore, these passages suggest that through the process of invocation the Israelites would see that their God was real and abiding. It was through invocation that one could know that YHWH is the Lord. In this regard Heitmüller was correct when he observed that “Das Rufen des Namens der Gottheit spielt eine Hauptrolle im Kultus, so daß das יְהֹוָה ...den Yahve-Kultus überhaupt bezeichnen kann.” and Bresnard in his study of invocation has this to say, “Il semble qu’on puisse dire, sans craindre d’exagérer, que toute l’animation transcendante de la religion d’Israël est passée à travers l’invocation du nom de Yahvé.”

Given that God had emphasized that the children of Israel would know that He is God through invocation of His name, and since this invocation would demonstrate that He alone is the Lord, this makes the early Christian claim that the name of Jesus was to be used instead of YHWH quite astonishing. Insofar as God’s name held pride of place in cultic activities, the reconfiguration of the Christian cult not just to include, but instead emphasize alone, the name of
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889 Heitmüller, INJ, 30.
890 Bresnard, Le Mystère du Nom, 108.
Jesus signals the birth of a profound christological belief, viz. Jesus was part of the divine identity, however ill defined this notion may have been.

TO HAVE FAITH IN THE NAME OF JESUS

This characteristic Johannine expression is found in Jn. 1:12; 2:23, 3:18, and 1 Jn. 3:23; 5:13. In 1 John 3:23, for example, the community is enjoined to have faith in Jesus’ name (Ἰνα πιστεύσωμεν τῷ ὄνοματι τοῦ νινό Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ) so that they will love one another.

Before I tackle the material in the Gospel of John, I shall examine the occurrences of this expression in 1 John.

In order to emphasize this commandment the author at 1 Jn. 3:23 places the imperative in the mouth of God; it is He who commands that the community have faith in the name of Jesus. This call to have faith in Jesus’ name conveys the notion that the community recognizes the Sonship that Jesus uniquely bears. This faith also calls to mind the concern to reinforce the belief that Jesus has come in the flesh. Accordingly, in this context, the call to have faith in the Name means also to acknowledge that Jesus has come in the flesh, as God’s decisive act of entering into human history in the last days. Essentially, the idiom may be rephrased as having faith in Jesus as the Son of God (cf. 1 Jn. 5:10). Therefore, the function which the name has here is that it is a symbolon for Jesus himself.

With respect to the Gospel of John, Untergaßmair has noted that emphasis is placed on Jesus as the revelator of God the Father. Accordingly, those passages which speak of having
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891 So too Smalley, who states that the idiom is just shy of being a confession. For the author the confession would be to believe that Jesus is the Son (2:23; 4:15; 5:5) and the Christ (2:22; 5:1). For more see Stephen S. Smalley, 1, 2, 3 John, Word Biblical Commentary V.51, (Waco Texas: Word Books, 1984), 207-208.


893 Ibid. Bietenhard too sees that belief on Jesus’ name means belief in Jesus’ unique Sonship and messianic mission. In addition, through this faith the believer enters into the ‘sphere of his person.’ See, “Ἰνα,” 276.

894 Ruck-Schröder, DNJGNT, 205-206, 216; Untergaßmair, INJJE, 171 and Rudolph Bultmann, A Commentary on the Johannine Epistles, 59. Bietenhard thinks that the expression means to believe in Jesus’ messianic mission and his sonship. I think that initially this expression referred to the belief that Jesus’ name was the sole name that one called upon to be saved. Later developments produced what we see here in 1 John. Of further interest is that Ruck-Schröder, following in the footsteps of R. Brown, makes the claim that belief in the name of Jesus means the belief that Jesus bears the divine name—he is the “Träger des Namens Gottes” [emphasis Ruck-Schröder]. For Bietenhard see, “Ἰνα,” 276.
faith in Jesus’ name (e.g., 1:12; 2:23; 3:18) mean therefore “Annahme des Sohnes,” as the “Offenbarer des Vaters.” Another underlying aspect that Untergaßmair detects is that the changing back and forth between the name of the Father and the name of the Son within the Gospel (e.g., for Jesus 1:12; 2:23; 3:18, then the Father, 5:43; 10:25; 12:28, and back to Jesus, 14:26; 15:16, to name just some of the passages) communicates the truth of the Johannine theologoumenon concerning the unity of the Father and the Son (cf. Jn. 10:25-30).895 One other interesting note is that those who have faith in the name of Jesus have received the authority (1:12) to become “Children of God” (περιφέρεσιν τοις πατέροις).896 Their faith in Jesus (and his name) results in God’s gift (εὐαγγελίζων τὸν θεοῦ γενεσίαν) of salvation and adoption. Those who have placed their faith in the name of Jesus recognize that Jesus has been sent and authorized by God.897 This latter function is similar therefore to the usage in the Epistles. The name is a symbol for Jesus, but it is also a symbol of the truth of the Gospel.

Now one passage in the Gospel of John sounds a clear echo to those passages in Acts which speak of having faith in the name of Jesus in the context of miracles. It is Jn. 2: 23, where the author reports that after performing many miraculous signs the people came to believe on his name. The meaning here I think mirrors what we see in Acts, viz. that belief ‘in the name of Jesus’ means believing that his name has been installed by God as the name of power par excellence. In effect, there seems to be a connection drawn between ὄνομα and σημεία; that is, “signs” generate a belief in Jesus’ ministry and this is expressed by stating that they believe in his name.898 The one difference though between John and Acts is that in John these signs are pressed into the service of an explicit programmatic revelatory function.899 The name is in this


896 One last matter is worthy of notice here. Brown observes that 1:12 bears the hallmark of the author and might therefore betray the possibility that the author has added 1:12 into the Logos hymn. If true, the hymn did not bring the author to this belief in Jesus’ name. For further details see Raymond E. Brown, The Gospel According to John (i-xii), The Anchor Bible Commentary, 2nd Ed., (Garden City, New York: Double Day & Company, Inc., 1983, first ed., 1966), 11.

897 Ibid., 172.

898 Ibid., 173. In connection to John 2:23, Bietenhard avers that the expressions means that the crowds believed in Jesus’ messianic mission; that is, they believed in Jesus as the Christ. For further insight from Bietenhard see, “ὁνομα,” 276.

899 Ibid.
respect like Jesus himself, i.e. Jesus is exalted by God and exists in perfect unity with the Father. So too, the name of Jesus has been exalted and its use has been authorized by God. And the fact that God has raised the name of Jesus to such status attests that Jesus and God exist in complete unity.

Interestingly, in later tradition the expression “faith in the name of Jesus” could be seen to convey the notion that Jesus’ name was numinous, very much as is the case in Acts. One indicator of this emphasis upon the power of the name of Jesus is found in Origen’s brief exhortation to believe on more than just the Name, but also on Jesus himself. The text reads:

Now when he was in Jerusalem at the Passover, during the feast, many believed in his name, beholding his signs which he did.....To this we must add that it was not to those who believed in him that Jesus did not trust, but those who believed on his name: for believing in his name is a different thing from believing in him. ...We must therefore, cleave to him rather than to his name, lest after we have done wonders in his name we should hear these words addressed to us which he will speak to those who boast of his name alone [cf. Mt. 7: 21-23]...Those, on the other hand, of whom we now speak....And as they believe the signs and not in him but in his name, Jesus ‘did not trust them’...900

Moving back to John, we find that faith in Jesus’ name plays a recurring role and highlights the importance that this expression had for the author. When we look more closely we find that right after verse 1:12, at 1:14, Jesus is said to be πλήρης χάριτος και άληθείας. This statement is lifted straight from Ex. 34:6. There it forms a part of the divine predications which are used to reveal to Moses what God is like. This revelation of God’s nature stands in concert with the revelation of God through His name. Therefore, its employment, now in terms of Jesus, signals that Jesus is “die geschichtliche Manifestation des Namens des Gottes Israels.”901 If this last insight holds then the claim that faith in Jesus’ name allows one to become a child of God stakes out the further claim that Jesus bears the divine name in himself (much like the Angel of the Lord in Exodus). Ruck-Schröder correctly notes that the claim in verse 18, that no one has seen God except “the only begotten God, who is in the bosom of the Father” generates the correlative claim that only Jesus can reveal the Father, and His name. Just as God revealed His Name in times past, so now Jesus bears this name, and thus, he alone can reveal it to mankind (17:11-12, cf. Jn. 12:44-45; 17:6, 26).

900 Commentary on John, V.29.

901 Peter von der Osten-Sacken. As quoted in Ruck-Schröder page 206. For van der Osten Sacken’s work see Logos als Tora? Anfragen an eine neue Auslegung des Johannesprologs, H.F. Weiß in Rostock zum 65 Geburtstag; (1994), 145.
Now in 3:18 we find the expression πιστεύειν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ μονογενοῦς υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ. Untergaßmair stresses that the basic meaning here is to be taken as faith in Jesus in his role as the Son, and therefore, the salvific revelator of God.\textsuperscript{902} To unpack this meaning we need to look at the larger context. The passage (3:18) reads, “He who believes in Him is not judged; he who does not believe has been judged already, because he has not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God.”

As the context makes clear, Jesus has been sent by God as the Son who comes into the world to save it (3:16), while 3:18a makes clear that to have faith in Jesus is the same as believing in his name. Between these hinge passages is verse 17, which portrays Jesus as the Savior sent by the Father for the express purpose of bringing salvation. Thus, believing in Jesus’ name is the same as believing in who Jesus is, his role in the divine plan, and his mission.

The situation in 1 John 5:13 is much the same. The passage reads, “These things I have written to you who believe in the name of the Son of God, in order that you may know that you have eternal life.” The author takes pains to call to mind the facts of the Gospel and to dispel any thought of doubt. Here, too, believing in the name of the Son of God means to believe in the message of Jesus: his ministry, works, and salvation. So then, the name of Jesus here serves to represent Jesus and his message. With the relevant passages covered, it is now time to take up the comparative materials.

**ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON TO JEWISH AND GRECO-ROMAN MATERIALS**

Surprisingly, there are no extant references, save one, so far as I am aware that speak of having faith in God’s name. The one place that mentions this expression is 1 Enoch 67:9, where we read that the ungodly kings will undergo God’s punishment because they have denied the Lord of the Spirits and because they “cannot believe in his name.” Although there is but one reference, this review does not end with this observation. If we cast about for comparative material that may offer illumination, one cannot help but draw attention to the fact that to have faith in the name of Jesus is loosely similar to those Old Testaments passages which refer to the name of YHWH as an object of reverence and fear (Deut. 28:58,60, Neh. 1:11; Ps. 33:21; cf. Rev. 11:18).\textsuperscript{903}

\textsuperscript{902} Untergaßmair, *I N.J.E.*, 171-172. By extension, as Untergaßmair notes, is the belief in Jesus’ claim to be the one who reveals God, a position which results in faith in Jesus’ Sonship.
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Another possible point of contact with Old Testament conceptions is that faith in the name of Jesus recalls Ps. 124:8, which expresses faith that Israel's help was to be found in the name of God.

Here the belief in God's name is another way of saying that they have faith in God Himself. As is so often the case, the Name serves to represent God. In like manner, the name of Jesus represents Jesus: his person, work, and ministry as the supreme revelator of God.904

**COMMAND OR ADMONISH SOMEONE IN THE NAME OF JESUS**

This expression is found in II. Thess. 3:6, where we read:

Now we command you (Παραγγέλλω σέ ὀνόματι Κυρίου), brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ (ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ), that you keep aloof from every brother who leads an unruly life and not according to the tradition which you received from us.

In order to unpack the function of the name of Jesus in this passage it should be noted that an almost identical form of admonishment is found in v.12, where the author states that he is commanding and exhorting “in the Lord Jesus Christ.” This second verse makes it clear that the name of Jesus in 3:6 is really a symbol for Jesus himself, and correspondingly, for his authority over the Body of Christ.905

The function, therefore, of the name of Jesus is clearly that it serves as the symbol for the authority of Jesus, as well as an acknowledgement that this name is the name of the Lord (=a name of power and authority).906 In addition, the verse relates also to the recognition between the author and his audience that Jesus is their common Lord.907 Part of this recognition led to the recollection on the part of the author for his readers that their inclusion in the faith was
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903 Nagelsbach, *DNG, HJS*, 58.

904 Regrettably I know of no Greco-Roman materials that evidence this usage.


907 Delling, *Die Zweignung*, 55 fn. 192 and Heitmüller, *INJ*, 73. This acknowledgement of the Lordship of Christ is also seen in I Thess. 4:1. Like II Thess. 3:6 we find the use of ἀναφέρω in a fashion which suggests a relationship to Jesus’ Lordship. See Delling’s observations on pg. 55.
predicated on their ‘belonging’ to Jesus.\footnote{Nägelsbach, DNGJHS, 68.}

Although II Thess. 3:16 is perhaps the most oft-cited passage as an example of this type of action in Jesus’ name, we find this expression again in I Cor. 1:10, where Paul admonishes his readers to unity “in the name of our Lord Jesus (Παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, διὰ τοῦ ὄνοματος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Χριστοῦ).”

Paul hopes to appeal to the Corinthian believers to come together as one. This appeal presages the very troublesome issues which Paul will be forced to address next (i.e., the schisms described in 1:11-17). Paul uses the name of Jesus to call them to remember that they are all members of one body and one faith, baptized under one name.\footnote{Pace Steyn, who believes that this carries the sense that Paul’s appeal is predicated upon the reality that the use of the name of Jesus meant that Jesus was present. I think that here it is a symbolon for Jesus himself, their shared faith, and their allegiance to one Lord: Jesus Christ. For Steyn see, “To Onoma tou Kyriou in 1 Cor.,” 485.} The word Παρακαλῶ in this passage precedes the genitive construction which begins with διὰ, and this signifies that διὰ τοῦ ὄνοματος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Χριστοῦ should be rendered with, ‘by means of,’ and signifies more agent than instrument.\footnote{Steyn, Ibid., 484.} In this sense it is fair to say that the name of Jesus represents Jesus himself. Thus, to admonish someone in the name of Jesus is fundamentally the same as if someone admonished another person in Jesus; that is, by appealing to Jesus’ authority and Lordship over both parties.\footnote{Kramer, in my opinion incorrectly, sees not only the aspect of belonging to Jesus, but also an Anrufung of the Name. I think this highly unlikely and think the context makes clear that Paul is appealing to Jesus as their common Lord; the common point of reference and authority for the Church. For Kramer’s views see, Christos, Kurios, Gottessohn, 75.}

**ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON TO JEWISH AND GRECO-ROMAN MATERIALS**

There are, to the best of my knowledge, no examples which parallel this use, either in the Jewish literature, or in the Greco-Roman literature that I am familiar with. Still, some clues have been left for us in this literature which will help to gain some measure of understanding.

First of all, we know already that the name of a divinity could be used to command other spiritual beings. No less dependent on the notion of authority in the world of that day, the name
of Caesar could be used to represent Caesar.\footnote{E.g. Philo On the Virtues V.42, "And though they [a mob which had come to Flaccus] knew this (for they are very shrewd in their wickedness), they adopted a deep design, putting forth the name of Caesar as a screen, to whom it would be impiety to attribute the deeds of the guilty." Also Josephus in AJ 16.10.8, where the name of Caesar represents Caesar in a case of profanation, on a matter of the actions of Nicholaus in Arabia, "And this is all the war which these men so tragically describe; and this is the affair of the expedition into Arabia. And how can this be called a war, when thy presidents permitted it, the covenants allowed it, and it was not executed till thy name, O Caesar, as well as that of the other gods, had been profaned?"} Hence, one could command another person to do the bidding of Caesar by invoking his name as a symbol for the authority of the person (who is deputized so to speak to act on Caesar’s behalf). In the case of the divine, the power of a divine name to compel another god or demon was tied to the power and authority of the god. In the second case, that of Caesar’s name, a similar circumstance exists. Caesar’s name carried with it the authority and power which Caesar possessed. Thus, Caesar’s name represented Caesar himself. In a similar fashion, the name of Jesus stands as his representative; that is, it represents his authority and power over the church. As the Risen Lord and the sole bearer of salvation, Jesus was the head of the church and her ultimate authority.

**SUFFERING FOR THE SAKE OF THE NAME OF JESUS**

This motif is exampled at various places in the New Testament (e.g. Mk. 13:13; Lk. 21:12, 17; Acts 5:41; 9:16; 15:26; 21:13; 1 Peter 4:14, 16; Jn. 15:21; Rev. 2:3; 13:17; 20:4). With respect to references to suffering within Acts, numerous passages, specifically 5:41, 9:16, 15:26, and 21:13, all make clear that the sufferings were, or would be, engendered by actions relating to the propagation of the Gospel. Accordingly, suffering for the name of Jesus means, in the context of Acts at least, not just suffering because one holds to the Christian faith but also, or even rather, that one suffers for carrying out missionary endeavors.\footnote{Similarly Ziesler, "The Name of Jesus in the Acts of the Apostles," 36.} Taking a closer look at 5:41 the narrative reports that the Apostles were joyous about their suffering for the name of Jesus (5:41) and clearly the Apostles embrace this suffering for the name’s sake, for it is this name which they call upon for salvation (Acts 4:12), and it is the name into which they were baptized.

A related expression is found at Acts 9:15, concerning Paul’s mission. It is claimed that Jesus says to Ananias concerning Paul:

[He] is a chosen instrument of Mine, to bear My name before the Gentiles and kings and the sons of Israel (τοῦ βασιλέως τοῦ ὄνομα μου ἐμπιστεύω ἐθνῶν τε καὶ βασιλέων

\footnote{E.g. Philo On the Virtues V.42, "And though they [a mob which had come to Flaccus] knew this (for they are very shrewd in their wickedness), they adopted a deep design, putting forth the name of Caesar as a screen, to whom it would be impiety to attribute the deeds of the guilty." Also Josephus in AJ 16.10.8, where the name of Caesar represents Caesar in a case of profanation, on a matter of the actions of Nicholaus in Arabia, "And this is all the war which these men so tragically describe; and this is the affair of the expedition into Arabia. And how can this be called a war, when thy presidents permitted it, the covenants allowed it, and it was not executed till thy name, O Caesar, as well as that of the other gods, had been profaned?"}
Decisive for the understanding of this expression is the meaning assigned to it by G. Lohfink’s study. He has shown that the expression “To bear My name” refers to suffering for the sake of the Gospel and carries with it the notion of public confession. Lohfink also shows that ἐνώπιον bears the nuance of a public showing, while the word βασιλέων has clear Greco-Roman, as well as early Christian parallels. For example, in the Similitudes of the Shepherd of Hermas (IX 28.5) we find a clear connection between the expression and suffering. Lohfink also makes the interesting observation that the claim that Paul would bear the Name before βασιλέων conflicts with the interpretation that we are dealing with Paul’s missionary endeavors. Thus, it must mean that Paul would give a public showing of his faith before hostile Roman magistrates and Jewish kings.

Now according to 1 Peter 4:14-16 it is the person who suffers for the faith (represented as suffering for the name “Christian”), who can then glorify God through the bearing of the name ‘Christian.’ The author writes, “If you are reviled for the name of Christ, you are blessed, because the Spirit of glory and of God rests upon you... but if anyone suffers as a Christian, let him not feel ashamed, but in that name let him glorify God.” Here, the name of Christ represents both Jesus and the Christian faith. Although this text refers to Christ rather than Jesus, the notion of suffering for the Christian faith, as symbolized by a name, is nonetheless of some passing note.

914 We find this phrase again in Rev. 2:3 where the Ephesian Christians are described as those who, ἐβάστασας διὰ τὸ δόμιον μου. The community suffers because their confession of Christ differs from that of the false apostles. To describe the source of the conflict Ruck-Schröder suggests the expression “im Sinne ihres Christusverständnisses.” See DNG/INT, 243.


916 Ibid., 215.

917 Ibid., 216.

918 Ibid., 217. Clearly, if Paul’s mission were in view then the term βασιλέων is inappropriate.

919 Correctly Ruck-Schröder, DNG/INT, 240.
Naturally, this suffering is in keeping with the suffering that Jesus himself had undergone (1 Peter 4:13). This shared experience of suffering allows the Christian to join with Christ through these sufferings. Furthermore, suffering for the Name signifies adherence to the truth of the Gospel and the refusal to yield to those who would contest its truth. Of course, this also signifies that the person belongs to Christ as only they will have the conviction to endure until the end. It also signifies that those who suffer for the name of Christ can expect the presence of the Holy Spirit, as verse 14b makes clear.

In Mark 13:13 we read of Jesus speaking of those who are faithful as suffering διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου. It is clear from v. 13b that Jesus is referring to those who will endure to the very end. These are the ones who shall receive the promised salvation this is spoken of at the end of v. 13b. In any event, we should read all of these passages in light of the fact that the theme of suffering and rejection is a central element of apocalyptic thought. Thus, suffering for the Name is received by the readers as an eschatological event, and in accordance with their faithfulness they will receive the promise of salvation when the Last Days has come to its end.

**ANALYSIS AND COMPARISION TO JEWISH AND GRECO-ROMAN MATERIALS**

Regarding the suffering that is done for being a Christian, it is directly analogous, as we have just seen, to the Jewish theme of suffering for the sake of God. Jewish martyrology is replete with numerous legends and stories about the willingness of many Jews to suffer for the sake of their faith. We have seen in the section on confession in Jewish circles that Jews sometimes suffered extreme penalties for holding too rigidly to their religious convictions. Here, Josephus’ words are worth repeating. In the *Bellum Judaicum* (7.417-418) Josephus mentions the Jewish refusal to acknowledge Caesar as Lord. This refusal led to many physical trials. Josephus described the courage of those who suffered in the following fashion:

> Whose courage, or whether we ought to call it madness, or hardiness in their opinions, everybody was amazed at; (418) for when all sorts of torments and vexations of their

---


921 Although the Jewish literature prior to the Christian era contains no true analog to the New Testament expression, the notion is not at all foreign to pre-Christian Jews. Suffering for God is in fact the same as suffering for His name. Ruck-Schröder quotes in this context the interesting summation of Graubard from his essay, “Das ‘Kaddish’-Gebet,” in which he states that “Seit R. Akibas Martyrium war der Tod für die Heiligung des göttlichen Namens eine Krönung des Lebens, die Erfüllung des höchsten Gebotes der Gottesliebe.” Although the Rabbis stem from a later period, the concept of suffering for God reaches back centuries prior to the Christian era. For Ruck-Schröder see, *DNGJNT*, 191, fn.145. For Graubard see, “Das =Kaddish= Gebet,” in *Das Vatertunser Gemeinsames im Beten von Juden und Christen*, 3rd ed., ed. M. Brocke, (Freiburg/Basel/Wien, 1990), 116.
bodies that could be devised were made...they could not get anyone of them to comply so far as to confess or seem to confess, that Caesar was their lord; but they preserved their own opinion, in spite of all the distress they were brought to, as if they received these torments and the fire itself with bodies insensible of pain, and with a soul that in a manner rejoiced under them.

In a similar manner, Christians were willing to endure sufferings for their faith. Naturally, the whole notion of suffering for one’s faith was not unknown in Greco-Roman circles either. Although living at a time of impressive syncretistic impulse some faiths were less popular than others and many suffered the consequences. One of the better known examples is the prohibition of some magical practices, such as the *Lex Cornelia de Sicariis et Veneficiis* (81 B.C.E.). Following this edict numerous magicians were rounded up and the Roman officials meted out severe punishment. Clearly, persecution for ‘Jesus’ name’ reflects a common experience among Christians, although the Christian (and Jewish) persecution is distinguished from what we know of persecutions of adherents of various Greco-Roman cults in that Christian and Jewish persecution was engendered by refusal to acknowledge the Greco-Roman gods.

As for the significance of this willingness to suffer for Christ it must be pointed out that this suffering has a christological component to it; that is, Christians suffer for Jesus’ name (=Jesus and his message). Obviously, the earliest Christians believed that Jesus bore a message and revelation that was worth suffering for. In essence, Christians believed that Jesus was the Savior and Lord, whose person and mission cleared the only path to God.

**THANKS OFFERED TO GOD IN THE NAME OF JESUS**

In Eph. 5: 20 the author admonishes his readers to always give thanks to God “…in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ.” This admonition harkens back to 5:4, where the author instructs his readers that as a holy people no unseemly language should be found among them, “but rather thanksgiving.” A similar admonishment is expressed in the immediately preceding verse where the author admonishes his readers to sing songs and hymns to the Lord (λαλοῦντες εαυτοῖς ἐν ὑμῖν θαλμοῖς καὶ ὑμῖν καὶ ὑδαίς πνευματικαίς), and also “giving thanks to God the Father at all times and for everything in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ.” (cf. Col. 3:16f.).

---


923 It is uncertain whether the term *kyrios* refers to God or Jesus.
These spiritual songs were made possible because the readers were filled with the Spirit (5:18). Of great importance is that the passage carries the notion that Jesus is the mediator between God and man; thus, it is he who is the mediator of the thanksgiving.\(^{925}\) This role as mediator is here the same as we have seen in the case of prayer offered to God in Jesus’ name. In both cases, Jesus is the mediator between God and man (cf. Heb. 7:25; Rom. 8:34). The author has indeed already employed this concept at 2:13, where the author speaks of being drawn close to God in the following terms: \(\text{νῦν δὲ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ὡμιλεῖς ήτε ποτε ὄρτες μακρὰν ἐγενήθητε ἐγγὺς ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ.}\) This thought of mediation by Jesus to God in Eph. 5:20 does not escape the notice of Paul himself in Rom. 7:25, where Jesus is the reference for the act of thanksgiving to God.\(^{926}\) Moreover, Eph. 5:20 sounds clear echoes of Col. 3:17, where the Deutero-Paulinist author exhorts his readers to do all in the name of Jesus, as well as give thanks to God through Jesus.\(^{927}\)

Now this action clearly takes place with reference to Jesus, and to his position as the sole mediator between God and man.\(^{928}\) This concept of Jesus as the mediator between God and man leads us to the supposition that the early Christian communities held the conviction that ritual acts, such as prayer, thanksgiving, praise, were acceptable to God only when they are offered

---

\(^{924}\) Lincoln notes that the word προσματικαῖς, although agreeing only with ὁδοῖς in gender, relates to all three terms. See Andrew Lincoln, Ephesians, Word Biblical Commentary V. 42, (Dallas TX.: Word Books, 1990), 345-46. Ruck-Schröder believes, and I concur, that the name of Jesus was spoken out during these ritual performances, even if it turns out the word καὶ ἐπὶ applies to God. See Ruck-Schröder, DNGJNT, 100.

\(^{925}\) Ruck-Schröder, Ibíd., 101. So too Heitmüller, although he also adds that the expression additionally means that the name of Jesus is ‘named’ during the actions of the verbs because it is the go-between for mankind and God. See, INJ, 262. Nägelsbach however, thinks the passage means that the believer belongs to Jesus. See, DNGJHS, 71.

\(^{926}\) “Thanks be to God-through Jesus Christ our Lord.”

\(^{927}\) The features of similarity are that both Col. 3:17 and Eph. 5:20 speak of, ἡσαλωτοὶ ἐρωτε ὦ προσματικαίς, and both passages speak of giving thanks to God, while also containing an exhortation to perform some action in the name of Jesus.

\(^{928}\) Correctly Ruck-Schröder, DNGJNT, 100. Delling though thinks otherwise. He contends that the expression attests to an “um seinetwillen” function on behalf of Jesus. He points to Rom. 1:8 and 7:25 (“I thank God through Jesus Christ...”) to support his view. These passages seem to me to indicate rather a mediating function (see Rom. 8:34) on the part of Jesus-and hence his name too. See Die Zeiegnung, 53.
through Jesus. Accordingly, the use of the name of Jesus to thank God signifies the acknowledgement of this unique mediating position, which God had conferred upon Jesus.929

**ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON TO JEWISH AND GRECO-ROMAN MATERIALS**

Not surprisingly, the unique position allotted to Jesus as the mediator between God and man is largely unparalleled in Jewish literature. It is true that at times angels were thought to ‘carry’ prayers to God, but this is not ‘true’ mediation.930 This role is more along the lines of service to God’s people. In contrast, thanksgiving to God through another person or spiritual being is not attested in our sources. Of course, the absence of the use of God’s name makes some sense here, i.e., God’s people could thank Him directly and do not need to use His name. In contrast, Jesus is a historical figure who brought a unique experience of God. This experience, coupled with the belief that Jesus anchored the entire salvific drama in his person, led the earliest Christians to think that Jesus, and Jesus alone, could mediate offerings, prayers, and holy acts, to God. Correspondingly, ‘thanksgiving’ to God through Jesus’ name serves as evidence that Jesus was seen as the sole mediator between God and man.

**GLORIFYING (PRAISING) THE NAME OF JESUS**

This use of the name of Jesus is attested to in II Thess. 1:10-12:

When He [Jesus] comes to be glorified in His saints on that day, and to be marveled at among all who have believed—for our testimony to you was believed. 11 To this end also we pray for you always that our God may count you worthy of your calling, and fulfill every desire for goodness and the work of faith with power; 12 in order that the name of our Lord Jesus may be glorified in you [emphasis mine], and you in Him, according to the grace of our God and the Lord Jesus Christ.

The first thing to be noted is that this passage would appear to contain a faint echo of Isa. 66:5. Here in the latter half of the verse we read the admonishment, “Let the LORD be glorified, that we may see your joy.” The observation that this may a possible allusion to Isa. 66:5 is strengthened by the fact that Paul has just drawn upon Isa. 66:15 at verse eight. Critical to understanding this whole section is its tenor: it is thoroughly colored by eschatological

---

929 Another aspect which should be raised is that this thanksgiving to God through the name of Jesus is made possible through the actions of the Holy Spirit (Eph. 5:18). See Ruck-Schröder, *DNJGNT*, 101.

930 Likewise, Hermes was thought capable of carrying messages between the gods and humans. Again, this role is one of service and not mediation is its truest sense.
This backdrop makes the meaning clear; by carrying out their faith in reference to the Lordship of Jesus, which will be demonstrated and confirmed at the Parousia, Jesus will be glorified by what he has accomplished in the believer. Thus, the name of Jesus and Jesus’ eschatological glory (accomplished through his ministry and later lordship) are equated here.

Another passage which picks up this theme, albeit in a slightly different sense, is Acts 19:17. After the events of the Seven Sons of Sceva, the city of Ephesus is claimed to have undergone an amazing transformation in light of the events depicted in 19:11-16. This transformation included a new respect for the name of Jesus. Acts 19:17 reads:

And this became known to all [the events surrounding the Seven Sons of Sceva], both Jews and Greeks, who lived in Ephesus; and fear fell upon them all and the name of the Lord Jesus was being magnified.

It is clear from the remarkable events at Ephesus that Jesus’ name was now recognized as a name of power; perhaps even the preeminent name of power among some in Ephesus. People were now ‘magnifying’ (=glorifying) the name of Jesus as a name of a divine being. This magnifying attests to the fact that many Ephesians now had faith in the name of Jesus; that is, they now believed that his name was laden with numinous and apotropaic power.

**ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON TO JEWISH AND GRECO-ROMAN MATERIALS**

In terms of Greco-Roman conventions the statement that Jesus’ name is to be glorified recalls those places in the *PGM* that speak of ‘hymning’ or ‘glorifying’ the name of the deity (e.g., XXXVI.165-170, where the magician is “glorifying” the “sacred and honored names which are in heaven”; XII.256-257, which speaks of the angels ‘hymning’ the name of the god and XXI.18 [cf. XIII 788-789], where the Muses ‘praise’ the glorious ‘name’). As in the case of the New Testament, the devotees were concerned to bring glory to the deity by glorifying the name of the god or goddess. Of particular relevance is *PGM* VII.496-500, where in a summons of Isis a supplicant prays and says that he will glorify the name of the son of the gods:

---


932 So too E. Best. Ibid.

933 F.F. Bruce believes the connection to be one of name and reputation in the present situation of the readers. Bruce relies upon a present ethical emphasis, but clearly, given the broader eschatological context, Best is to be preferred here. For Bruce see, F. F. Bruce, *1 & 2 Thessalonians*, 156.
Protect me, great and marvelous names of the [gods]...Protect me, great and marvelous names of the great god,...glorify me, as I have glorified the name [ἐδόξασα τὸ ὅνομα] of your son Horus...

As the examples from the PGM demonstrate, divine names were thought to be worthy of glory, honor, praise, and ‘hymning.’ In the illumination cast by the PGM it seems reasonable to assume that a hint of this same belief must have suggested itself to Gentile-Christians who heard, or used, these expressions with respect to the name of Jesus. Certainly, this chorus of examples compare favorably with the examples cited from the New Testament.

Now we have already seen in the section on the Jewish practice of praising the name of God that the Israelites were encouraged to honor the Name by praising it. We also observed that several passages make an association between the praise of God and His Name; establishing in effect that the Name served as a surrogate for God Himself. The Israelite often combined this praise with a recounting of the glorious deeds of God. The context, in its broadest scope, is one of cultic praise of God and His name in the congregation. But how does this cultic practice impact our understanding of the early Christian practice of ‘praising’ the name of Jesus?

As Bietenhard has already pointed out, even as it was the concern of the Old Testament piety to glorify the name of God, in the new covenant the focus had shifted to glorifying the name of Jesus.934 This glorification was thought to be acceptable because God Himself had installed Jesus as the Lord over the cosmos. This exaltation was so robust and singular that many in the early Church were led to the conclusion that Jesus was part of the divine identity. As the historical manifestation of the divine reality, Jesus, and his name, were believed to be worthy of praise. It is worth noting that in terms of Judaism I am unaware of any examples where the names of angels, or other intermediary beings, receive cultic praise. Jesus’ name, as is so often the case, is singular.

**PRAYER IN THE NAME OF JESUS**

To begin, we need to observe that the act of praying in Jesus’ name is a more complex phenomenon than it would at first seem, and this has divided scholars on the meaning of the phrase. According to Nägelsbach this phrase means nothing more than the fact that the petitioner stands before God as someone who is the possession of Jesus.935 Others would insist that at first

---

934 Bietenhard, “Ὑομα,” 274.
instinct we should think of invocation when we hear of prayer in Jesus’ name. Still others insist that the phrase should be understood as signifying that prayer is offered in Jesus’ name because he is acknowledged as “den Heilsbringer, den Offenbarer.”936 In order to ascertain what is meant by this phrase we will need to look at various places in the New Testament where it occurs.

Examples of this phraseology are most numerous in the Gospel of John (14:13; 15:16; 16:23, 26f).937 The first to be examined is 16:23, and the second is 16:26f. I quote them both here:

And in that day you will ask Me no question. Truly, truly, I say to you, if you shall ask the Father for anything, He will give it to you in My name.

And, In that day you will ask in My name, and I do not say to you that I will request the Father on your behalf; for the Father Himself loves you, because you have loved Me, and have believed that I came forth from the Father.

In these passages the name of Jesus functions, not so much a numinous agent, but as the symbol for the “Offenbarungswerk” of Jesus.938 Beyond this, these two passages are designed to strongly underscore the unity between God, Jesus, and the followers of Jesus.939 This relationship permits the intentions of God to become concrete actions on behalf on His children when they pray in the name of Jesus. This unity is seen in that God answers prayers when they are performed in Jesus’ name.

Now in terms of Jn. 14:13-14 we find that it is Jesus who says that he will fulfill the prayer request. The passage reads:

And whatever you ask in My name, that will I do (καὶ ὅ τι διὰ τοῦ ἄστυμα ἐν τῷ ὄνοματί μου τὸ δεῦτο τοῦ ἀνθρώπου), that the Father may be glorified in the Son. 14 If you ask Me anything in My name, I will do it.

---

935 Nägelsbach, DNGJHS, 72.

936 So Delling. See Die Zwingung, 58. Bietenhard, when addressing the meaning of the phrase in John’s Gospel, comes to the conclusion that prayer in Jesus’ name translates into the belief that Jesus has “come forth from God;” and that Jesus is “God’s Son,” for whom God will answer prayer. See, “Ωνομα,” 276.


938 Untergaßmair’s expression. See, INJIE, 236. Nägelsbach contends, as always, that these passages carry the notion of simply belonging to Jesus. See DNGJHS, 72.

939 Delling, Die Zwingung, 58-59 and Untergaßmair, INJIE, 239.
Several observations are in order. First, this section (14:7-15) revolves around the concern to establish one issue; namely, the unity between Jesus and God.\footnote{Untergaßmair, INJIE, 161.} It is therefore interesting to observe that 14:13-14, with its emphasis on Jesus’ promise to fulfill the request, has a strong christological coloring. Indeed, Jesus’ promise to fulfill the requests is yet another extension of Jesus’ revelatory work (14:9; cf. 14:6) of glorifying the Father (“that the Father may be glorified in the Son”).\footnote{Ibid., 161, 119. Essentially, what the author is attempting to establish is that just as the earthly Jesus revealed the glory of the Father (11:40; cf. 17:1, 4), so too will the ‘heavenly’ Jesus continue this work. In point of fact, it is clear throughout the Gospel (esp. chapter 17) that Jesus is acting in this capacity on the commission of God. Of additional significance is that the promised fulfillment by Jesus (τὸν τούτον ποιήσω) relates to, indeed it is subordinate, to the following ἵνα-clause of glorifying the Father (ἵνα δοξάσῃ ὁ πατὴρ εἰς τὸ ὄνομά).} Both aspects; that of glorifying the Father, as well as revealing the Father, form the core of the author’s christology throughout the Gospel, and it is this christological focus which fuels the claim found in 14:13-14.

Another concern of the author is seen in verse 12; that is, to assure the disciples that they will also do even greater works than Jesus (“Truly, truly, I say to you, he who believes in Me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do; because I go to the Father”; cf. Mt 21:22; Mk 11:24; Lk. 11:9; James 1:6). Here, the thought does not lie in the direction of the numinosity of the name itself, but rather that the works are an outgrowth of faith in Jesus,\footnote{Ibid., 161. Untergaßmair rightly notes that verse 12 does not say, “You will do works etc.,” but rather that, “he who believes in Me [emphasis mine], the works that I do shall he do also, and greater works than these shall he do; because I go to the Father.” This verse then justly emphasizes the correlation between faith in Jesus and the ability to carry out the revelatory work of Jesus.} as well as a product of the ‘oneness’ of Jesus and the Father (14: 10-11):

Do you not believe that I am in the Father, and the Father is in Me? The words that I say to you I do not speak on My own initiative, but the Father abiding in Me does His works. 11 “Believe Me that I am in the Father, and the Father in Me; otherwise believe on account of the works themselves”\footnote{Ibid., 114-116. Untergaßmair observes that the statement in 12b, that Jesus returns to the Father, carries with it some consequences. One of these consequences is that while Jesus has gone to the Father, the disciples now carry on the revelatory work which Jesus began. Another consequence is that because Jesus will be with the Father, the revelatory work will be expanded.} Of course, the unity between Jesus and God, must also by necessity extend to the disciples and Jesus.\footnote{Ibid., 113. See Untergaßmair’s discussion.} In any case, unlike what we are used to seeing in the Book of Acts, in the
Gospel of John we do not see any overt concern to emphasize the numinous nature of the name of Jesus and supernatural events. Here the focus is solely upon the christological program of the author, viz. that Jesus is the revelator of the Father to mankind, and that Jesus and the Father are ‘one.’

We perhaps catch a further glimpse of this ‘oneness’ when we turn to the Johannine passage of Jn. 12:28, where Jesus says “Father, Glorify your Name” and the passage of Jn. 17:1, where Jesus also says, “Father, Glorify your Son.” The parallelism can perhaps be taken to imply more than a literary relationship; instead it intimates that a parallel reality is being underscored; that is, Jesus the Son is the name of God. Indeed, just as Jesus is the Word (logos) of God (Jn. 1:1), so too is he the name of God incarnate. In part, Jesus assumes this role because his ministry and his work takes on the same functions that the divine name had in the O.T.

ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON TO JEWISH AND GRECO-ROMAN MATERIALS

In terms of direct Jewish parallels there are no examples that I am aware of in the Old Testament that speaks of prayer in God’s name (although surely prayer must have been performed in God’s name). We do find numerous examples of the use of the name of God in healings and the like. As for the christological significance of the early Christian practice we need look no further than Colin Brown’s suggestion that Phil. 2:9-10 must be taken to imply that all creation must now approach God through the name of Jesus. I think that Brown’s understanding offers not only great promise for understanding the use of the name of Jesus in a mediation context, but also the origin for such use. If Brown is right, then it is clear that the earliest Christians believed that they must use the name of Jesus to reach God, because God had authorized this name alone as the medium whereby God and man could come together.

---

945 Bresnard, Le Mystère du Nom, 178.
946 Ibid., 182.
947 We should remember what Unztergaßmair has pointed out, viz. that the sole unambiguous cultic use of the name of YHWH in the Old Testament with respect to prayer is found at Ps. 63:4. As already noted, in this Psalm of praise the Psalmist says, “So I will bless Thee as long as I live; I will lift up my hands in Thy name (BHS 63:5; 7222).” See, Unztergaßmair, IN/JJE, 237 fn. 156.
948 Colin Brown, “Ernst Lohmeyer’s Kyrios Jesus,” 16. Delling adopts a contrary position. He argues that prayer is answered on an “am seinewillen” (for Jesus’ sake) basis. I think that this is following the wrong track. Brown is more on the mark and we must reckon with the notion that Jesus’ salvific work, and subsequent exaltation, placed his name in the ultimate mediatory position. In any case, for Delling’s views see Die Zueignung, 59.
TO COME IN THE NAME OF JESUS

At Mark 13:5-6, Jesus, when speaking of the events that will transpire in the last days says that “See to it that no one misleads you. Many will come in My name (ἐπὶ τῷ ὄνομα μου), saying, ‘I am He!’ and will mislead many.” Jesus is here referring to the numerous (πολλαῖς) false prophets and false apostles which were to come (v.21-23). Just who these false prophets and false apostles may have been need not concern us here. Nor do I need to delve into the various ways of understanding the ἐγώ εἰμι phrase.949 Instead, I need to deal only with how the use of the name of Jesus functions in this passage. Here, it seems to me, the name clearly functions as the source for their claim to have the authority of Jesus and the legitimating of their mission.950 That is, the name symbolizes the authority of Jesus himself (see discussion below for examples of this meaning in contemporary non-Christian texts). Thus, their authority and position is established by reference to the name of Jesus.

Now in contrast to Mark, Matthew adds δέ χριστός at 24:5, and clearly signals that he sees the imposters as false Christ’s. These false Christ’s use the name of Jesus to establish their claim as legitimate.951 That is, they claim that they come in the commission of Jesus, a claim that they try to establish by saying that they come in Jesus’ name. Matthew also sees these imposters as performing their exorcisms and miracles on the authority of Jesus, which is symbolized by his name (e.g., Matt. 24: 23-25). Matthew also believes that the false prophets will perform their miracles by using Jesus’ name as is made clear by 7:15-22. It reads:

Beware of the false prophets, who come to you in sheep’s clothing, but inwardly are ravenous wolves...19 “Every tree that does not bear good fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire. 20 “So then, you will know them by their fruits. 21 “Not everyone who says to Me, ‘Lord, Lord,’ will enter the kingdom of heaven; but he who does the will of My Father who is in heaven. 22 “Many will say to Me on that day, ‘Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy in Your name, and in Your name cast out demons, and in Your name perform many miracles?’

Here it is clear that the name of Jesus would be used by these false prophets to perform wonders.

949 Most commentators see here a reference to an imposter, who is claiming to be Jesus redivivus. Other exegetes see instead a direct taking up of an Offenbarungsformel which would certify the imposer as the proper divine revealer. Ruck-Schröder offers the suggestion that the phrase is a claim to be the returning Christ at the promised Parousia. Yet another possibility is that Christian prophets were going around in an apocalyptic guise and proclaiming their authority. A possible indication in this direction is that the following section, v. 9-13, is clearly set in an apocalyptic context. For a fuller exposition on these matters see Ruck-Schröder, DNG, INT, 110-112.

950 Ibid., 109-110.

951 Ibid., 112.
Not to be outdone, Luke also fashions the Marcan pericope to his own ends. In 21:8 Luke makes it clear that those who will come in the name of Jesus will come during the supreme eschatological moment. The author writes, “See to it that you be not misled; for many will come in My name, saying, ‘I am He’ [ἐγὼ εἰμί] and, ‘The time is at hand’ [ὁ καιρὸς ἐγγίζει]; do not go after them. And when you hear of wars and disturbances, do not be terrified; for these things must take place first, but the end does not follow immediately.” Luke also chooses to relate this coming as related, not to false prophets, but to those who come falsely promising the Kingdom of God (17:20). Although the emphasis has shifted from Christ to the Kingdom the use of the Name as emblematic of the bearing, authority, and commission of Jesus remains the same.

ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON TO JEWISH AND GRECO-ROMAN MATERIALS

This misuse of the name of Jesus sounds clear echoes of the numerous Old Testament passages which speak of false prophets who came in the name of God (cf. Zech. 13:1-5, Jer. 14:13-16; 23:16,25). In this light it is suggestive that the respective Synoptic authors all use the name of Jesus as the source of authority rather than the name of God. It seems clear that Jesus' name represents Jesus himself: his mission, authority, and sending by God. To claim that one comes in Jesus' name means that the false prophet also has claimed the authority and commission of God.

In terms of Greco-Roman conventions, I know of no text that uses this expression. There were, however, instances when people would come in the name of Caesar in order to claim his authority when they gave his orders. This use parallels nicely what we have seen from the Christian and Jewish texts. Adding its weight to that of the Jewish evidence, we can say that to come in the name of Jesus meant that the person was claiming to come in the authority of Jesus himself.

PREACHING (PROCLAIMING), SPEAKING OR TEACHING IN THE NAME OF JESUS

We find in the New Testament various texts which speak of teaching (διδάσκειν—Acts 4:18; 5:28), speaking (λαλεῖν—Acts 4:17; 5:40), speaking boldly (ἐπαρρησιάζομαι ἐν τῷ ὄρμωτι τοῦ Ἰησοῦ—Acts 9:27,28.), and 'preaching' (κηρύσσω—Lk. 24:47) in the name of Jesus. The antithesis, that is, to prohibit someone from speaking or teaching in the name of Jesus, is found at Acts 4:17-18 and 5:28, where the Jewish authorities prohibit the apostles from these activities. It remains an open question as to exactly what is meant by these various expressions.
Some have mentioned as a suitable backdrop the possible rabbinic practice where one rabbi teaches in the name of another rabbi; that is, he draws on the authority of the other rabbi in a matter over a legal question, or passing on tradition. This suggestion is clearly not generally applicable, for as we see from Acts 4:17-18 (cf. 5:40), speaking in the name of Jesus amounts to teaching and preaching in the Name. The text reads:

*But in order that it may not spread any further among the people, let us warn them to speak no more to any man in (ἐπί) this name.* 18 And when they had summoned them, they commanded them not to speak or teach at all in the name of Jesus.

As we know from the section on healing, the prohibition was aimed not only at the authority of Jesus, but also aimed at stopping the name of Jesus from being used in demonstrations of power. Indeed, the prohibition by the Jewish leaders against speaking in the name of Jesus hints that they believed the name of Jesus was a source of power so that one can say that the apostles had spoken “in der Kraft des Namens.”

The apostles clearly understand the situation in this manner for they do the opposite of the prohibition, i.e. they pray to God and ask Him to perform wonders and healings “through (διά) the name of your holy servant Jesus.”

In another passage, Lk. 24:46b-47, we read of the Risen Christ saying:

*Thus it is written, that the Christ (τοῦ χριστοῦ) should suffer and rise again from the dead the third day; and that repentance for forgiveness of sins should be proclaimed in (ἐπί) His name (αὐτοῦ) to all the nations, beginning from Jerusalem.*

Now it is evident that the genitive αὐτοῦ refers back to τοῦ χριστοῦ. As such the passage means to convey the fact that while the name of Jesus may be what is in the foreground, behind this stands Jesus’ work as the Messiah, who in accordance with the Scriptures had suffered and risen in order to save his people. Accordingly, it points to the salvific work of God in Jesus, as well as the recognition of the unique role of Jesus as mediator between God and man (cf. Heb. 13:15). A very significant passage for our understanding is Acts 8:12, where it

---

952 Ruck-Schröder’s expression. *DNG. JNT*, 190. While Ruck-Schröder is no doubt correct, Delling notes in addition, correctly in my view, that the prohibition of verse seventeen relates also to the claim in verse 12 that “there is salvation in no one else; for there is no other name under heaven that has been given among men, by which we must be saved.” See *Die Zuteignung*, 48.


954 Delling recognizes the notion of the saving acts of God in Jesus being included, but I think it also involves the acknowledgement that Jesus stands between God and man; indeed, the author of the very salvation which is preached in his name is the mediator to God. See, Delling, *Die Zuteignung*, 47.
is reported that Philip preached to the Samaritans “the good news of the Kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ...” This passage establishes several very important points. This passage suggests that the name of Jesus conveys or mediates the Kingdom of God. In short, this passage means to convey the fact that the name of Jesus is not a *symbolon* of the Gospel alone, but also is the key which initiates the benefits of the Gospel and is therefore something that is preached (8:12) and believed in. Although we have some indication of how the name of Jesus functions in these passages we might ask how this data might yield other insights for our understanding of other functions.

First, all of the various expressions carry the sense of the authority of Jesus himself. In some particular cases, such as Acts 4:17-18, the name of Jesus must also be read as representing the Gospel message and its contents, as we have already seen. We also see this usage clearly in Rom. 15:20, where Paul expresses his desire to go to places and proclaim the Gospel. He expresses this as going to places where *εὐαγγελίζεσθαι ὄνομα Χριστοῦ* (where Christ is not ‘named’). Here, as in Acts 4:17-18, the name of Jesus (Christ) represents the Gospel message. With this understanding in hand, I shall turn to the analysis section.

**ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON TO JEWISH AND GRECO-ROMAN MATERIALS**

We have already encountered Ex. 9:16, which states that the Lord told Moses that His name was to be proclaimed in the entire world. This command was issued during the confrontation between the Pharaoh of Egypt (who was a symbol of the power of this world) and God. Hence, the name of God represents God in this text as a world conqueror; that is, as the Lord of all the earth. Moreover, it is clear that this usage signifies that through the proclaiming of

---

955 Ruck-Schroder, *DNGJNT*, 173. Ruck-Schroder observes that the proclamation of the Kingdom and the power in the name of Jesus go together in the apostolic mission. She states, “Die Verkündigung des Reiches Gottes und *die wunderwirkende Kraft Jesu, die in seinem Namen präsent ist* [emphasis Ruck-Schroder’s], gehören im Wirken der Apostel zusammen.” As with everything else, Nægelsbach holds to the view that this act means only that the person is in possessive relationship with Jesus. Here Nægelsbach points to Acts 8:12 and notes that as soon as the people had received the message of Phillip they immediately consented to baptism. Thus, Nægelsbach draws his connection and concludes that proclaiming the name of Jesus stands in close connection to baptism after conversion. For Nægelsbach’s views see *DNGJHS*, 75.


957 Also in favor of adopting this view are Heitmüller and Ziesler. See, *IJ*, 61-62, and “The Name of Jesus in the Acts of the Apostles,” 33.
His name God Himself is exalted. By proclaiming God's name, His fame is spread, as well as the covenant which he has established with His people. This usage clearly situates this type of action among those passages where the Name stands as a surrogate, sometimes for God, sometimes for His deeds, but always tilted toward revelation.

In fact, the notion of proclaiming the name of Jesus is correctly seen by Scherer against the backdrop of God's disclosure of his name to Moses in the narrative of Exodus 3:13-15, where Moses receives the divine name as a seal of authentication for his divine mission. With this backdrop in place, Sherer proposes that the proclaiming of the name of Jesus in Acts 8:12 carries the same broad theological import as the narrative about the sending of Moses. Accordingly, the 'proclaiming of the Name' in Acts is meant to convey the thought that those whom God has sent (the apostoloi) come in the power and authority of Jesus. In essence then, one might say that the function of the name of YHWH in the Old Testament revelation and proclamation has now been extended in the early Christian communities to the name of Jesus.\(^{958}\)

In a loose fashion, those passages that speak of proclaiming the name of Jesus not only take on broadly similar shading as O.T. passages involving the name of God, but more importantly the name of Jesus now plays a crucial central role in salvation history. Proclaiming or preaching the name of Jesus meant to proclaim salvation in his name. This usage clearly is associated to the phenomenon of calling on Jesus' name for salvation. Hence, proclaiming the name of Jesus meant to tell others that Jesus' name is the name of salvation. We have also observed that speaking or proclaiming the name of Jesus can also take on shadings of telling others that Jesus' name is the name of power. The name of Jesus can cast out demons and cure the sick, and Christians broadcast this fact to others. Finally, it is worth noting that nowhere do we see in Judaism any figure whose name is preached as a salvific name. This makes the name of Jesus completely unique in salvation history.

'**DO ALL' IN THE NAME OF JESUS**

According to Col. 3:16-17 the Christian should do all in the name of Jesus. The passage reads in full:

> Let the word of Christ richly dwell within you, with all wisdom teaching and admonishing one another with psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with

thankfulness in your hearts to God. 17 And whatever you do in word or deed, do all in (ἐν ὄνομα Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ) the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks through Him to God the Father.

Some scholars, such as Nägelsbach, maintain that this means only that this passage conveys the notion that by acting in the name of Jesus everyone can recognize that the person belongs to Jesus.959 Other scholars, such as Delling, maintain that the expression means that the actions are done in recognition of the Lordship of Christ.960 This means that the author prompts his readers to carry out their lives (i.e. their conduct) in terms of Jesus’ claim over their lives. In addition to this observation, Ruck-Schröder emphasizes the connection between Col. 3:17 and 1:13. Col. 1:13 reads, “For He [God] delivered us from the domain of darkness, and transferred us to the kingdom of His beloved Son.” This connection suggests transference into the realm of Jesus. Accordingly, the admonishment means that the author’s readers now exist in “den Herrschaftsbereich [emphasis Ruck-Schröder’s] des Sohnes...”961

Another aspect is that the author also reminds his readers that by carrying out all of these actions in Jesus’ name they give thanks to God, through Jesus (in his name? Cf. Eph. 5:20). In other words, by extension, when they carry out their Christian duties in the name of Jesus they give glory to God, and the name of Jesus serves once again as a sort of bridge between God and man.962 Stated more pointedly, by conducting themselves in a manner consistent with the Gospel, as well as their carrying out their worship and other cultic behavior in a manner pleasing to God, they give glory to God. Indeed, only those actions that are done in or to Jesus’ name (as the symbol for Jesus’ position as mediator between God and man) are acceptable to God.

959 Nägelsbach, DNGJHS, 71. Ruck-Schröder, more correctly in my view, argues that the name serves as an indication of the ‘Machtbereich’ of the bearer of the name, and accordingly the passage signifies that the community acts under the Lordship authority of Jesus himself. She observes that 3:17 picks up on 1:13, where the Son’s kingdom is spoken of. She also rightly points out that actions done in the name of Jesus on the part of the community result in deeds done for the glory of God. See Ruck-Schröder, DNGJNT, 96; Cf. Heitmüller, who thinks it means the naming of the name of Jesus. See IJM, 68, 260.

960 Delling, Die Zueignung, 54. Ruck-Schröder has pointed out in this context that the fact that the community will carry out their actions in Jesus’ name takes on similar shadings as a confession of the Lordship of Jesus. See, DNGJNT, 266.

961 Ruck-Schröder, DNGJNT, 96.

962 The concept of a mediating role is found often in the New Testament, either in terms of Jesus, or through his name. Examples are John 1:3, 7, 10; Acts 3:16; Rom. 1:5; 11:36; Eph. 2:18; Col. 1:20; Heb. 7:25; 1 Peter 1:21; 1 Jn. 4:9.
Correspondingly, actions which are pleasing to God, when done in Jesus name, bring honor to God, as I Cor. 10:31 states, “Whether, then, you eat or drink or whatever you do, do all to the glory of God.” But as Col. 3:16-17 makes clear, these actions take place in reference to Jesus’ name.

ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON TO JEWISH AND GRECO-ROMAN MATERIALS

This particular use of the name of Jesus has no direct analog as far as I know in Jewish piety—at least it was not put to paper as far as I know. Still, the Old Testament notion of ‘walking’ in the name of God is very similar. For example, as we saw earlier, Micah 4:5 states that religious conventicles are defined by the name of the divinity in which they walk, i.e. the name in which they carry out their acts and their adherence to the religious code prescribed by their faith system. This sense of following God’s commandments (doing things that please God) is demonstrated in Zech. 10:12, where God speaks of the gathering of the Diaspora Jews and then the text ends with this promise, “And I shall strengthen them in the L ORD, and in His name they will walk.”

In the sense that ‘walking’ is similar to carrying out actions in God’s name we may speak of some informal points of similarity between this Old Testament usage and the command in Col. 3:16-17. When we recall that ‘walking’ in the name of God means that God is the frame of reference for the actions of the covenantal communities, we can therefore also infer from Col. 3:16-17 that Jesus is the frame of reference for the new covenantal people of God. While such emphasis does not by any means exclude God, it nonetheless is striking that now, in the era of the dawning of the Kingdom of God, Jesus has become the frame of reference for the community.

This ‘walking’ in the name of God underscores that those who follow their respective gods will carry out their lives and religious obligations in the names of their gods, thus they carry out their lives in close relationship to their gods. Jews, the chosen and covenant-bound people of God, must walk only in His name, just as the non-Jew ‘walks’ in the names of their gods. This

963 So too Ruck-Schröder, DNG/NT, 96-97.

964 Boehmer correctly draws attention to this close relationship but fails to note the fact that a additional facet is in view, viz. that people not only live in close relationship with their gods, but also that they fulfill the obligations mandated by the gods. That is to say, it expresses the notion that one lives faithfully within the moral strictures, as well as the prescribed ritual and cultic behavior of the faith. For Boehmer’s take on this expression see BIN, 61.
great Name distinguished, in part, the people of God from the nations. Of course this adherence carried all sorts of religious obligations, e.g., rites and cultus, religious scruples, etc., all of which were to be carried out in the power and authority of the Name. But now, the new people of God use the name of Jesus and this usage has obvious christological significance, i.e. Jesus is the head of the Church, its Lord and Savior. Moreover, this command to ‘do all’ in the name of Jesus is not mirrored by any Jewish texts in terms of any figure, angelic or human, apart from God. Thus, Jesus’ name once again stands alone, unparalleled by any mediator figure in Second Temple Judaism.

CALLING THE NAME OF JESUS OVER SOMEONE OR SOMETHING

In Acts 15:14 we read that in the midst of the Jerusalem Council James arose and stated that God would draw out a λαὸς τῷ ὄνοματι αὐτοῦ. The inspiration for this eschatological gathering is drawn from Deut. 14:2, where we read that, “For you are a holy people to the LORD your God; and the LORD has chosen you to be a people for His own possession out of all the peoples who are on the face of the earth.” As for its literal literary derivation, Acts 15:17 quotes directly from Amos 9:11-12, which as we have already seen applied in its O.T. context to the name of God. It is worth a quick reminder what the text says. It states:

In that day I will raise up the fallen booth of David
And wall up its breaches; I will also raise up its ruins,
And rebuild it as in the days of old; That they may possess the remnant of Edom
12 And all the nations who are called by My name.”
Declares the LORD who does this.

It is noteworthy that this passage begins with the temporal clue that the name will be used “in that day.” This is a clear signal that these passages are eschatological in nature and signifies that in the author’s mind the name of Jesus has become operational in the promised New Age of the dawning of the Kingdom of God.965

---

965 Franz Georg Untergaßmair. *Im Namen Jesu beten: biblische Implulse zu christlichem Gebet* (Stuttgart: Katholischen Bibelwerk, 1990), 62. This interpretation stands in contrast to other attempts to understand this use of the name of Jesus in a non-eschatological fashion. Untergaßmair has an excellent summary of the various other attempts to understand this phrase. In brief he notes R. Büttmann, S. Schultz, and F. Büchsel’s view that the phrase means, “unter Berufung auf ihn.” L. Bouyer’s view is that it means, “im Glauben an ihm.” A. Schlatter’s view that it means, “nach seinem Willen, in seinem Auftrag zur Erfüllung der Sendung, die er den Jüngern gegeben hat.” M-J Lagrange and W. Bauer’s view of “unter Nennung des Namens Jesu.” F. Tillmann’s interpretation of, “in meiner Person, d.h. in der innigsten Gemeinschaft mit Jesus.” F. M. Braun claims that it means, “en faisant appel à son pouvoir.” We have seen that the phrase really has an eschatological basis and signifies God’s creation of a chosen people. For more details, see *INJJE*, 63-64.
We should recall from the section which dealt with the phenomenological use of the name of God, that Amos 9:11-12 signified that the object or person over whom the Name was called became the possession of God. When taken together with Deut. 14:2, we arrive at a proper understanding of the meaning of Acts 15:17. In effect, God will ‘call out’ from among the nations a group of people, an eschatological community, which, because they are called by Jesus’ name they belong to Jesus. Of course this transference from the world, to a possession of Jesus, took place at the moment of baptism.  

Beyond this, it is also noteworthy that the statements made at the Council refer to the events which occurred at the house of Cornelius. The events serve to demonstrate, through the conversion of Cornelius and his household, that God had now swung the door of salvation wide open in order to admit Gentiles to the new faith. This passage thus makes clear that the Church is equated with the ‘new’ Israel, populated with both Jew and non-Jew.

Another prominent passage which speaks of calling out of the name of Jesus comes from James 2:7, where we read: οὐκ ἀντίθετα βλασφημοῦν τὸ καλὸν ὄνομα τὸ ἐπικληθὲν ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς. We know from our investigation on the Jewish materials that this phrase is a septuagintalism which signified that the object or person belonged to God. In the present context though, while not calling into question this meaning, it should be pointed out that this idiom also reflects the events surrounding baptism. As such, we may read into this expression that the name of Jesus was called out over the baptizand, and that the person was now a member of the ‘Jesus’ movement.

---

966 Ruck-Schröder, *DNJGNT*, 199.


968 Davids, *The Epistle of James*, 113. As Davids has noted, the baptismal context helps to explain the use of the aorist here.


970 I adopt this phrase for as Hartman’s study shows, the expression in baptism reflects a concern to show the person to whom the rite derives its fundamental referent. Seen in this light, it is possible to describe Christian baptism as a ‘Jesus’ baptism (to borrow Hartman’s expression). This understanding lends the rite a rich christological flavor. For further discussion see Lars Hartman, “‘Into the Name of Jesus,’ A Suggestion Concerning the Earliest Meaning of the Phrase,” 439.
ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON TO JEWISH AND GRECO-ROMAN MATERIALS

In order to grasp the deeper meaning of this phrase we must look at two analogous passages. The first comes from the Jewish portion of II Esdras 4:22-25, which reads:

Then I answered and said, ‘I implore you, my lord, why have I been endowed with the power of understanding? For I did not wish to inquire about the ways above, but about those things that we daily experience: why Israel has been given over to the Gentiles in disgrace...We pass from the world like locusts...and we are not worthy to obtain mercy. But what will he do for his Name that is invoked over us?’

We see here that in II Esdras, as was the case in Amos 9, the name which was invoked over the elect is YHWH. Now this invocation is not treated as a mere formality. Instead, the author actually stresses to God the necessity that He act for the sake of the very Name which was invoked over them. Such signification most certainly transcends a simple formality.

The argument in II Esdras 4:22-25 signifies that God’s name is so bound up with His revelation and His relationship with His people that He must act. Understanding this, we need to look at the meaning of the phrase in Christian practice.

In terms of Christian practice, this act signifies that the ones over whom the name of Jesus is invoked now belong to him, just as in the previous dispensation those who had God’s name called out over them became God’s possession: a chosen people elected to experience His salvation and His covenant. This replacement of the name of God, with the name of Jesus, found its rationale in the early Church because of the Church’s belief that Jesus’ name was the name to be invoked for salvation in conformity to Joel 2:21. Because Jesus’ name was the name of salvation, it was thought worthy to be called out (or invoked) over a new believer. It was, after all, the name which was called out during baptism. By adhering to the logical consequences of using Jesus’ name, instead of God’s, for the carrying out of the promise of salvation in Joel 3:5 (LXX), Jesus’ name became the ‘name’ of salvation in all its varied contexts and uses. By invoking the name of Jesus during baptism the baptizand entered into a new relationship to God; that is, he or she now belonged to His ‘Son.’

BAPTISM IN THE NAME OF JESUS

The rite of baptism has rightly taken up the lion’s share of scholarly attention over the last century in terms of those scholars who have investigated the importance of the name of Jesus. This attention is completely warranted when we stop to consider that the rite of baptism is filled with christological significance, and that baptismal imagery can express this christological
significance in various ways. As we shall see, within the New Testament, baptismal motifs are much more rich and variegated than Heitmüller's simple belief that baptism signified only transference of the baptizand to Jesus. Indeed, various New Testament writers pressed baptismal imagery into service and fashioned it to their own ends.

On the whole, scholarship on baptism and the name of Jesus can be divided between earlier scholars, who emphasized the linguistic arguments (i.e. the use of various prepositions in the baptismal formula in conjunction with the name of Jesus), and later scholars, who brushed aside such concerns and instead focused on the context and/or the meaning of baptism as suggested from Jewish comparative materials. These latter scholars concluded that the New Testament does not offer us a uniform picture in terms of prepositional use. This ambiguous situation has created an exegetical quagmire of sorts. Scholars such as Delling and Hartman have persuasively argued that instead of attempting to fix an interpretation based on various prepositions the only sound method for discovering the meaning and significance of baptism is by looking at the context, and making use of any light shed by comparative background materials.\textsuperscript{971} In my opinion, the abandonment of the attempt to explain the meaning of baptism in terms of various prepositions (and the like) is completely warranted.\textsuperscript{972} I, too, shall follow suit and look solely at the context and historical roots of baptism as my means of uncovering the meaning and significance of baptism.

Now in order to appreciate this significance it will be useful to conduct this portion of my study in two phases. The first phase will look briefly at some of the more important New Testament texts which speak about baptism and the name of Jesus in the same breath. Other

\textsuperscript{971} In the case of the latter, both men come to the conclusion that the phrase comes from the thought world provided from the LXX. Bietenhard too, rejects any notion that the meaning of baptism can be derived from Greek commercial expressions; he sees a Hebraic background to the εἰς τὸ ὄνομα prepositional phrase (i.e., שְׁם). For further details, see Delling, \textit{Die Zueignung}, 42; Hartman, \textit{Auf den Namen des Herrn}, 40, 45; and Bietenhard, "ὄνομα," 275.

\textsuperscript{972} I have already mentioned the possibility that the author of Lk-Acts seems to employ certain prepositions with some purpose in mind. But in terms of baptism there are not sufficient examples to draw any firm conclusions based on the authors' use of various prepositions. Hartman concurs with this view, but others, such as Delling, beg to differ. Delling thinks he detects certain fixed meanings. For example, the preposition ἐν means, "auf Grund deren" die Taufe vollzogen wird." Εἰς signifies, "Die Richtung, den „Beziehungspunkt“, auf den hin die Taufe geschickt" (Delling does offer a nuance concerning Mt. 28:19, here he thinks the expression means, "Auf den Heilswirksamkeit hin, den der Taufing eingefügt wird"). With respect to the preposition ἐν Delling concludes that this combination means, "Im Blick (unter Beziehung) auf die mit diesem Namen bezeichneten Heilswirklichkeit." See Delling, \textit{Die Zueignung}, 92-96, and Hartman, \textit{Auf den Namen des Herrn}, 39.
passages which discuss baptism, but which do not expressly mention the name of Jesus, will be
ignored. Here I shall look at what these texts can tell us in their local contexts. The second phase
examines Christian baptism in light of what we know of other similar religious rites in Jewish
and Greco-Roman belief. After these two phases are completed, I shall turn to the question of the
significance of the use of the name of Jesus.973

The best place to begin is where the author of the Book of Acts claims the rite began: in
the events of Pentecost which are cast by the author of Acts as the fulfillment of Joel 2:21. This
outpouring was, for Joel, restricted to God’s people (cf. Ez. 39:29); that is, it was reserved for
those whom YHWH had called out from among the various nations to be His people. There is
reciprocity to this arrangement: those whom YHWH calls will be those who in turn call upon His
name. This new people of God, according to the author of Acts, will heed a new call for
repentance and a confession of Jesus as the Lord installed by God’s edict. Now in terms of the
use of Jesus’ name, the justification for the fact that Jesus’ name is the reference for the baptism
is found in 2:36, where Peter makes clear that God has made Jesus, κύριον αὐτῶν καὶ Χριστὸν
ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς. Because Jesus now occupies these exalted positions his name can be used in
lieu of the Tetragrammaton.

Recalling our earlier observations on Acts 2:38 it is clear that the author sees the events
of Pentecost as the eschatological fulfillment of God’s promise to visit His people in the End
Times. By invoking the name of Jesus, and submitting to baptism, the baptizand became
incorporated into the new eschatological people of God. Obedience to the call for repentance was
predicated not only on the salvific actions of Jesus’ ministry, but also upon the realization that
the promised Kingdom of God was now dawning. Additionally, this baptism was a baptism for
the forgiveness of sins and this is confirmed at verse 40, where in the narrative Peter exhorts his
listeners to allow themselves to be saved, and in the immediately following verse the listeners are
said to undergo baptism. This binding of baptism and forgiveness of sins is also found at Acts
2:38, where Peter states, “Repent and be baptized, everyone of you, in the name of Jesus Christ

973 Interestingly, and somewhat inexplicably, Hans Von Campenhausen thinks that there never was a
baptismal formula which had the name of Jesus at its heart. His main argument hinges upon Paul’s statement in 1
Cor. 1:12-13, where Paul asks rhetorically, “Were any of you baptized into my name?” Von Campenhausen
extrapolates from this and claims that the statement that some Corinthians were baptized into Jesus’ name is also
therefore just a rhetorical flourish! To review Hans Freiherr Von Campenhausen’s arguments see, “Taufen auf den
for the forgiveness of sins. And you will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." If we peer a bit closer at the verse, as well as the broader picture which the author paints in the Gospel of Luke, several features stand out as worthy of note.

First, the entire Pentecost speech attributed to Peter is programmatic for the author. This is most clearly seen when we compare Lk. 24: 47b-49 to Acts 2:38. In the Gospel the author states that during Jesus’ post-resurrection appearance he claims that his suffering was done in accordance with the Scriptures, but also that shortly into the future:

Repentance for forgiveness of sins should be proclaimed in his [sic] name to all the nations, beginning from Jerusalem. 48 “You are witnesses of these things. 49 “Behold, I am sending forth the promise of My Father upon you; but you are to stay in the city until you are clothed with power from on high.

This passage, in so many words, forms the backbone of the programmatic approach which the author adopts and its fulfillment fills the pages of the author’s companion work to the Gospel. Key to this program is the connection between forgiveness of sins in the name of Jesus, and the bestowal of the Spirit (Lk. 24:49, “power from on high”), a connection which the author expressly draws. When we return to the narrative in Acts chapter two we see a similar connection being drawn (2:38, “And you will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit”). Further points of interest are that Jesus claims in his post-resurrection speech that this connection between the bestowal of the Spirit and forgiveness of sins in his name is attested to by God’s own word (24:46-47: γέγραπται παθείν τὸν χριστὸν καὶ ἀναστῆκται ἐκ νεκρῶν τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, καὶ κηρυχθῆναι ἐπὶ τῶν δύναμιν αὐτοῦ μετάνοιαν εἰς ἁφεσίν ἀμαρτίων εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθη; cf. Acts 1:8). This claim mirrors the similar claim put in the mouth of Peter later on that all of the prophets testify (3:24: πᾶντες ὁ προφήται μαρτυροῦσιν) that forgiveness of sins would take place in Jesus’ name. We see here yet again that this motif performs a programmatic function within the author’s *Heilsgeschichte*.  

---

974 Gerhard Barth, “Taufe auf den Namen Jesu,” 52.

975 Insofar as the reception of the Spirit signaled that the baptizand was now a Christian, that is, the bestowal of the Spirit led to the notion that the baptizand was now a ‘Son of God,’ it is obvious that baptism in Jesus’ name is laden with christological significance. Baptism in Jesus’ name, bestows God’s spirit. For further details see, Hartman, *Auf den Namen des Herrn*, 26.
Other important features in Acts 2:38 that deserve notice are that the clause, ‘Repent and be baptized,’ constitutes a conditional construction. In fact, the sequence, imperative + καί + future, signal that repentance and baptism are requirements to receive the Holy Spirit. Needless to say, the Spirit is reserved for those who invoke his name, and this outpouring was seen as the fulfillment of the eschatological promise of God. There is yet more that can be said in favor of some sort of connection between baptism in the name of Jesus and reception of the Spirit.

For example, for the author of Luke-Acts it is clear that the baptism of John was a baptism of repentance which, although carried out with water (e.g., Lk. 3:16; Acts 1:5, 11:16), did not result in the bestowal of the Holy Spirit (Acts 19:2f.). Furthermore, in Acts 10:48 we find Peter’s command to baptize the household of Cornelius; thereafter Cornelius’ household is said to have received the Spirit immediately after Peter’s statement that all who repent in the name of Jesus would find forgiveness of sins (Acts 10:43-44; cf. 22:16). Correspondingly, although we see some variability concerning baptism and the reception of the Spirit in Acts, the author nevertheless held to some attachment between the two.

Moving outside of the Book of Acts, another passage of import is found in I Cor. 6:11, where in an apparent allusion to baptism Paul describes the state of his charges in the following manner, “…you were washed, you were sanctified, you were justified in the name of

---

976 Pesch, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 125.
978 Ibid., 59. Hartman in this context says, “Nicht die Drohung einer bevorstehenden Krise prägt Umkehrverkündigung und Taufe, sondern die Vorstellung, daß jetzt die eschatologischen Gaben gegeben werden, die vom Werk Jesu und seiner Erhöhung abhängen und dadurch frei geworden sind.” See pg. 133. Haenchen’s read of the data also comes to the conclusion that for the author of Acts the gift of the Spirit and water baptism are bound together. Moreover, Ruck-Schroder observes that the important exception of Acts 8:17 (cf. 19:1-6), where those people who were converted in Samaria had been baptized, but did not receive the Spirit until John and Peter came and lay hands upon them, serves Luke’s apostolic motive and is thus no indication for a Spirit-free baptism. See, Ernst Haenchen, *Apostelgeschichte*. KEK, Abt. 3,12, (Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 1959), 258, and Ruck-Schroder, *DNGJNT*, 173.
979 Most commentators accept that baptism is in view, although the entire process of salvation is evidently also entertained here. Now interestingly, the imagery in 6:11 is generally thought to lie outside of Paul himself. This passage therefore finds a further importance in that it presumably delivers a traditional understanding of one of the effects of baptism, not just Paul’s own view. For more on this aspect see Hartman, *Auf den Namen des Herrn*, 83.
the Lord Jesus Christ and by the Spirit of our God."\(^{980}\) It is exegetically accepted that the actions described by these three verbs are all carried out \(\epsilon\nu\ \tau\omega\ \delta\nu\omicron\mati\ \tau\omicron\ \kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\)\.\(^{981}\) Apparently, by this expression Paul is thinking here in terms of an \textit{Anrufung} of the name of Jesus during baptism.\(^{982}\) Not to be overlooked too is the striking parallelism between \(\epsilon\nu\ \tau\omega\ \delta\nu\omicron\mati\ \tau\omicron\ \kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\ \varepsilon\nu\ \tau\omega\ \pi\nu\epsilon\omicron\mati\ \tau\omicron\ \theta\omicron\omicron\). This parallelism highlights the fact that baptism is efficacious both because Jesus’ name is invoked,\(^{983}\) and also because the Spirit of God works in the baptism. The fact that the author places the name of Jesus and the Spirit of God in such close proximity (and parallelism) implies a direct connection in the author’s mind between the bestowal of the Spirit in baptism and the invocation of the name of Jesus during the baptismal rite.\(^{984}\) In this context, 1 Cor. 12:3 takes on new meaning when we read, “No one can say \textit{kurios \varepsilon\nu \tau\omicron\sigmao\upsider} except by the Holy Spirit.” As this passage makes clear, it is the Spirit of God which enables a person to recognize Jesus as the \textit{kurios} and to confess in faith that he is the Lord who saves. This fact translates into the conclusion that it is the Spirit which allows the baptizand to call out Jesus’ name in faith.\(^{985}\) Furthermore, it is the name of Jesus, as well as the Spirit of God, which serves as, in the words of

\(^{980}\) The use of the metaphor of washing of sins (through baptism) is also found elsewhere in the New Testament. For example, from the pen of the author of Acts we find at 22:16 that Paul is said, while defending himself before his fellow Jews in Jerusalem, to make a call to repentance and he states that, “Why do you delay? Arise, and be baptized, and wash away your sins, calling on His name.” Another prominent example is Titus 3:5, where the Deutero-Pauline author writes, “He saved us, not on the basis of deeds which we have done in righteousness, but according to His mercy, by the washing of regeneration and renewing by the Holy Spirit.

\(^{981}\) So Steyn, who quotes a host of authorities to this effect. See “To Onoma tou Kyriou in 1 Cor.,” 487 fn. 49. Ruck-Schröder also understands \(\epsilon\nu\) in an instrumental sense in regards to all three verbs. See, \textit{DNGJNT}, 79.

\(^{982}\) Ruck-Schröder, \textit{DNGJNT}, 79.

\(^{983}\) The name of Jesus is to be understood in the instrumental sense. Ruck-Schröder also understands the passage in this way, as does Conzelmann, who she follows in this context. See \textit{DNGJNT}, 79.

\(^{984}\) So too Ruck-Schröder. In connection to 1 Cor. 6:11, she rightly points out that it is the Spirit who allows the baptizand to call out the name of Jesus. Some expositors have thought along the lines that Jesus’ name must be spoken out first, and then the Spirit is ‘activated’ so to speak. Ruck-Schröder notes the obvious difficulty in positing that the Spirit is subordinate to the name of Jesus. Indeed, the three verbs are in the passive and this signifies that it is God who brings these three actions into realization as both Hartman and Delling recognized. See, \textit{Auf den Namen des Herrn}, 65; Ruck-Schröder. \textit{DNGJNT}, 79-80; and Delling, \textit{Die Zuwendung}, 56.

\(^{985}\) Hartman correctly notes that in terms of this particular passage Paul thinks here only of the present work of the Spirit to effect the salvific actions and that we can not draw any inference about a connection between the bestowal of the Spirit and baptism based on this passage alone. See \textit{Auf den Namen des Herrn}, 66.
Ruck-Schröder, “die Kraftquelle der Taufe” [emphasis mine]. The above-noted parallelism between the name of Jesus and the ‘Spirit of God’ suggests that the name of Jesus has the same claim to divine authority, power, and status as the Spirit of God.

Of further import is that Paul saw this act as a decisive eschatological act, for I Cor. 6:11a says of Paul’s readers, “And this is what some of you were....” This reference is to be understood in relationship to 6:9, where Paul says, “Do you not know that the wicked will not inherit the Kingdom of God...” In light of the larger context, it is implied that through the baptismal rite the baptizand becomes incorporated into the Kingdom of God and this puts an eschatological tinge to the entire event (cf. Acts 28:31 and especially 8:12, where the two phrases, τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ, and, τοῦ ὄνοματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ are brought together).

In any case, the effects of baptism according to I Cor. 6:11 are of course profound: the Christian is washed, sanctified, and justified through baptism, brought near to God, transformed, transferred into the Kingdom of God, when baptism is carried out by calling on the name of Jesus. What, however, is the import of this transference into the Kingdom of God (i.e., incorporation into the community of believers) in Jesus’ name?

Baptism played a central role in that it functioned as the entry point for the formation of a new community (I Cor. 12:13; cf. Gal. 3:28; Eph. 4:5). The reader may recall that in the introduction I made mention of the fact that cultic acts formed the very brick and mortar by which a religious community constructed its ideological walls and it forms a sort of barrier between the community and those who do not share the same convictions. In this sense one may rightfully say that baptism stands in relationship to Christianity in the exact same fashion that circumcision stands within Judaism—it signals inclusion into the redeemed people of God who will experience His salvation and eschatological benefits in the world to come. Indeed, we can even speak in terms of baptism of Jesus’ name replacing circumcision.

With I Cor. 6:11 reviewed, I shall turn to other passages which employ different imagery. Of interest here is the notion that the baptizand had been transferred to the ownership of Jesus. In
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986 Ibid. Ruck-Schröder suggests, and I agree, that the name of Jesus insures not only the power of Jesus, but also his presence, while the Spirit of God naturally insures the presence and power of God during the rite.

987 This is seen very clearly at Acts 22:16, where as we have seen in footnote 980, Paul states to his listeners, ‘And now why do you delay? Arise, and be baptized, and wash away your sins, calling on His name.’

988 Ibid., 81. See also, “Into the Name of Jesus,” 29.
spite of Heitmüller’s over reliance on Greek commercial expressions, and his all encompassing explanation of baptism in terms of transference of the baptizand to Jesus, there is at least one passage which does unquestionably highlight this meaning. Here I refer to I Cor. 1: 10-13. Although the passage does not expressly mention the name of Jesus, it nevertheless does take up the issue of what baptism into the name of Jesus means. In this passage, Paul speaks of divisions in the Corinthian assembly. Different groups within the community who had allied themselves with various leaders in the early Church engendered these divisions. Now let us briefly look at the passage in full:

Now I exhort you, brethren, by the name (διὰ τοῦ ὄνοματος) of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you all agree, and there be no divisions among you, but you be made complete in the same mind and in the same judgment. 11 For I have been informed concerning you, my brethren, by Chloe’s people, that there are quarrels among you. 12 Now I mean this, that each one of you is saying, “I am of Paul,” and “I of Apollos,” and “I of Cephas,” and “I of Christ.” 13 Has Christ been divided? Paul was not crucified for you, was he? Or were you baptized in the name of Paul?

Clearly, Paul intends on combating the forces of division, and he draws upon three arguments: first, it is impossible for Christ to be divided, therefore, as followers of Christ they too are not to be divided. Second, it was Christ who was crucified for the Corinthian believers—not Paul, or Peter or any other person; thus, the believers have become Christians based on the salvific works of Jesus. Paul’s third argument is that the Corinthians were all baptized into the name of Jesus. Paul’s argument is clear enough, but how does this relate to the notion of possession? If we look a bit closer at this latter claim we see that while Paul asks, “Were you baptized into the name of Paul,” at verse 13, just immediately prior to this in verse 12 Paul states that the Corinthians are saying that they belong to one person or another. Here the connection between possession and baptism is made abundantly clear. It would seem fair to assume that the Corinthians received this understanding from Paul himself and that for Paul baptism could mean the baptizand is brought into the possession of Christ. Stated differently, they are under the
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889 Heitmüller, JNJ, 118. Heitmüller states, “...der ganze Tenor von I Kor, 1 ff., zu der Annahme zwingt, dass der Name Christi bei der Taufe genannt wurde...Auch dass Korinther nicht εἰς τὸ ὄνομα des Kephas oder des Apollos, sondern εἰς τὸ ὄνομα Χριστοῦ getauft sind, muss für die Leser zum Greifen klar gewesen sein.”
lordship of the person that they were baptized into. Essentially, this passage speaks of transference of the baptizand to Jesus, a sort of "Herrschqfiswechsel."

Now that we have reviewed some of the more prominent baptismal imagery I shall turn my attention to the comparative materials.

**ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON TO JEWISH AND GRECO-ROMAN MATERIALS**

When we turn to examine Jewish or Greco-Roman parallels to Christian baptism we find that no ‘true’ parallels exist. With respect to prior Greco-Roman ‘baptisms’ it must be said that there simply are none that can serve as true analogs and which therefore can serve in facilitating a comparison to Christian baptism. True enough, Apuleius informs us that he underwent ritual washings when he was dedicated to the cult of Isis, but in this case Apuleius speaks in terms of lustrations which are designed to render the initiate ritually clean. In contrast, Christian baptism was a baptism for the remission of sins. Its orientation was eschatological, unlike Apuleius’ ‘here-and-now’ concern to bring about ritual purity. Another meaningful difference is that Christian baptism was performed by another Christian to the baptizand. In other terms, Apuleius washed himself, a practice common in ritual lustrations. Finally, and most importantly, we have no direct evidence that this particular rite was carried out in the name of the god, even though we have good reason to suppose that it might have been.

In terms of Jewish rites, the ritual lustrations which were practiced at the time were certainly not a ‘baptism.’ These lustrations suffer from the same shortcomings that what we have just observed about Apuleius’ initiation into the mysteries of Isis. Like the lustrations of the Gentile world, Jewish lustrations were designed only to render the believer ritually clean.

---


991 G. Barth’s wording. See Barth, "Taufe auf den Namen Jesu," 54. Naturally, this conclusion would go hand in hand with those who see baptism as an exorcistic rite with apotropaic overtones. For further discussions see, Otto Böcher, *Christus Exorcista,* 89.

992 Met. 11.23.1.

993 It must be pointed out that later so-called ‘baptisms’, such as the Taurobolium, post-date the New Testament and almost certainly reflect the concern to mirror Christian rituals—the rituals of a faith that was finding success in the Greco-Roman world.

994 Josephus mentions that his spiritual tutor Bannus often bathed himself to remain pure. See *Vita* 11.
These cleansings were not signs of conversion; instead they rendered the already converted ritually clean so that they could partake in cultic rites.

Jewish proselyte 'baptism' also existed, but, while superficially similar in that the rite signaled the entry into the religious community, it differed in many significant ways.995

The only remaining candidate which might offer some similarities to Christian baptism is the baptism of John. In John's baptism we find three points of commonality: first, the baptism had an eschatological orientation; second, the baptism was a baptism of forgiveness; third, the baptizand was baptized by another person.996

Still, for all of its similarities to John's baptism, Christian baptism is suis generis.997 To begin with it should be noted that while much is known about both Christian and Johannine baptism, by any comparative measure Christian baptism is most differentiated from Johannine baptism by the baptismal formula which uses the name of Jesus.998 Another feature that I believe is unique to Christian baptism is that Christian baptism was executed in terms of entrance into the Kingdom of God.999 Indeed, Christian baptism placed the believer between the two poles of

995 For instance, like ritual lustrations, but unlike Christian baptism, the proselyte performed the ritual themselves. Although both Christian baptism and proselyte baptism were baptisms of conversion, proselyte baptism lacked any eschatological orientation. Absent too, so far as we know, was any connection with the forgiveness of sins. So, while some similarities exist, the differences overwhelm the common traits and point us in a different direction.


997 This uniqueness can be seen in the variable imagery which surfaces now and again in the Epistles.

998 Gerhard Barth, "Taufe auf den Namen Jesu," 50. The call to be baptized in the name of Jesus might possibly derive from an established cult formula. See, Corp. Herm. 1 26; Apuleius, Met. XI 22; and finally, Acts of Thomas 73.78.

999 Most authors fail to note that the reoccurring connection between the name of Jesus, and the 'Kingdom of God' are also singular traits of Christian baptism. John's baptism emphasized repentance and escape from the eschatological wrath to come, while Christian baptism emphasized more the entry into the Kingdom of God with its positive corollary: the baptizand in the process becomes a recipient of the promises of God. That one can not simply equate the baptism of repentance of John and its Christian variant is amply stressed by Behm (as quoted in Hartman, "Baptism 'Into the Name of Jesus' and Early Christology," 42; Hartman quotes from J. Behm, "μετανοή;" ThNT V. 4 (1942), 998. "Aus der Umkehr erwächst in der Verkündigung Jesu der Glaube (Mk. 1:15), nicht als ein zweites das er verlangt, sondern als Entfaltung der positiven Seite der metanoia; der Hinwendung zu Gott. Die Umkehr im Sinne Jesu erschöpft sich nicht im Negativen, dem Bruch mit dem alten Wesen angesichts des drohenden eschatologischen Gerichts: sie umfasst die ganze Wandlung des Menschen, den die Gottesherrschaft in Anspruch nimmt, und schliesst die Begründung des neuen persönlichen Verhältnisses des Menschen zu Gott, der pistis mit ein. Umkehren, sich bekehren ist in einem alles, was der Anbruch der Gottesherrschaft vom Menschen verlangt." In short, for John, the Kingdom was coming, for the post-Easter Christian, the Kingdom was now breaking in. Certainly the author of the Shepherd of Hermas thought along these same lines. In the third book of the Similitudes (3.9.12) the author attempts to unravel one of his similes. He equates entry into a city with entering the Kingdom of God and says, "For if you desire to enter into a city, and that city is surrounded by a wall, and has but
salvation history—the ‘here-and-now’ inclusion into the Kingdom of God and the promise of participation at the future coming of Jesus. These crucial differences signal not only that Christian baptism held some inherent differences from the Johannine baptism, but also that the name of Jesus played a central role in the rite—in contrast to John’s baptism, which evidently did not use any name. What conclusions may we than draw given the connection between John’s baptism and Christian baptism, while simultaneously retaining the recognition that Christian baptism was something novel?

First, it seems clear that the early Christian faith appropriated the original Johannine baptism and infused it with new meaning. Here the early Christians, by baptizing into the name of Jesus, have transformed the Johannine baptism and made Jesus the frame of reference for the baptismal rite (that is, it is executed with respect to Jesus). It is also surely significant that the predecessor to this baptism was a metanoia that was brought about by proclaiming the apostolic kerygma (indeed it was predicated upon Jesus’ ministry and mediated through Jesus’ name), which was preached in the name of Jesus and secured by adherence to his original message of the Kingdom.

Now, Hartman has promoted the view that the resurrection of Jesus clothed the rite with an electric eschatological element. More specifically, the resurrection points to vindication and the Christian belief that Jesus was the coming Son of Man (the primitive Christian

one gate, can you enter into that city save through the gate which it has? “Why, how can it be otherwise, sir?” I said. “If, then, you cannot enter into the city except through its gate, so, in like manner, a man cannot otherwise enter into the kingdom of God than by the name of His beloved Son

1000 As Hartman puts it, “The phrase then characterizes the rite in a fundamental way: it was a ‘Jesus baptism’.” From the examples Hartman culled from his sources he was able to delineate three basic meanings of the baptismal phrase: 1) The action takes place “with respect to” a thing or person; 2) the action takes place “with respect to” things expressed in abstract nouns; 3) the action takes place “regarding” persons, namely men, as well as beings belonging in the divine sphere who are not engaged as agents in the action described by the verb. Hartman takes up another thread when he points out that the expression, “into the name of someone”, can often bear the connotation of partitive action or separateness. As evidence for this claim Hartman adduces the phrase in b. Av. Zar. iii 13, where the Samaritans are said to perform circumcision, “into the name of Mt. Gerizim,” whereas the Jews perform circumcision, “into the name of the covenant.” Thus, within the context of the intra-muros schism between the adherents of the Baptist and those of Jesus the use of the phrase, ‘in the name of Jesus,’ would signify that Christian baptism was now to be distinguished from John’s baptism. For more details see Hartman, “In the Name of Jesus.” 437-439. See also Auf den Namen des Herrn Jesus, 134 and “Baptism ‘Into the Name of Jesus’ and Early Christology.” Studia Theologica, 28 (1974): 27-28.


1002 Ibid., 37. As Betz notes the Pauline phrase, Χριστοῦ ἐνδοεν, surely signifies a divine dynamic of transformation. See Betz, Galatians, 187.
Naherwartung). We would do well at this point to allow Hartman to summarize this final turn in his own hermeneutical argument:

A Christology in Son of Man terms seems to be one that fits well the facts that after Easter people were summoned to repent and be received (by Jesus) into the Heilsgemeinde, b) they expected the imminent Kingdom of God which included their own vindication, c) the gateway into that Heilsgemeinde and into that expectation was a baptism ‘into the name of Jesus’; This means that a) and b) depended upon Jesus, who was regarded as vindicated after his death. This, in its turn, necessarily brings a Christology into the picture and prevents us from referring a), b), and c), to, e.g. a general apocalyptic-eschatological Hochspannung.1003

If we follow this trail to its logical conclusion we see that this use of the name of Jesus christologically orients Christian baptism. This finding suggests that this christological placement of Jesus at the center of the cultic rite signifies that Jesus had now transcended human categories in the opinion of the Church.

Just how far removed from ordinary humans Jesus was thought to be can be gauged in the light of Old Testament conventions, where the very act of calling upon YHWH was equatable to worship of Him, as well as signaling that the person belonged to YHWH.1004 From this one may conclude that a similar situation now existed with respect to Jesus.1005 Of course this calling out of the name of Jesus during baptism signaled that the baptizand acknowledged that Jesus was both Christ and Lord. Indeed, as I Cor. 6:11 strongly intimates, prior to baptism the baptizand was impure and sinful; therefore they belonged to “dem Machtbereich dieses [their prior] Gottes.”1006 This reality also therefore means that after baptism the baptizand was now under Christ’s sphere of power. Hartman aptly formulates this relationship between baptism and Christ in the following fashion:

Wenn man von der...Taufe auf den Namen des Herrn Jesus gesprochen hat, hat der Ausdruck einen Inhalt erhalten, nach dem der ‘Herr Jesus’ dieselbe Bedeutung für die Taufe hat wie ‘der Name’ [i.e., as a circumlocution for God] oder ‘der Himmel’ für den Gottesdienst, die Versammlung, das Opfer oder die Gelübde. Dort wurden die genannten Riten im Rahmen des Dienstes von Gott ausgeführt und im Lichte seiner Bedeutung für sein Volk. Hier wird etwas ähnliches vom Herrn Jesus gesagt. Der Name


1004 Bietenhard, “ἀνάμνησις,” 255.

1005 Heitmüller was not alone on this score. Jacob too inclined in this direction, as did Nägelsbach. See DNGJHS, 73 and ING, 62.

Hartman is clearly following the correct trail when he notes with respect to cultic rites in general in antiquity that “Sie [culotic rites] werden „auf den Namen“ der Gottheit ausgeführt, der der Ritus gilt oder mit der er verbunden wird. Die betreffende Gottheit ist eine grundlegende Referenz des Ritus.”  

To bring out the implications of this further I need to unpack this statement of Hartman just a bit more.

First, we should remember that Jewish scruples mandated that the invocation of the Tetragrammaton alone occur exclusively within cultic settings and the occupation of this same ‘sacred space’ by the name of Jesus naturally has profound christological implications. It is impossible to exaggerate the fact that within Judaism it was YHWH who authorized and generated every cultic act—indeed every holy object or act stemmed from Him.  

In this context Mowinckel justly coined the truism with respect to cultic acts that “Hinter diesen Handlungen steht die Gottheit selb...”  

This truism then must be taken to also infer that it is the risen Jesus who stands behind the ritual. In light of this evidence it seems certain that Jesus was the frame of reference for baptism because he was the bearer of salvation. He was also the referent because it was believed that Jesus was part of the divine identity; indeed, he was the historical manifestation of God.

In summary, baptism was an eschatological event that saved the baptizand from God’s imminent visitation, and transferred the baptizand to the sphere of Jesus’ power and protection. This aspect of transference is also seen in those references which speak of the baptizand becoming incorporated into the Kingdom of Jesus.

Baptism also served to bring the baptizand into conformity with the sufferings and vindication that characterized Jesus’ life, death, and resurrection. Because every Christian had conformed to this pattern through baptism, they were now all one, members of the chosen redeemed (eschatological) people of God. And all of these remarkable events and

---

1007 Ibid., 45f.
1008 Ibid., 44.
1010 Ibid.
transformations were accomplished *in* the name of Jesus.

With my section on the phenomenological review finished, I shall now take up what this study reveals to us about the christological beliefs of the early Christians.
CHAPTER SIX
THE RITUAL USE OF THE NAME OF JESUS, EMERGENT BINITARIAN
CHRISTOLOGY, AND SUMMARY OF RESULTS

Je bedeutender, ungewöhnlicher ein Person ist,...um so wirkungskräf tiger ist auch sein Name, um
so mehr Heil oder Unheil strahlt von ihm aus.1011

Before I attempt to answer how the name-concept contributes to our understanding of the
process of christological development, it is worth pointing out that the real difference between
cultus and magic is not to be found in ὀρώμενον (i.e., performed acts), but in the far more
significant λεγόμενον (i.e., the spoken word). Actions such as prayer, intercession, offering of
worship, are found as a matter of course in almost all cults and do not offer us much help in
distinguishing the most salient differences between various systems of belief. For example, on
the outside magical invocation appears similar to ritual prayer; the magical invocation for
blessing is similar to the priest calling out God’s name over the children of Israel. We must look
at what words were employed, or in the case of my study, what name was invoked to help us
unlock the significance of ritual actions in early Christianity.

Upon sifting through the data on the early Christian use of the name of Jesus, as well as a
fair amount of reflection on the meaning of the name of Jesus, several firm conclusions can be
drawn. I shall address the group of passages which contain reflection first.

It is evident that in those passages which take up reflection over the significance of the
name of Jesus that several major functions were served. One of the most significant functions
was to express the somewhat ill-defined belief that Jesus must be included in the divine identity.
Passages which speak of Jesus having received the divine name (Phil. 2:9), divine names/titles
(Rev. 19: 11, 16), or the name ‘Son’ (Heb. 1:4), all serve to support the belief that Jesus was a
part of the divine formulation. By staking out the claim that Jesus had received either the divine
name, or at least another divine name (i.e., the Son of God), the earliest Christians could express
their conviction that Jesus not only belonged in the divine reality, but furthermore, that since the
bestowal of the name(s) came by the hand of God this recognition of the incorporation of Jesus
into the divine identity was prompted by God Himself. The earliest Christians accordingly saw
themselves not as violators of Jewish monotheistic scruples, but rather as a group who
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recognized that God had revealed in some fashion that the divine identity included Jesus. The earliest Christians certainly found this belief difficult to understand and were no doubt pained when attempting to work out this complex ‘divine identity’ from a rational point of view, but they nonetheless believed that it was true. We can see in these passages not only the conviction that Jesus was a part of the divine identity, but also that these passages, and the christology which undergirds them, served as the provision for the defense that the Church had not departed from monotheism.

Another function which this reflection provided was to serve as a signpost for who Jesus was in terms of his ministry and mission. Passages such as Matt. 1:18 clearly reflect the concern to alert the readers that Jesus was a divinely ordained prophet and messiah whose ministry would bring about the ultimate salvation of those who allied themselves with Jesus.

A different function is served by Acts 2:38. Here the name of Jesus functions in several ways. First, it served to establish that Jesus was the divinely ordained intermediary between God and man. Only by calling upon God’s ordained prophet, messiah, and Son, could one receive salvation from the coming wrath of God. The early Church clearly viewed the name of Jesus as an object of faith in the sense that to have faith in the salvific work of Jesus entailed also having faith that his name alone could usher in salvation. Jesus’ name functions almost like a door; it allows entry into the divine family where God Himself provides protection for His people. This use of the name of Jesus also makes it clear that the early Christians believed that in some fashion Jesus was part of the divine identity. Numerous lines of evidence converge in support of this conclusion.

One evidence for this conclusion comes from the nature of confession, for confession served to highlight the core beliefs of the community. The fact that the earliest Christians could confess the name of Jesus means that they believed that Jesus was part of the divine identity and was worthy of acknowledgment. It is also clear that the earliest Christians confessed the name of Jesus because they believed that this brought glory to God; in fact, in their view God mandated this confession.

Now, in terms of the power of the name of Jesus it may be said that the implementation of the name of Jesus in exorcisms, healings, and other related phenomenon, signaled a clear shift to a new paradigm which incorporated significant christological features; that is, the use of the name of Jesus as a numinous name par excellence serves as an indication that he had been
elevated to a position over all creation in the opinion of the early Christians. This use of the name of Jesus is in keeping with the claims of the early Christians who speak of Jesus' elevation to a position of power over all beings. Indeed, the fact that the earliest Christians invoke only the name of Jesus to perform miracles and exorcisms indicates that they felt that Jesus was above all other earthy and spiritual powers; that is to say, Jesus was somehow an indispensable component of the divine reality.

When we turn to the use of the name of Jesus in baptism we find another strong indication that the earliest Christians felt that Jesus' name was above all other names. Indeed, the fact that this entire rite had to be carried out during the calling out of the name of Jesus is one of the most christologically pregnant actions of the early Christians. We know that Christian baptism is a christologically-reworked version of the baptism of John. The most obvious and important aspect of this christological revision is the use of the name of Jesus in the Christian rite. By utilizing the name of Jesus the rite was oriented toward Jesus himself. Thus, Jesus was the referent for the rite. Never before in the history of Judaism had a rite of inclusion into the people of God included the name of any intermediary being, angel, or historical person-no matter how exalted. It seems plausible, therefore, in the light of this singular use of the name of a historical person to suggest that the earliest Christians did not see Jesus in simply human terms. This in turn suggests that the earliest Christians had come to the conclusion that Jesus was part of the divine identity and that he was the historical manifestation of God. It was this realization, and the fact that Jesus had provided for the very salvation which they enjoyed, that allowed Jesus' name to be used in the rite of baptism. Indeed, because Jesus was seen as part of the divine identity Christians could belong to Jesus just as a Jew could belong to God. In the mind of the earliest Christians belonging to Jesus was something commanded by God and believed to bring God glory and honor, for it was God who had orchestrated the entire Christ-event.

It is also worth calling to mind the fact that invocation in a cultic setting had always been reserved for God alone in Jewish piety. The similar invocation of the name of Jesus within the Christian cult clearly invites comparison to the invocation of God in Jewish cultic settings and signifies that Jesus had transcended normal human categories in the view of the earliest Christians. Thus, in one of the most important acts of religiosity; that is, in cultic acts, the name of Jesus stood alone. This is yet another strong signal that the earliest Christians felt that Jesus shared in the divine identity.
This study also demonstrates that part of this reformulation of the divine identity to include Jesus was driven by the practice of transferring Old Testament YHWH texts/titles to Jesus. This accommodation also included the transference of certain divine prerogatives and attributes.

For some, this accommodation included the belief that Jesus was in some sense the historical manifestation of the name of God. As a natural and inevitable corollary this accommodation also included the integration of Jesus at the center of the Christian cult, and his name therefore became the focal point of cultic activities.

Finally, I should take a moment to explain how the name of Jesus related to the name YHWH in early Christianity. First, in my judgment, we can speak of a belief that Jesus’ name had been elevated to a plane which in the past had been reserved for ‘YHWH’ alone. This elevation was believed to have been instituted by God, and a part of this exaltation was that God had also exalted Jesus’ name. Jesus’ name, and Jesus’ name alone, was now the ‘name of power’ that was to be invoked in times of spiritual conflict. This sole emphasis on Jesus’ name was believed to bring God glory because it was the fruition of the work which He had accomplished in Christ.

In summary, this survey demonstrates that the earliest Christians used the name of Jesus in a manner which suggests that they believed that Jesus was in some fashion divine. Jesus was not just a mediator figure, or a messenger. In their view he was somehow a manifestation of the divine reality. The earliest Christians utilized the name of Jesus in a manner strikingly similar to Jews who employed the name of God in various ritual settings and in many other activities. This overlap is nearly total. Exceptions to this rule seem to be readily explained by the absence of any occasion in the New Testament documents whereby the various authors needed to use the name of Jesus in a particular fashion.

Furthermore, it must be pointed out once again that it is of the utmost significance that in stark contrast to the normative application of numerous divine names in Greco-Roman magic and religion, the earliest Christian praxis was to apply Jesus’ name alone in effecting healings, exorcisms, miracles, cultic functions, salvation, revelation, and providing access to God. Even within the Church itself, never are the names of the apostles placed in apposition with Jesus’ name, nor are they said to be mediums of exchange in the divine economy. Not only is Jesus’ name applied across the entire spectrum of activities, but we must also recognize that Jesus’ name
is utilized without escort with the names of other principal divine agents (angelic beings for example), including even the name YHWH. For the early Christians, Jesus’ name bore the divine exousia, dynamis, and doxa. This study demonstrates that the earliest Christians felt obligated to accept that the prerogatives and divine predications which belonged to the Name must now be shared with the name of Jesus. This absolute use of the name of Jesus by the early Church unquestionably reveals a profound binitarian christology which implies the elevation of Jesus over the entire created order, seen and unseen. In brief, the evidence strongly shows that the use of the name of Jesus by the earliest Christians provides strong, “on the ground” proof, so to speak, that the earliest Christians believed that Jesus must be recognized as part of the divine reality.

Now, this elevation of the name of Jesus to such rarified status testifies to a profound ‘high’ christology on the part of the early Church. Perhaps most astoundingly we have also observed that this supplanting of the name of YHWH by the name of Jesus seemingly occurred from the very outset of the Christian faith. This last point cannot be overstated for the issue of chronology has been a central focus in the debate over ‘high’ christology. In the mind of some, a ‘high’ christology at a relatively late date (ca. 80-100 C.E.) would imply an evolutionary development and free the early Church from charges of bitheism. Along with other studies, the results of this study will help to clear up this ongoing debate.

In conclusion, this review of the name-concept in terms of the early Church has put us in the center of a profound christological development. Simply put, for the early Christian the name of Jesus occupied all ‘divine space’; that is, it was at the center of the cult and it was the spiritual authority and power over the entire cosmos. This hegemony over all divine space unmistakably testifies that a high christology was imprinted upon the shape of early Christ-devotion.
APPENDIX ONE

BACKGROUND TO PHILIPPIANS 2:6-11

There have been many attempts to uncover the background of the hymn but to date none have met with universal approval. In order to appreciate this fact I introduce here the major attempts which have been undertaken for understanding the background for the hymn.

Certainly the most influential study yet produced on the hymn was the seminal study of Ernst Lohmeyer in his Kyrios Jesus. Lohmeyer’s work inaugurated the modern study of the passage by conclusively demonstrating that the verses have a poetic ‘hymnic’ quality which separates them from the larger context in which they are found. Lohmeyer believed that the historical backdrop to the hymn’s production is found in the nascent theology of the Palestinian mother church (or maybe Antioch or Damascus) and pressed into service in cultic settings, esp. the Eucharist. While useful in numerous ways, Lohmeyer’s study did not explain why Isa. 45:23 was specifically incorporated into the hymn.

Another notable model proposed an Urmench-redeemer background to the hymn. E. Käsemann championed this view and saw the figure in Corp. Herm. 1:13-14 as forming the most proximal backdrop for the Philippians hymn. There the primal man is said to be like God and even to display the form of God. Käsemann saw vv. 6-8 as describing the subjection of Jesus to the hostile cosmic powers (a theme embraced by the Hermetic literature), while vv. 9-10 detailed Christ’s victory over these powers. Unlike Lohmeyer, who attached a Palestinian provenance to his theory on the creation of the hymn, Käsemann saw the hymn as having a Hellenistic provenance.

Against this position however D. Georgi has persuasively argued that key elements of the Urmench-redeemer myth are absent in the hymn. There are, for example, no obvious conflicts between the redeemer and powers neither of the cosmos, nor between believers and the cosmic powers who would seek to hinder them. Furthermore, the existence of the redeemer in his pre-temporal state is nowhere mentioned. Moreover, there is no mention of the redeemed, an

---

1012 KJ, 73.

1013 See Käsemann’s, “Kritische Analyse.” Wengst, too, persuaded by Käsemann’s work, adhered to this model. See Christologische Formeln, 146-147.

1014 Jesus’ state is framed with respect to his former divine place and does not expressly bring out Jesus’ pre-temporal existence except by extension.
integral component of the Gnostic Redeemer myth. Nagata has chimed in and added that the apparent reference to an actual incarnation in verse 7, and the investiture of the greatest honors inclusive of the ‘name above every name’ (v. 9), are unparalleled in the Gnostic redeemer myth. Indeed, it is this last respect, exaltation and universal acclamation, that the Gnostic redeemer myth most misses the mark by offering no analog. Moreover, in the Redeemer myth it is the Redeemer himself who rises by virtue of his own power, while in the hymn it is God who is the subject of the action. Besides these objections the proposition of a well-developed Gnostic myth in pre-Christian times is rather dubious, to say the least. Käsemann, to his credit, rejected his proposal shortly after he issued it and it remains only as a historical footnote.

Another proposed background is that Jewish Wisdom speculation forms the backdrop to the hymn. D. Georgi is perhaps its best-known champion. This background envisions the suitable figure to be the Righteous One who is chosen as a divine instrument. Examples of this motif are drawn from the Wisdom of Solomon where the Righteous One lacks any individual traits and is clearly only a figurehead intended to bring to the fore the characteristics of righteousness. To bring out the comparison between the Righteous One and the figure depicted in Phil. 2:5-11, I need to create the outline of the Righteous One.

One of the most prominent features within Wisdom tradition is that the Righteous One is said to fall upon evil times (Wis. 3: 4-6), but is later vindicated by God. This would, in the mind of its advocates, of course correspond to Jesus’ death and resurrection. Other points of contact would be Phil. 2:8 and Wisdom 5:1,16, where in both texts the figures are exalted due to their obedience.

Georgi’s hypothesis falls wide of the mark however when it is observed that in Hellenistic Judaism pre-existent Wisdom has as its most characteristic role that of mediator in creation, or in sustaining its continued existence, a role not attested in the hymn. Nor is there mention of any sending or any reference to descending. It is also meaningful that Wisdom is

---

1015 Nagata, Philippians 2:6-11, 204.
1017 Ibid., 274.
1018 Nagata, Phil. 2:5-11, 304-305.
never referred to, or even conceived of, as a righteous sufferer in obedience to God (i.e., Wis. 5:16 refers to the righteous, not Wisdom). In addition, the term μορφή Θεοῦ, with its antithetical juxtaposition alongside μορφή δούλου, is hardly an appropriate cognate term for the traditional Wisdom expression εἰκών Θεοῦ. Finally, but by no means the least of the numerous objections which beset the theory is the problem which arises when we catalog the varied traits which Wisdom possesses in the tradition. Here we find yet another stumbling block, for we see that it is Wisdom that is said to preexist and come to earth, not the Righteous One.

Another contender is that of the Ebed-YHWH figure of Deutero-Isaiah, a view put forward by L. Cerfaux, J. Jeremias, M. Rissi, and most recently by R. Bauckham. Advocates point out that the phrase ‘taking the form of a slave’ would seem to reflect the Ebed-YHWH figure, while the phrase ‘he emptied himself,’ points to Isa. 53: 12, where the Servant is said to have, “poured out his soul [unto death].”

The validity of this stance has been challenged on numerous grounds, not the least of which is that there are no absolute verbal correspondences between the hymn and the Suffering Servant spoken of in Isaiah. For example, the use of μορφή δούλου contains no direct echo of the term πνεῦμα which is employed in the Servant Songs. In a similar vein Bornkamm has objected that

1019 So Gnilka, Die Philippbrief, 143.
1020 Ibid.
1021 “L’hymne au Christ-Serviteur de Dieu (Phil. 2,6-11=Is 52,13-53,12),” in Recueil Lucien Cerfaux Vol. II. Études d’Exégèse et d’Histoire Religieuse. (Gembloux: éditions J. Ducolot, 1954): 425-437. Lohmeyer had already pointed to a number of informal points of correspondence between the Ebed-YHWH and the figure described in the hymn, see page 23, 69, and especially page 36 of KJ.
1023 Rissi challenges, among other things, the concessive sense of the participle ὑπάρξεως (preferring a modal or casual sense). He also sees ὑπάρξεως as meaning not grasping after deity, but simply desire. See Mathias Rissi, “Der Christushymnus in Phil. 2,6-11,” Aufstieg und Niedergang in der Romischen Welt, Religion, 25.4 (1987): 3315-3326.
1024 Bauckham, “The Worship of Jesus in Philippians 2:9-11,” 128-139. Bauckham argues that the inclusion of Isa. 45:23 can be explained by seeing the hymn as a christological reworking of Deutero-Isaiah. Bauckham’s proposal ultimately must patch together both Servant Song material and those which have God as the subject to account for the use of Isa. 45:23.
1025 Strimple however notes that other allusions to the Servant Songs in the Synoptic Gospels appear to be based on an ancient translation of the Hebrew text independent of the one utilized for the translation of the Septuagint. Additionally, Rissi maintains that these two phrases are the same, basing this judgment on lexicons.
the original phrases ‘his soul’ and ‘unto death’ could have scarcely been ignored by the author of
the hymn if it had been his intention to draw upon Ebed imagery.1026

Perhaps the most telling objection that can be leveled at this position is the lack of
specific soteriological elaboration at precisely those points where such elaboration would be
expected.1027 As Lohmeyer states, “Nirgends ist hier von Glübigen oder einer Unterscheidung
von Gemeinde und Welt die Rede, nur das Bild eines göttlichen Geschehens und seines Trägers
ist hier gezeichnet...”1028 This lack of soteriological focus is disturbing given that the Ebed-
YHWH’s suffering is intimately bound up with forgiveness of transgressions.

Further difficulties are raised when one asks why, if the hymn is reflective of Ebed-
YHWH imagery, does the citation of Isa. 45:23 come from a section which does not concern
him?1029 As if this is not enough to indicate that this is a false trail, additional obstacles surface
when we consider the claims of preexistence, a notion which is completely foreign to the Ebed-
YHWH tradition.1030 Finally, advocates of this view are forced to accept that ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν
is a reference to the crucifixion.1031 This proposal is strained to say the least as the phrase is more
naturally seen as referring to the incarnation. Although the Ebed-YHWH proposal displays

can raise the objection though that if the terms have no substantive differences in their respective semantic fields
than one is prompted to ask why the author of the hymn, if indeed his purpose was to recall the image of the
Suffering Servant, did he not use εἰκὼν in order to more exactly reflect the terminology of the Septuagintal text?
and Rissi, “Der Christushymnus,” 3317. For a brief but helpful review see also O’Brien, The Epistle to the
Philippians, 268-271.

1026 As quoted in O’Brien, The Epistle to the Philippians, 269.

1027 Rissi has noted this lack of elaboration but dismisses this absence as simply an unnecessary addition.
But the case stands quite to the contrary, for the peculiar absence of this elaboration is a formidable obstacle to his
formulation (cf. Heb 1:3b). Nagata also notes, “…the hymn omits explicit references to soteriological significance,
even at those points where the hymn could elaborate on it.” I would emend Nagata’s statement to say that the hymn
does not take up soteriological themes where the hymn should have done so. Schenk is of a similar opinion. See
Wolfgang Schenk, “Der Philippbrief in der neueren Forschung (1945-1985),” Aufstieg und Niedergang in der
and Nagata, Phil. 2:5-11, 335-336.

1028 Lohmeyer, KJ, 85. See also Reinhard Deichgraber, Gotteshymnus und Christushymnus in der frühen
Christentheit. Untersuchungen zu Form, Sprache und Stil der frühchristlichen Hymnen (Göttingen: Vanderhoeck &
Ruprecht, 1967), 119 and Gninka, Der Philippbrief, 141.

1029 Gninka, Der Philippbrief, 141.

1030 Ibid.

1031 Jeremias, Studia Paulina, 154 n.3. As quoted in O’Brien, Philippians, 220.
flickers of genius it ultimately fails to convince, and this had led some scholars to attempt a more promising formulation.

In an effort to bypass the troubles which beset the figure of the Ebed-YHWH Eduard Schweitzer proposed that the most suitable background is that of the righteous sufferer, a motif well-attested in post-biblical Judaism. The motif draws primarily from Jewish martyrlogy of the Maccabean period and offers to side-step the difficulties of the Ebed-YHWH servant proposal, since it requires no formal verbal correspondence between the Servant Songs and the hymn and yet takes on board many of the motifs which are found in the Servant Songs. Schweitzer draws attention to the fact that the obedient servant embodies the suffering and humiliation for the Jewish faith as seen in light of the Maccabean revolt. This martyr for the faith was also expected to be vindicated by God, especially in eschatological terms, and this, it is claimed, fits well with the claim of vindication within the hymn.

Significant problems arise however when we note that the righteous sufferer envisioned by Schweitzer can hardly be described as a pre-existing figure who descends to earth. More problematic yet is that no martyr figure is ever said to be exalted to the very right hand of God and granted the status of kyrios over all things.

An even more contemporary exegesis draws upon Genesis 1: 26-27 and 3: 1-5 to bring out a proposed first Adam-last Adam (or Second Adam) antithesis. The chief proponents of this view are O. Cullmann, J. Héring and more recently, J. Dunn. These scholars add in support of their view that in various places in the New Testament we find clear intertextual echoes of Genesis 1 and 3, e.g., Rom. 5:18-19 and I Cor. 15: 45-47, where this sort of imagery is employed. This model proposes further that such expressions as εὐ κυρί αἰωνίου and τῷ εὐνοων γονείᾳ Θεοῦ are very familiar first Adam-last Adam themes which are well attested in Philonic thought. Ultimately the whole scheme can be reduced to the basic notion that what the first Adam lost through his disobedience the second Adam recovered by means of his obedience. Dunn pushes this theme even further and suggests that the entire hymn recounts only the earthly life of Jesus, both in his abasement and his exaltation. In Dunn’s view there is no reference to an incarnation here, nor any thought of a heavenly elevation.1032 Despite some interesting parallels

to Adamic motifs, recent research has cast doubt upon the validity of several pillars upon which the model rests.

First, the term \( \mu \omicron \rho \omicron \varphi \chi \eta \) is not an appropriate cognate term for the traditional Wisdom and biblical expression \( \epsilon \iota \kappa \omicron \omega \upsilon \), and their presumed interchangeability, has been rightly challenged.\(^{1033}\) Dunn complains however that this misses the point, allusion, he maintains, by its very nature is non-specific and does not require a one-to-one correspondence to the thing that it alludes to.\(^{1034}\) Dunn nonetheless feels the need to explain this choice and puts forward the thought that \( \mu \omicron \rho \omicron \varphi \chi \eta \ \delta \omicron \omicron \lambda \omicron \upsilon \omicron \) was chosen so that the reader can see that Jesus had really become a slave, he was not just \( \text{like} \) a slave.\(^{1035}\) Hurst alertly fires back that if this was the case then why should the expression \( \epsilon \nu \ \mu \omicron \rho \omicron \varphi \chi \eta \ \theta \omicron \epsilon \omicron \omicron \upsilon \) not be taken to imply that Jesus was \( \text{really} \) in the form of God, not just \( \text{like} \) God?\(^{1036}\) Dunn also appears to undercut his own argument here, for if the art of allusion is subtlety and lack of precision then why the selection of the more precise \( \mu \omicron \rho \omicron \varphi \chi \eta \ \delta \omicron \omicron \lambda \omicron \upsilon \omicron \)?\(^{1037}\) Why then too, if allusion did matter, did the author not make an even more direct allusion by using the Adamic \( \epsilon \iota \kappa \omicron \omega \upsilon \) terminology?

The case against Dunn is brought along further by Colin Brown, who has called attention to the difference between these terms by observing that \( \mu \omicron \rho \omicron \varphi \chi \eta \) carries the thought of visible appearance while \( \epsilon \iota \kappa \omicron \omega \upsilon \) is more vague.\(^{1038}\) Drawing out the implications of this a bit further Brown comments, “While the biblical Adam was the image of God, he was not the visible appearance of God or the form which God took.”\(^{1039}\) Related to this is O’Brien’s observation that the proposed interchangeability thesis stumbles badly when it is noted that the compound

\(^{1033}\) For references see O’Brien, The Epistle to the Philippians, 263 fn. 7.


\(^{1035}\) Dunn, Christology, 311 fn 70.


\(^{1037}\) Ibid., 89.

\(^{1038}\) See Brown, “Ernst Lohmeyer’s Kyrios Jesus,” 27.

\(^{1039}\) Ibid.
μορφῆν δοῦλου cannot readily be understood as a synonym for εἰκών δοῦλου. 1040

O’Brien further draws attention to the fact that the phrase in verse 7 καὶ σχήματι εὑρεθεὶς ὦς ἄνθρωπος is a curious expression for someone who, following Adamic patterns, would have always existed as a man and the contrast itself which draws upon existence, ‘in the form of God,’ and existence, ‘in the form of a human,’ scarcely makes sense if a purely earthy sketch of Jesus’ life actually lay before us. 1041

Another problem for the non-incarnational view arises if we accept that the passage should be viewed in light of other Pauline ‘sending’ passages such as Gal. 4:4 and Rom. 8:3 (e.g., I Cor. 8:3; Hebrews 1:3; Colossians 1:15-20), which clearly demonstrate, in my opinion, that Paul held to a doctrine of preexistence. It seems scarcely believable that Paul would utilize this hymn if he understood it to be at variance with his own theology. All of the above considerations point us in the direction of concluding that Phil. 2:6-11 implies an incarnation, and this belief is not attested in Adamic thought.

Another impediment to accepting the Adamic model is that the whole notion of Jesus not seizing what Adam had (i.e., equality with God) has no discernable mechanism for its accomplishment. This statement might perhaps seem cryptic, but what I mean is this: unlike the Genesis account, the Philippians hymn gives no hint as to how Jesus could have ‘seized’ divine equality if no pretemporal divine state was contemplated by the author. 1042 Adam had the possibility of eating from the Tree of Knowledge, but by what mechanism might Jesus attain to the divine prerogatives? This question Dunn leaves unanswered.

Further problems for Dunn’s thesis appear when we look closely at the verbs employed in the first section of the hymn. Dunn maintains, as he must, that the hymn does not speak of a point in time in which Jesus became human, but instead should be read as encompassing Jesus’

1040 O’Brien, Epistle to the Hebrews, 264.

1041 O’Brien, Epistle to the Hebrews, 267 and Deichgräber, Gotteshymnus, 124.

1042 Wanamaker has remarked, “He [Dunn] maintains that Christ as the Second Adam, ‘faced the same archetypal choice that confronted Adam.’ But unlike Adam, Christ ‘chose to empty himself of Adam’s glory and to embrace Adam’s lot,’ namely man’s slavery ‘to corruption and the powers.’ This view lacks coherence, however, because Dunn gives no account of what glory Christ could have had which was not available to other men and how he surrendered it up. In effect Dunn mythologizes the humanity of Christ by making him qualitatively different from the rest of humanity without any explanation of the origin of the supposed difference. Dunn does not seem to realize that it was precisely this problem which the idea of Christ’s pre-existence explained for Paul.” As quoted in Hofius, Der Christushymnus, 114. Original quote comes from C.A. Wanamaker, “Philippians 2:6-11: Son of God or Adamic Christology?” NTS 33 (1987), 182.
human life taken altogether. But this proposal runs counter to the natural sense of the verbs for the hymn begins with a present participle ὑπάρχων, when referring to Jesus being in the form of God, while shortly thereafter, when seeming to speak of an incarnation, we come across the aorist participle λαβὼν and γενόμενος. This tense change would seem to strongly indicate that a literal point in time is meant.1043

Additionally, if the hymn is following established Adamic conventions, then Dunn’s proposal is washed up yet again against the rocks of reason when we recall that Adam is nowhere said to be exalted in the way that Jesus is. Dunn’s response to this objection appeals to drawing a parallel between Phil. 2: 6-11 and I Cor. 15: 24-28, where an allusion to Ps. 8:6 is found (15:27), coming just after the Adam-Christ contrast of 15: 21-22.1044 Dunn also calls upon the fact that Adam receives glorification in several works including the Life of Adam and Eve, Apocalypse of Moses 37, and Testament of Abraham A 11. Dunn’s arguments fails to persuade, however, for the degree of exaltation is nowhere close to being equal between Adam and Jesus. Jesus receives the divine name, universal acclamation, and is installed as the kyrios over all things.1045 Dunn makes no attempt to explain the difference between Jesus’ exaltation to divine status and Adam’s more limited glorification.

Finally, two other considerations need to be added to this catalog of objections. First, the hymn seems to be utilizing common New Testament themes which are attested elsewhere. For example, the claim found in Heb. 1: 3 that Jesus is the “radiance of His glory and the exact representation of His nature” appears to form a near perfect analog to the hymn’s statement that Jesus was ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων. Likewise the claim that Jesus emptied himself and then humbled himself, and was later glorified, sounds apparently clear echoes to Heb. 2:9 which says of Jesus, “But we do see Him who has been made for a little while lower than the angels, namely, Jesus, because of the suffering of death crowned with glory and honor, that by the grace


1044 Ibid., 77.

1045 Hofius rightly questions whether the author could have believed that a mere human, no matter how obedient and righteous, could ever be worthy of receiving the divine name. He also correctly points out that the very section of Isaiah that the author employs contains the statement that God’s name is for him alone (Isa. 42:8). This would seem to exclude Dunn’s vision of a purely human Jesus. See Hofius, Der Christushymnus, 115.
of God He might taste death for everyone." The granting of the highest name also seems to mirror the statement of Heb. 1:4 that Jesus was given the διαφορώτερον ὄνομα. In short, the theme of preexistence, abasement in becoming human, as well as obedience unto death, with a later vindication, replete with the bestowal of a higher name, finds ready parallel in the Epistle to the Hebrews. This suggests that the Philippians hymn orbits around many of the same (shared) christological themes that we find in Hebrews, rather than taking up the concerns and themes of Gen. 1. This congruence suggests a common tradition which both authors drew upon to compose their works. The fact that the conventional reading of Phil. 2:6-11 squares nicely with established New Testament categories can also be taken to suggest that the conventional understanding is closer the mark than Dunn’s synthesis.

Now another approach that has been advocated is that the hymn aims for the eschatological promise that at the end of time the universal revelation of YHWH and His rule would occur. We owe this proposal to the work of Otfried Hofius. What Hofius has brought to the table is the idea that this universal event entails not only recognition, but also actual worship by the entire cosmos. To this end, Hofius hopes to establish two facts: first, that the confession and the bowing of the knee in v. 9 signifies worship and not simple acknowledgement of the lordship of Christ, and second, that the terms ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ καταχθονίων refer not to demonic or spiritual forces hostile to God, but rather that this collocation of terms denotes in a comprehensive fashion the three cosmic spheres and thus point to the universality of this projected worship.1046

Hofius’ reconstruction has much to commend it, particularly his proposal of universal acknowledgement (rather than acknowledgement by demonic forces alone). But his reconstruction does not do justice to the very peculiar use of Is. 45:23. Also, in order to place on a firm foundation the claim that worship is meant when we read of the cry that ‘Jesus is Lord,’ Hofius must claim that this is Anbetung rather than confession. In spite of the fact that he highlights the confessional nature of the cry, he sees this cry as being synonymous with the meaning delivered in Rom. 10:12f., I Cor. 1:2 and Acts 9:14, 21. In order to achieve this he binds

Ruck-Schröder has observed that the terminology which we find in 2:10c, sounds very much like those Psalms in the LXX which speak of acknowledging the divine name (e.g., 21:23; 28:2 and 148:1-5,13). This would seem to preclude accepting the triad of 10c as referring to demonic powers. O’Brien proposes instead that the adjectives are masculine nouns and thus construes the phrase as denoting all rational beings who must make homage. In any event, he offers a helpful review and I refer the reader to this section of O’Brien’s work. See, DNGJNT, 72-73 for Ruck-Schröder and Epistle to the Philippians, 244 for O’Brien.
together ἐν τῷ ὄνοματι Ἰησοῦ with the cry κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός (for Hofius a Huldigungsrvf). He then takes a rather huge leap by claiming that this proposed nexus is equal to ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τὸ ὄνομα. This equation is simply untenable. As we have seen the ritual action of invoking the name of Jesus, ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τὸ ὄνομα, is a technical term for calling upon Jesus by his name. In contrast, the phrase ἐν τῷ ὄνοματι has another function altogether; that is, it has an instrumental function. To claim then, that they are equivalent is pushing the evidence beyond what it will bear.

1047 Hofius, Der Christushymnus, 38, 51.
APPENDIX TWO
DEFINITION OF MAGIC

Magic is a term which casts many shadows. Attempts to define magic have long occupied scholars in the field and generated some controversy. For the sake of brevity I shall begin with the definition of David Aune rather then covering the previous attempts and then move forward. There are two reasons for starting with Aune.

First, at times it seems that there are almost as many definitions of magic as there are researchers in the field and this makes for a cumbersome analysis. The second reason for selecting Aune is that his essay marks a significant sea change in the way we view the relationship between magic and religion. Earlier scholarship had subscribed to the view that magic and religion are so disparate that one must view them as categorically different entities rather than merely differing from one another by degrees. What Aune’s article emphasizes is that magic and religion are in many respects simply two sides of the same coin; thus, magic cannot be viewed in a pejorative fashion, as was sometimes the custom among earlier scholars.

Another reason to emphasize Aune’s work is that it has drawn considerable attention from other New Testament scholars as well as scholars of magic in general. With that said I will begin with Aune’s definition.

Aune’s formulation of magic runs as follows: 1) Magic and religion are so closely intertwined that it is virtually impossible to regard them as discrete socio-cultural categories; 2) The structural-functional analysis of magic-religious phenomena forbids a negative attitude toward magic; 3) Magic is a phenomenon that exits only within the matrix of particular religious traditions; magic is not religion only in the sense that a species is not a genus. A particular magical system coheres within a religious structure in the sense that it shares the fundamental religious reality construction of the contextual religion; 4) Magic appears to be as universal a feature of religion as deviant behavior is of human societies.1048

Assessments such as Aune’s have helped to lead to a shift away from the assumption that magic was usually marginalized and illicit in nature. One example of this shift is found in the work of Robert Ritner, who has correctly observed that in Egypt at least, so-called magical or occultic practices were not performed by the marginalized elements of society in defiance of

1048David Aune, “Magic in Early Christianity,” 1516.
societal norms. On the contrary, magic was the everyday practice of the priests and scribes, the “very source of tradition,” and magic was carried out under their aegis.\textsuperscript{1049} In fact magic was believed to have been revealed by the gods themselves.\textsuperscript{1050} Even the pharaohs engaged in its practice.\textsuperscript{1051} What I hope the reader takes away from these recent contributions is that magic and religion play off one another and are not necessarily antithetical to one another.

Another development that is germane to my analysis is the recent definition of Greco-Roman magic offered by Clinton Arnold. He has presented a more detailed definition of Greco-Roman magic-a definition with which I am in agreement. I offer here an abbreviated version of Arnold’s definition:

1) There is an identifiable form to the charms and spells...Most have the following elements; (a) a rite to perform, (b) an invocation...and (c) a statement of command...

2) That magic was perceived to guarantee results...

3) Magical documents have an array of terminology given specialized significance....

4) The documents invariably include a series of names...or characters...thought to be laden with power.\textsuperscript{1052}

Arnold’s definition is quite useful but for the purposes of my study; I would emphasize, however, that the central core of any definition of magic is the belief that the theurgist or practitioner of magic could compel the divinity against its will. By way of comparison, a prayer is performed by a worshiper of the divinity and is intended to request something from the divinity, but ultimately leaves the answer in the hands of the divinity. The prayer is offered in


\textsuperscript{1051}Ritner, “Egyptian Magical Practices,” 3354.

submission to the deity and relies upon the beneficence of the deity for the answer. In contrast, a magical act is something that seeks to bring, even force, the divinity into compliance through the intrinsic power of either the medium employed or the rituals that are carried out. Accordingly, for the purposes of this work I have defined magic generally as the belief that one could compel a divinity to answer the petition without necessarily seeking its volition. This conclusion is in keeping with the implications of Arnold’s second point that magic was perceived to guarantee results. Thus, I have adhered to the other more specific points concerning Greco-Roman magic which Arnold has made.

\[1053\] My position does not deny that prayer, or some facsimile thereof, existed in magical circles. Fritz Graf has catalogued several excellent examples of this phenomenon. Still, as witnessed in the papyri, the normative process in attempting to move the gods was through magical technique. For further reading on prayers in magic consult Fritz Graf, “Prayers In Magical and Religious Ritual,” in MAGIKA HIERA, Ancient Greek Magic & Religion, Eds. Christopher A. Faraone and Dirk Obbink, (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 188-213. Also, it is worth drawing attention to the position of G. Luck, who has noted that arguably the greatest difference between magic and religion is simply this, "...praying for something, giving thanks for something, is conceivable in magic, but not the consciousness of sin and the prayer of forgiveness...". See Georg Luck, Arcana Mundi: Magic and the Occult in the Greek and Roman Worlds, (Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University, 1985), 5.

\[1054\] I recognize that this definition may appear too ‘Frazerian,’ but I hold nonetheless that the notion of coercion still allows us to distinguish between magic and religion, even though magic and religion oftentimes use the same ritualistic tools when approaching the supernatural. Some scholars, such as Graf, of course still recognize that coercion is a part of magic, but point out that it is not its sole characteristic. I concur, but as we have seen with divine names, all to often the notion of coercion enters into magical thinking. For a good review of the place of coercion in magical operations and thought see Fritz Graf, Magic in the Ancient World, trans. Franklin Philip (Cambridge Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1997), 222-229.

\[1055\] For the interested reader I draw attention to the work of Fritz Graf, who devotes an interesting section to this question in his Gottesnähe und Schadenzauber. Like others, he concludes that compulsion or force of divine beings was an integral component of magic. See Fritz Graf, Gottesnähe und Schadenzauber: die Magie in der griechisch-römischen Antike, C.H. Beck Kulturwissenschaft (München, C.H. Beck, 1996), 198-201.
APPENDIX THREE
THE TERM HYPOSTASIS

As for the term hypostasis, it must be remarked that in the past this term has been liable to various abuses. The term itself is either often ill-defined, or in some cases, definitions have relied too heavily on the term as it came to be defined during Early Christian doctrinal disputes. Saul Olyan, a figure whom we shall encounter again momentarily, describes this situation well when he states “It is impossible to know the assumptions underlying each individual usage of these vexed expressions [i.e., hypostasis and hypostatization]. There are now many scholars who avoid entirely the use of the terms or redefine them…”

To date, various attempts to provide a fuller and clearer description have fallen within three types. First comes the Bousset/Greßmann conception, which deemed a hypostasis as a Mittelwesen between God and the world and which made possible the display of God’s power on the earth. This definition does not stray far from the notion which previous authors have offered. Mowinckel weighs in next and registers the opinion that a hypostasis is “eine halb selbständige, halb als Offenbarungsform einer höheren Gottheit...die eine Personifizierung einer Eigenschaft...einer höheren Gottheit darstellt.” Interestingly, Mowinckel’s definition implies a more subtle and abstract view than the Bousset/Greßmann conception.

Finally, Ringgren takes up Mowinckel’s definition and adds further refinements stating that a hypostasis is “eine oft nur halb selbständige göttliche Wesenheit, die eine mehr oder weniger durchgeführte Personifizierung einer Eigenschaft, einer Wirksamkeit, oder irgendeines Attributs...Oft ist die Grenze zwischen poetischer Personifizierung und eigentlicher Hypostasierung schwer zu ziehen.” Naturally no one definition has proven to be suitable to everyone’s satisfaction and the search for a suitable definition goes on.

---


1057 Gerhard Pfeifer, *Ursprung und Wesen der Hypostasenvorstellungen im Judentum* (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1967), 14-16. All the references to the following quotations are found in Pfeifer’s work.

1058 Ibid. Pfeifer’s description contains two parts. Pfeifer agrees with those who maintain that in relationship to the world a hypostasis acts in the manner and way of the divinity itself. Secondly, he posits that in part a hypostasis partakes in the nature and essence of the divinity. See pg. 15.
Whatever one may make of these various definitions, Ringgren’s more cautious tone highlights a major conceptual problem in this field of study, viz. how one may answer the vexatious question of how to discriminate a hypostasis from mere poetic metaphor. For example, what criteria should we use when we encounter a figure in a text which seems to appear as a hypostasis?

Fortunately, recent progress has been made in this area. In this context I report the valuable contribution made by Olyan. Olyan has provided the immensely useful task of cleaning up and tightening our understanding of this nebulous term, as well as offering a practical criterion for discriminating between a hypostasis and mere rhetorical flourishes that involve metaphors. In Olyan’s schema there are two distinct categories for characterizing the ‘hypostatic’ attributes of a deity. The first category he terms “special figurative treatment.” Olyan uses this term to describe the process which prior scholars had referred to as hypostatization. This category embraces all of those references to the deity, which emphasize the attributes or presence of the deity in symbolic or metaphorical terms; thus, references to the Arm of the Lord (e.g. Isa. 51:9-11), or the Wisdom of God (e.g. Prov. 8-9), or passages such as Ps. Philo 32:15, which claims that the knowledge of God is a strong tower in which the Israelite may find protection, would neatly fall into this category according to Olyan.

Olyan’s second category is termed divinization. In this grouping Olyan proposes to include those objects or attributes which have received cultic devotion in some manner. Olyan has noted in defense of this grouping that it was rather commonplace in the Ancient Near East for divine attributes to obtain to this status. And it is precisely this criterion of receiving cultic veneration that Olyan relies upon to distinguish a hypostasis from those cases which receive special figurative treatment. In this area, Olyan can point to several positive examples of this phenomenon, such the cultic veneration of the name of Baal; thus, in Olyan’s framework the name of Baal was divinized, that is, it can be called a hypostasis.

Olyan has served the scholarly world well insofar as his use of comparative Old Testament and rabbinic materials has demonstrated that many divine attributes—which some scholars have on occasion accepted as hypostatic agents (e.g. Paním; Arm of the Lord; Wisdom;...


\[1060\] Ibid., 91.
Memra; Kāvōd; Dāhār, Shem)—were simply accorded metaphorical treatment in many Old Testament passages. Indeed, Olyan’s work has exposed the fact that many previous workers in this area have not proceeded with sufficient caution.

While it must be acknowledged that Olyan has provided a useful clarification his proposed definitions fall short for the purposes of my study, for his study focused upon materials from the Ancient Near East during a much earlier period than the era of my concern, and consequently, he did not entertain Greco-Roman perceptions. Thus, while I intend to retain Olyan’s twofold classification I must also augment it so as to embrace the Greco-Roman evidence.

In light of the Greco-Roman evidence, I contend that we need to go beyond Olyan’s two-tiered schema. As we have seen, there are cases where certain entities of Greco-Roman magic (e.g., names of deities and the so-called παρεδροι, i.e. essentially demons who assisted the magicians) clearly go beyond even special figurative treatment, and yet they do not receive cultic devotion. Moreover, in certain cases it is evident that these entities were thought of as being genuinely ‘real’ independent entities apart from the gods themselves. If we do not recognize these entities for what they are and instead adhere strictly to Olyan’s schema we deny ourselves the opportunity to learn something new about magical thought in the Greco-Roman world. With specific respect to numinous names how then might we discriminate a ‘true’

---

1061 Ibid.: 92-98. Pace Pfeifer who maintains that such figurative treatment of divine properties or attributes was foreign to the Ancients. Accordingly he accepts that the Name in the Old Testament was a hypostasis (see Ursprung: 15, 71-72). Along the lines which Olyan has sketched one might also note the observation by Cohen that passages such as Isa. 30:27, where it states that “the Name comes” clearly refers to God himself, while the parallel passage in 59:19 alternates between the Name and glory without distinction. Cohen is joined by König who also agrees with this analysis. See Samuel S. Cohen, “The Name of God. A Study of Rabbinic Theology,” Hebrew Union College Annual Part I, 23 (1950-51): 579-604 and Eduard König, Theologie des Alten Testaments: kritisch und vergleichend dargestellt, 4th ed (Stuttgart: Chr. Belser, 1923), 132.

1062 Pace Giesebricht (among others) who sees in these metaphors a real hypostasis which finds ready parallels in various Ancient Near Eastern examples. See for example ATSNG, 102-105, 116-118. The sole exception here is Jacob, who rightly recognized that the hypostasis conception of the Name did not hold true for the Old Testament. See Benno Jacob, In Namen Gottes, 47 and passim.

1063 Ciraolo notes that the παρεδροι are not only considered to be divine but are often called by the name of a well-known deity to whom they were apparently affiliated in some way. See Leda Jean Ciraolo, “Supernatural Assistants in the Greek Magical Papyri,” in Ancient Magic and Ritual Power, ed. M. Meyer & P. Mirecki (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995), 280.
hypostasis\textsuperscript{1064} from a divine name that received special figurative treatment? To answer this I have drawn upon the insights yielded by T. Hopfner’s work.

Hopfner’s suggestion, as we may recall, advances along two lines and has paved a new path to understanding this phenomenon. First, Hopfner proposes that when we encounter a supplicant in our sources who invokes a divine name itself; that is, they seem to invoke the name without addressing the divinity to appear and do their bidding, then we are dealing with a hypostatic-like conception of the divine name.\textsuperscript{1065} In addition, Hopfner notes that on occasion numinous names could themselves be commanded to carry out a task as if they were autonomous from the deity which they ostensibly represent.

The second criterion that Hopfner suggests involves those cases where the names of the gods seem to have been envisioned as dwelling in a specific geographic area such as the heavens. If Hopfner has read the evidence correctly, and I believe he has, then at least some Greco-Roman practitioners of magic viewed these names as being in some sense ontologically real. And their ability to operate and exist independently of the deity suggests that they were also in some manner autonomous from the deity.

\textsuperscript{1064}Although I acknowledge Olyan’s classification, in particular his criterion for recognizing a divinized entity, I shall nonetheless retain the term hypostasis for the sake of simplicity. After all, it is Olyan’s criterion of cultic veneration that is significant, not per se his proposed terms.

\textsuperscript{1065}Theodor Hopfner, \textit{GAOZ}, § 693.
APPENDIX FOUR

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF CULTIC ACTIONS

The significance of religious practices within religion as a whole has been summarized well by Mowinckel who stated that “Alle wichtigen Phänomene der Religion irgendwie in naher Verbindung mit dem Kultus stehen.”1066 From this insight it may be deduced that religious practice influences cultus and cultus in turn becomes the most important setting where the introduction and institutionalization of ritual practices takes place. Mowinkel also offers a useful definition of cultic acts. He states that:

The cult is thus a general phenomenon appearing in all religions...cult or ritual may be defined as the socially established and regulated holy acts and words in which the encounter and communion of the deity with the congregation is established, developed, and brought to its ultimate goal. In other words: a relation in which a religion becomes a vitalizing function as a communion of God and congregation, and of the members of the congregation amongst themselves.1067

This definition allows us to see that ritualistic actions and practices can serve as the most basic criterion for defining the boundaries of a religious group and provides the essential cohesion that allows for a group dynamic to occur. Moreover, these practices enshrine the beliefs of a group. Ritual practices such as worship, confessions, and other aspects of group behavior provide the mortar and brick for erecting the ideological walls that define a community. As such these practices provide a secure insight into the beliefs of the group being investigated.

It will be helpful if I also take the time here to introduce the additional definitions that Karsten Lehmküller has put forth. Lehmküller proposes the following definitions:

1) The proper way to judge and evaluate religiosity is by the external form adopted by the adherents.1068 Among these external forms cultus is the most important. It is the visible and auditory side of religion.

2) Religion can be divided into three categories; holy words, a sanctified people, and holy traditions and customs. Both magic and cultus fall into the latter category.1069

---

1068 Lehmküller, Kultus und Theologie, 35.
1069 Ibid., 39.
3) For Lehmküler cultus is "that attempt to act upon a personal spirit or god through a personal relationship." \(^{1070}\) This aspect can be most clearly seen through worship and adoration so that one can say that without cultus there is no fellowship with the divine. \(^{1071}\)

4) Cultic activity can be classified as that side of religion that is reflective of popular conception and practice. \(^{1072}\)

If we step back for a moment and look at Biblical Judaism we find that the role of cultic activities can hardly be overstated as it formed the setting where the Israelite encountered YHWH. \(^{1073}\) It was simply "ein Kraftzentrum, von dem geistige Kräfte ausgehen." \(^{1074}\) In terms of the cultic importance of divine names Heitmulter correctly maintained that the name was the most basic elementary and important component of cultic activity. The main key in securing the presence of the divinity is the ability to communicate with the deity in a medium through which one could call on it to appear, carry out instructions, or alternatively answer prayer \(^{1075}\).

---

\(^{1070}\) Ibid. My translation.

\(^{1071}\) Ibid., 40.

\(^{1072}\) Ibid., 168.


\(^{1074}\) So Gillis Weters. See Gillis Weters, Altchristliche Liturgien II. Das christliche Opfer neue Studien zur Geschichte des Abendmahls, (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1922), 181.

APPENDIX FIVE

THE NAME-CONCEPT IN THE ANCIENT NEAR EAST

Any inquiry into the place and function of the name-concept within Near Eastern cultures must first take up the question of magic and cultic invocation, for there are no other areas in which the application of divine names is so vital to the success of the endeavor as it is here. When we turn to seek the roots of Jewish magic and name-mysticism we do not have far to look. Ostensibly, the putative progenitors of the Jewish name-conception were primarily Egyptian and Babylonian magic and religion.\textsuperscript{1076} I need not detain myself here by an exhaustive review of Egyptian magical practices, but several examples culled from early Egyptian sources will demonstrate that a magical aura already enshrouded divine names in pre-Hellenistic Egyptian culture. I shall now turn to examining some of the evidence that we have available to us.

An excellent place to begin this brief review is with a look at a text which dates from the reign of Pepi II, where we find the following invocation of the gods, “Great company of the gods who dwell in Annu, grant that Pepi Nefer-ka-Rā may flourish,...even as the name of Temu, the chief of the nine gods, does flourish.”\textsuperscript{1077} Here we can see that the notion of a person, or object, and its name, as being tightly interwoven was well received.

Another text worth mentioning is the Papyrus of Nesi-Amsu, where following the outline of the legend of the creation of the cosmos it is recorded that the god Neb-er-tcher existed before the hylic realm was fashioned. At the moment when the god is in the midst of the act of self-creation and is coming into being he states:

I created [from] my mouth, and I uttered my own name as a word of power and I thus evolved myself under the evolutions of the god Khepera, and I developed myself out of the primeval matter...\textsuperscript{1078}

\textsuperscript{1076} Jacob may not be far from the mark when he posits that the more magical beliefs concerning divine names stems from Alexandrian Hellenistic-Judaism. It is also important to observe that Arai had pointed out that the Second Book of Jeu, Excerpta ex Theodoto, Philo, Clement of Alexandria, and Pistas Sophia, all emphasize name-speculation of one sort or another, and that they all stem from Egypt. Add to this Blau’s conjecture that the Tetragrammaton passed into currency from its usage at the Temple of Onias in Egypt. See ING, 110. See also, Arai Sasagu, Die Christologie des Evangelium Veritatis: Eine Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1964), 71; Blau, DAJZ, 133; and Heitmüller, INJ, 182-190, 218-222.

\textsuperscript{1077} As quoted in Budge. See E.A. Wallis Budge Egyptian Magic (New York: University Books, 1899), 158-9.

\textsuperscript{1078}Ibid., 161.
Another particular of some interest is the fact that for some adherents of Egyptian religion the Egyptian gods were viewed as divinized entities of the name of the god Nu. In chapter XVII of the Egyptian Book of the Dead we find the following declaration of this theologoumenon:

I am the great god Nu, ...who made his name to become the company of the gods.... What does this mean? It is Rā, the creator of the names of his limbs, which came into being in the form of the gods. From this text many scholars of Egyptian religion have concluded that the gods were thought of as personifications of the names of Rā. ¹⁰⁷⁹

Another central tenet of the Egyptian name-concept was that the gods possessed secret names. This perception led in the course of time to the construct that both those who occupied themselves with carrying out proper cultus, as well as the theurgist, must, above all else, ascertain the ‘true’ names of the gods in order either to induce them into compliance, or to obtain divine interaction. ¹⁰⁸⁰ In a further development that closely mirrors Greco-Roman beliefs we find the concept that is was prohibited to disclose the true name of the gods in the hope that these names would not fall into the hands of potential enemies. ¹⁰⁸¹

The most conspicuous example of this conception in Egyptian religion is the well-known account of the search for the secret name of Rā by Isis. In the tale, Rā is bitten by a poisonous serpent and falls gravely ill. Rā summons his retinue to search for anyone who has the magical power to help him. Isis answers this call and seeks to surreptitiously obtain his true name for she believes that by means of his name she can attain divine status. She asks, “Cannot I, by means of the sacred name of God, make myself mistress of the earth and become a goddess like unto Rā in heaven and upon earth?” In an effort to uncover the secret name Isis promises the cessation of his agony if he will reveal to her his secret name for she says, “Your secret name is not among those which you have told me. Confess it to me and the poison will go.” ¹⁰⁸²

¹⁰⁷⁹Ibid., 162.
¹⁰⁸¹Jacob, ING, 91.
¹⁰⁸²As quoted in Budge, Egyptian Magic, 137-138.
In a strongly analogous myth Horus is said to have been sailing one day with his brother. The brother managed to receive a deadly snakebite and subsequently fell ill. Horus importuned his brother to reveal to him his secret name so that he may pronounce it in a healing incantation. His brother, at first reticent to divulge this privileged name, relents and tells it to Horus, and forthwith, Horus then pronounces the healing spell.1083

We see this theologoumenon again in an adoratio to Horus, which also deals with the healing of a poisonous bite, where the following use of names in healing is found, “...I have spoken your name...May you exorcise for me the pulsating poison....See your name is (involved) therein on this day....See your name is invoked on this day: I am Horus the Savior who insures protection for you.”1084

Another example of Egyptian name-mysticism is found in a hymn where the god Shu is said to have an unknown name, which when spoken at the bank of a river would cause the river to dry up. Further, it is said that if this name was spoken upon the earth a flame would issue forth.1085

Within the era of my concern we can find numerous examples of the influence of Egyptian magical practices and conceptions, as well as evidence of how non-Egyptians viewed the magical powers thought to be taught in Egypt. A case in point can be found in the exploits of Harnuphis, the priestly magician, who it is claimed, rescued the Roman troops under Marcus Aurelius by bringing down rain in the Danube campaign undertaken in 172 C.E.1086

As for the gods themselves an interesting example of the perceived apotropaic nature of the names of the Egyptian gods is probably alluded to in Joseph and Aseneth 3:11, where, no doubt in reflection of current Egyptian practices, we read of Aseneth’s preparation to meet her parents, who have come in from the fields to make preparations to receive Joseph. We read that Aseneth had “girded herself (with) a golden girdle and put bracelets on her hands and feet...and

1085 Ibid., 87-88.
1086 Dio Cassius 71.8.4.
the names of the gods of Egyptians were engraved everywhere on the bracelets and the stones...” Here the implication is that these bracelets were a type of amulet thought to ward off evil.

We can also see how widely Egyptian magical practices had spread when later in the Late Antique period the Talmudic Rabbis opined “Ten measures of witchcraft have come into the world. Egypt received nine of these, the rest of the world one measure.”

Suffice it to say that sufficient evidence exits such that scholars of Egyptian religion are united in their conviction that names of power were an indispensable element of magical practice.

Switching to the religious and cultic aspects of the application of divine names several interesting features surface in examination of various Egyptian sources. Worthy of mention is an inscription from the era of Ramses IV (1200 B.C.E.). It states that if one speaks the name of Ptah-Tatenen then this act was accounted to that person as a sin. In another interesting case, Cicero reports that the Egyptians of his day were prohibited from vocalizing the name of Thoth. Furthermore, in concert with the foregoing, we find the prohibition against falsely swearing an oath in the name of Ptah. In addition, it was claimed that at the very name of Seth the earth and the heavenlies, as well as the underworld, would shake.

Another vital role which divine names played in Egypt was the belief that through invoking them one could insure the presence of the god. By way of example, on a stele from the New Kingdom Era we find written the following, “The august god (Râ), beloved and gracious,

---

1087 In b.Qid 49b.
1088 To cite but two, Budge, Egyptian Magic, 61 ff. and Geraldine Pinch, Magic in Ancient Egypt, (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1994), 87-88, 163.
1089 As cited in Kâkosy, Zauberei im alten Agypten, 117.
1090 In Bourghouts, Ancient Egyptian Magical Texts, 118.
1091Ibid., 102. See also pg. 238. The text is from a stele in the British Museum, Hieroglyphic Texts from Egyptian Stelae. 9 vol. (London: 1911-70). Bourghouts cites from v. 9, plate 31 no. 589.
1092Ibid., 87-88.
who answers prayers, who listens to the supplicant of him who calls him, who comes at the voice of him who pronounces his name."

Similarly, a prayer to Thoth describes Thoth as one who is "...listening to the prayers of [the] one who calls upon him. And who comes at the voice of the one who pronounces his name..." And in a prayer to Amenophis I we find that "one comes to you [through] the greatness of your name, when is heard your strong name.""1

The tendency to direct encomium toward the name of the divinity, a practice so familiar to the Old Testament scholar, is also attested to in numerous texts. To cite but one example, the name of Amun is praised in the following fashion, "...sweeter, sweeter is the great name of Amun, more than [precious things]."6

Moving into the Fertile Crescent we again encounter the name-concept in ways similar to that which we have encountered in Egyptian sources. For example, in one particular Ugaritic text (ca. fourteenth century), which mirrors what we have seen concerning the gods being seen as personifications of divine names, we find Ashtoreth described as "the name of Baal." In an Eshmuna inscription Astarte also shares the prize of being called "the name of Baal." And in a striking parallel to contemporaneous Jewish sources the name of Baal is said to come on the day of battle (cf. Isa. 30:27). Indeed, this sort of particularizing manifestation of a deity

---


1095 Ibid., 207. From, *Stele e ALTRE: 049:B:5.*
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(sensu stricto Olyan) was almost customary in the Ancient Near East.\textsuperscript{1099} Insofar as Ashtoreth is in fact the name of Baal, and insofar as she later receives full cultic devotion, it may be said that the name of Baal had evolved so far as to attain divinization.\textsuperscript{1100}

As for the utilization of the names of the gods as apotropaic agents, we have evidence of such usage, in Mesopotamia at least, by no later than the sixth century B.C.E. For example, in an exorcistic text we read, “In the name of the great god Ea....be thou exorcised!”\textsuperscript{1101} Given this preoccupation with powerful names in Babylonian religion, perhaps there is a kernel of truth in the assertion of the Palestinian Talmud when it declares, “The names of the Angels came along with those who returned from Babylon.”\textsuperscript{1102}

\textsuperscript{1099}Ibid., 97.

\textsuperscript{1100}Ibid., 107.


\textsuperscript{1102}RoshHaShana 56d.
APPENDIX SIX
THE NAME-CONCEPT IN RABBINIC SOURCES

The name-conception poured into the rabbinical stream of thought in both the Talmudic and Targumic literature. The growing emphasis and mysticism which was forming around the Name is seen in the seemingly ubiquitous reference to the Name as שֵׁנֶּרֶד וַסְגִּיר; that is, the separate special name of God. This phrase encapsulates well the notion that the true name of God was powerful. 1103 Strangely this turn of events had reversed the significance of the disclosure of the divine name in Exodus. Apparently the rabbis must have felt compelled to keep the name of God secret for precisely the same reasons that the names of the gods of the pagans were guarded. 1104

Other evidence also suggests a growing evolution in the name-concept in rabbinic circles. This development can be seen in a number of texts. For example, according to R. Jose b. Chalaftha (Mekilla Ex. 20:3) the gods of the pagans were powerless because they did not bear the name of God, while Targ. Jonath. Ex. 28:30 states that whosoever shall pronounce the Name in an emergency will be saved.

Other narratives such as b. Tamid. 3.8 claim that when the Name is spoken in Jerusalem it could be heard as far away as Jericho, and when the Name was spoken during Yom Kippur, it is said, all the people congregated there fell upon their faces and blessed the Name (Yoma 6.2).

In b. Sabb. 120a we find a gemara, which deals with a mishna that takes up the theme of how one ought to put out fires (i.e. what materials are kosher to handle and treat). The tractate states that if a person has the divine Name inscribed upon his flesh in the public domain, where the Name could be witnessed, the person was to cover the Name by winding a leaf of reed around it. Interestingly, this gemara also discusses the rabbinical injunction which forbade standing nude before the Name. As in our previous case, the Name was to be covered while bathing. 1105

---

1103 So Bietenhard, "הברכה," 268.

1104 Ibid.

1105 In the following exposé I am indebted to the sketches outlined by Blau in his chapter, "Die mystischen Gottesnamen" in DAJZV, 117-128, 146, as well as Ephraim Urbach’s chapter, “The Power of the Divine Name,” in his The Sages: Their Concepts and Beliefs, 2nd ed., trans. Israel Abrahams, (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1979), 124-134.
In addition, in the rabbis' schema heaven and earth shall pass away, but the Name will endure. While in the present age only certain individuals have the divine Name revealed to them, in the world to come, all will know His Name. Not only must the name of God not be effaced, but also neither can even one letter be tampered with or erased. And in an amusing legend it is said that Moses would only speak the Tetragrammaton after he had spoken at least 212 other words, for the Name ostensibly should not be spoken too often.

In Talmud (b. Sukkah. 53a), there is a tradition about David digging a pit whereupon it was reputed that David had broken open the fountains of the Great Deep. In order to seal off the fissure David utilized the numinous power of the Tetragrammaton as the narrative states:

When David dug the pits, the Deep arose and threatened to submerge the world...thereupon [David] inscribed the [Ineffable] Name upon a shard, cast it into the deep and it subsided sixteen thousand cubits.

Other Talmudic gemara also impute numinous qualities to the Name. One maintains that while Joseph was in Egypt he was made to learn seventy languages, but he was unable to do so. In the night the angel Gabriel is said to have come to him and added to his name a letter from the Tetragrammaton [i.e. ] and with that Joseph was immediately able to learn all seventy languages!

Other Talmudic texts also claim that the divine name had numinous qualities. In h. San. 95a the narrative recounts the apocryphal tale of David's flight from Ishbi-benob. Earlier in the legend David's compatriot, Abishai, had killed Ishbi-benob's mother. In response Ishbi-benob, thinking that he now faced both men alone, decided that it would be prudent to fall upon one of them and quickly kill him and equal out the odds. Thereupon, Ishbi-benob came upon David and threw him in the air and placed his spear under David's supposed path of descent with the intention that the resultant thrusting would kill him. Abishai, in an attempt to interdict this calamity, pronounced the divine name, and concomitantly, David was suspended in midair! Then, in order to secure David's safe descent he invoked the divine name again, and forthwith, David descended gently to the ground.

In Mekhila de Rabbi Ishmael, in what may be a remnant of an older tradition, we read the amusing story of how Moses successfully raised the coffin of Joseph from the waters of Nile

---

106 A rabbinic, and even pre-rabbinic, notion which held that the original number of national groups instituted by God was seventy in number.
by inscribing the divine Name upon a tablet and throwing it into the river, while in *b. Bava Batra* 73a we read that seafarers were protected from inclement weather and rough seas by striking the water with clubs which had the divine Name inscribed upon them. In addition, we also read that every angel has a tablet over his heart which has the name of God combined with the name of the angel.

Other texts, such as *b. Sanh.* 106a, relate that at least some rabbis evidently believed that Jesus raised himself from the dead by invoking the true name of God, "Woe to him who makes himself alive by the name of God." Irrespective of whether this baraita actually refers to Jesus (as seems likely) it clearly demonstrates the imputation of numinous qualities to the Tetragrammaton. In addition, some rabbis seem to have believed that Moses was able to accomplish his miracles because the divine name had been embossed upon his staff.\(^{1107}\)

The name-concept is also well represented within the Targumim. For example, in *Targum Yerushalmi* I (*Pseudo-Jonathan*) Ex. 32:25, the meturgeman issues a midrash that is intended to serve as an aetiology of how the infamous golden calf of the rebellious Israelites came into existence. In this Targum we read that on account of Aaron's infidelity the Israelites were seduced and consequently stripped off the golden crowns that they had been wearing on which the divine Name had been "clearly" inscribed. Thereafter, they threw them into the fire that produced the golden calf. In this Targum it is claimed that Satan entered into the gold in order to effect the supernatural transformation of the golden crowns into the calf.

But in *Targum Neofiti* I (ca. second century C.E.),\(^{1108}\) where the same account is narrated, we find one important element missing—there is no mention of Satan enabling the gold to be transformed from one image into another. What is left unsaid is what agency might be responsible for effecting the change. It may be that the meturgeman for *Neofiti* I might have understood that the golden crowns with the divine Name were transformed due of the power resident within the Name itself. However, this conception possibly stumbles upon the notion that an ostensibly observant Jew would scarcely impute such malevolent characteristics to the divine

---

\(^{1107}\)Simon, *Verus Israel*, 344.

\(^{1108}\)Many scholars subscribe to this early date. For a full bibliography see, Evans, *Noncanonical Writings*, 101.
Name. The potentially offensive contention that the divine Name could produce the golden calf may be at the root of the absence of this tradition in Targum Yerushalmi I.

As for literary Jewish texts, we find that the stamp of name-magic upon the Talmud is also fairly strong. In b. Sabbath 61b we find a gemara on the use of amulets states that some amulets, utensils, and even the legs of beds, had the divine name inscribed upon them, presumably to ward off evil. In m. Shabbat vi.2 we read of the halakha that one should not go out on the Sabbath with an amulet, and of another prohibition not to make amulets on the Sabbath (m. Shabbat viii.2-3). Evidently, our sources suggest that the use of the Name in amulets was, in general, a fairly widely practiced form of apotropaism. Even the names of the demons themselves could protect one when engraved upon an amulet—at least according to Talmudic Rabbis! For still other examples from the rabbinic literature I direct the reader to Heitmüller.

\[1109\] T. Baba batra 134a.

\[1110\] Heitmüller, INJ, 141-145.
APPENDIX SEVEN
OTHER CONJECTURES ON THE ORIGIN OF THE NOMINA SACRA

That Jesus' name might have been numerologically interpreted beyond just the example given in the Epistle of Barnabas, mentioned earlier, is of some interest. No doubt this use of gematria did not end with the play on the number 18. One example of its continued use is found in Oracula Sibyllina 1.325, where the Sibyl's oracular musings produce the claim:

Then indeed the son of the great God will come, incarnate, likened to mortal men on earth, bearing four vowels, and the consonants in him are two. I will state explicitly the entire number for you. For eight units, and equal number of tens in addition to these, and eight hundreds [i.e., ΙΗΣΟΥΣ is 10+8+200+70+400+200 which comes to 888] will reveal his name to men who are stade [sober or serious] with faithfulness.1111

Along similar lines it can be seen that Jesus' name was pregnant with consequence as a Greek Zahlenswort, for many groups speculated in this manner (including heterodox groups), as Irenaeus indicates concerning the doctrines of the followers of Marcus:

This which you know and seem to possess, is not an ancient name...For Jesus is a name arithmetically, symbolical, consisting of six letters, and is known to all that belong to the called....This is the name of Jesus; for this name, if you count up the numerical value of the letters, amounts to eight hundred and eighty-eight. Thus, then you have a clear statement of their opinion as to the origin of the supercelestial Jesus. Wherefore, also, the alphabet of the Greek contains eight Monads, eight Decads, and eight Hecatads, which present the number eight hundred and eighty eight, that is Jesus, who is formed of all numbers; and on this account he is called Alpha and Omega, indicating his origin from all [emphasis mine].1112

What we should grasp here is both the symbolic use of Alpha-Omega, as well as the number symbolism of 888.

Of further interest is Marcus' opinion, which was that it was for symbolical and mystical reasons that God sent the Name (i.e. the six letter name of Jesus). Marcus states:

But when the Name of six letters was manifested the person bearing it clothing himself in flesh, that he might come under the comprehension of man's senses, and having in himself these six and twenty-four letters [i.e. the total number of the Greek alphabet].

---

1111 In a variant of this 137-145 says, "I am the one who is, but you consider in your heart: I am robed in heaven, draped around with sea, the earth is the support of my feet, around my body is poured the air, the entire chorus of stars revolve around me. I have nine letters. I am of four syllables. Consider me: The first three have two letters each. The last has the rest, and five are consonants. The entire number is: twice eight plus three hundred, three tens and seven."

1112 In ad Haer., I. XIV, A; XV, 2. The group which Irenaeus inveighs against here believed that they traveled through seven heavens in order to arrive at the eighth, the ogdoad—the goal of those who possess the perfect gnosis.
then becoming acquainted with him they ceased from ignorance and passed from death into life, this Name [emphasis mine] serving as their guide to the Father...\textsuperscript{1113}

Marcus amplifies this credo when he also states that Jesus is the Alpha and Omega because the numerical value of Alpha and Omega is 801, while the value for ‘the Savior’ is also 801.\textsuperscript{1114} Moreover, the value for the dove, the quintessential emblem of the savior, also has as its numerical valuation 801. Thus, following Greek numerological convention we see that “Jesus” was interlaced with the Alpha and Omega symbolism in two different ways.

Marcus further distinguishes himself by adding yet another new twist, viz., the bizarre number symbolism reported in Hippolytus’ \textit{Haer.} VI.41 (cf. Irenaeus I. XV). Marcus postulated with respect to Jesus that:

Jesus possesses this ineffable generation. For from the mother of the universe, I mean the first tetrad, proceeded forth, in the manner of a daughter, the second tetrad. And it became an ogdoad, from which proceeded forth the decade; and thus was produced ten, and next eighteen. The decade, therefore, coming in along with the ogdoad, and rendering it tenfold, produced the number eighty; and again making eighty tenfold, generated the number eight hundred. And so it is that the entire number of letters that proceeded forth from ogdoad into decade is eight hundred and eighty-eight, which is Jesus; for the name Jesus, according to the number in letters, is eight hundred and eighty-eight. Now likewise the Greek alphabet has eight monads and eight decades, and eight hecatontads; and these exhibit the calculated sum of eight hundred and eighty-eight, that is, Jesus, who consists of all numbers. And that on this account He is called Alpha (and Omega)...\textsuperscript{1115}

As this quote shows, Marcus’ view of the name of Jesus runs along the same lines as the Book of Revelation when it claims that Jesus is the Alpha and the Omega. Both Marcus, and Revelation, used letter symbolism to signify the infinite and eternal nature of the name of Jesus.\textsuperscript{1116}

This mystical \textit{\textit{A}Ω-Zahlenwert} is in part derived from the fact that the cosmos was viewed as being comprised of twenty-four elements:\textsuperscript{1117} incidentally the exact same number as the letters

\textsuperscript{1113} In \textit{ad Haer.} I. XV, 2. Irenaeus, for one, is unimpressed with Marcus’ explanation of things and roundly criticizes his excessive speculations. This is made quite clear in I. XV, 5.

\textsuperscript{1114} Ibid. I. XIV, 6; XV, 1. Another example of numerical equivalence allowing for the conflation of two divine beings is found in later Jewish lore. Metatron, as it turns out, equals 314, the same number as Shaddai. This allowed for some to speculate that Metatron was the demiurge. For more see Trachtenberg, \textit{Jewish Magic}, 262.

\textsuperscript{1115} It is interesting to note that in later Jewish Hekhaloth literature the name of the Ogdoas is called, \textit{Azhogah} (.navigate). This name is composed of two groups of three consonants and each group numerically adds up to the number eight. Together this yields the number 888. For further details see Gershom G. Scholem, \textit{Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition} (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1960), 66.

\textsuperscript{1116} Along similar lines see Clement, \textit{Stromata}, VI. XVI
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in the Greek alphabet. Accordingly, as Miller expresses it, the Greek alphabet is “cosmic” and “forms an exact ‘double’ of the heavenly elements.” 1118 In accordance with this principle then the symbolic $\text{AO}$ must represent not only the beginning and end, but also encapsulation of the entire cosmos. 1119 Thus, the Alpha-Omega is a sort of contraction, symbolizing the all-powerful nature of God. Hull has put it well when he summarizes the symbolic importance of the Alpha-Omega imagery:

There are twenty-four hours in the day and twenty-four letters in the Greek alphabet. Every letter equals an hour and is therefore an image of divinity. The alpha-omega, like the sum of the hours, represents the power of God in his totality. 1120 Perhaps the notion of Alpha-Omega as a contraction which symbolized divine reality found its way into Christian circles and helped form the basis for the creation of the nomina saera. However, we can infer little of real, hard, evidentiary value about the origin of the nomina saera and some connection with Alpha-Omega conceptions.

For example, we do not know whether the association attested here was already operational in the first century, or if it had any influence in the formative stages of the development of the nomina saera. It could just as easily have been a witness to a subsequent development in the unfolding evolution of the sacerdotal nature of the nomina saera. Having sided with the minimalist position, it nonetheless appears that Roberts’ assessment was striking in its prescience when he made these illuminating remarks:

It seems then that there were two lines of development, the one owing to number symbolism, the other, perhaps with an allusion to Alpha Omega, taking the first and last

---

1117 See PGM XXXIX. 20.


1119 This raises the possibility that the notion of ‘Alpha-Omega’ or alternatively, ‘the beginning and the end,’ may have had some religious connotation quite apart from the ambit of Judeo-Christian thought. In an interesting third century hymn to Tyche (i.e. the goddess Chance) the devotee extols her variegated virtues, but then concludes with this statement, “For you hold the beginning and the end of all things!” This type of language is of course the language of lordship so perhaps similar claims came to be applied to Jesus. For the reference to Tyche see John U. Powell, Collectanea Alexandrina, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1925), 196.

1120 Hull, Hellenistic Magic, 42. An almost verbatim representation of the sentiments of Philo. See Quae. et Sol.Gen., 2.5.
letters. If, as looks probable enough, Ιηρός was the first name to be treated as a nomen sacrum, the abbreviation KC for κύριος would have been formed by analogy.1121

Another possibility for the origin of the nomina sacra is derived from the fact that letters were considered significant in and of themselves. This was due in part to the notion that the letters of the name were of paramount importance in magic, and this played into the hands of those who sought a deeper meaning from onomatomantic procedures, as Hopfner notes:

Nun bestehen aber gerade die 'echtesten' Gotternamen gewöhnlich aus sehr vielen Lauten, bzw. Buchstaben und konnten, gerade weil sie für die Griechen oder auch sogar für Menschen überhaupt unverständlich (σημα) waren...Dem suchte man dadurch abzuhelfen, daß man hinter besonders schwierigen oder wichtigen Götternamen die Zahl ihrer Buchstaben angab.1122

Hopfner's assessment is clearly on the mark, but letters could be seen to be significant even without number symbolism. For example, Pliny the Elder records that the princeps civitatis of Rome, one Marcus Servilius Nonianus, employed a charm which contained only the letters rho and alpha in order to cure an eye affliction.1123 Moreover, according to Pliny it was widely believed that Pythagoras had demonstrated that names with an uneven number of vowels would invite unfortunate circumstances.1124 We read further that Demetrius’ treatise on numbers had shown that the number four was believed to be the prerogative of Hercules.1125 No less taken with number speculation were Pythagoras’ followers, or so Varro reports, who states that odd numbers are to be used for healing while the principal virtue of the even numbers is that they are infinite in duration.1126

Also, in a statement in Metamorphoses 3.17, Apuleius speaks of metal tablets which were engraved with mysterious letters, while in Plotinus’ exposé on magic1127 we encounter a

1121 Roberts, Manuscripts, 37.
1122 Hopfner, "Mageia," 342.
1123 HN 28.5. 29.
1124 HN 28.5. 33.
1125 HN 28.17. 64.
1126 As quoted in Virgil’s Aeneid, 5. 77.
1127 Enneades, 4.4.40.
statement that magicians use “figures with power in them,” which when properly deployed, “draw down upon themselves the powers.”

Such conceptions are also found in Sefer Ha-Razim where the author contends that even the letters of the Name have numinous power. This is expressed in the last invocation found in the text which deals with the sixth firmament. At 35-45 we read:

I adjure you, O angels of strength and might... by His name and by its letters; I repeat [your names] and adjure you that you come and stand with me...

The Christian Isaac of Antioch in his polemic against magic further elaborates upon this emphasis upon mystical Buchstaben. Isaac points out the significance of Buchstaben mysticism:

Whoever writes a yod [the initial consonant of the divine name] with his own blood puts himself in the place of the notorious magicians Jannes and Mambres.

Another example of letter symbolism is found in Midrash Rabba where we read:

And I [God] will make your name great [Abram; following Gen. 12:2]. This means: ‘I will add the letter He to your name.’ R. Abbahu commented on this: ‘It is not written: Look now בּרֵאשִׁית, but: Look now הָיְמִן נֶפֶשׁ [Gen. 15:5]. [for God said] ‘With this He, I made the world. And behold, I will add it to your name...’

Indeed, accordingly to rabbinic lore the name of the patriarch Judah originated from the Tetragrammaton. And Joseph, in like manner as Abram, had a letter added to his name—the sacred Yodh given to him by YHWH. In b. Sota 36b we read:

R. Hana b. Biza said in the name of R. Simeon the Pious, ‘Because Joseph sanctified the heavenly Name in private one letter was added to him [yod] from the Name of the Holy One, blessed be He, but because Judah sanctified the heavenly Name in public, the whole of his name was called after the Name of the Holy One [i.e. 7 and 7], blessed be He.’

The rabbis also posited that God had created the cosmos through Yodh and He:

For with Yod-He, YHWH created worlds. (Is. 28:4) These are the two worlds which the Holy One, Blessed be He, created, one with the He and one with the Yod...

---

1128 De magis, incantoribus et divinis, et de fine et consummatione.

1129 As quoted in Simon, Verus Israel, 357.

1130 b. Sota 10b; idem. 36.b.

1131 Ibid.

1132 b. Menachot 29b; p. Haggiah 77c. Fossum has pointed out that the letter He found its place in creation etiology due to Ps. 33:6. Ps. 33:6, which implies that the work of creation requires no more than God’s word (i.e., it was easy). He, being an aspirate, a letter requiring little to no effort to pronounce, was then associated with the creation in Rabbinic thought. See Jarl E. Fossum, “In the Beginning was the Name,” 118.
In later kabbalistic speculation the combination Yod-He was believed to be characteristic of God's mercy while the alternative name of God (i.e. Elohim) was conceived of as signifying God's judgment.\textsuperscript{1133}

Moreover, in the magical Eighth Book of Moses (\textit{PGM VIII}) it is strongly intimated that the initials of the names of the gods were a \textit{symbolon} of their numinous names. The text in question reads:

\begin{quote}
And he [the god] was called [by a name derived] from the nine gods, as having taken away, along with their power, also the initials of their names.\textsuperscript{1134}
\end{quote}

Of greater significance is the fact that within the rabbinical ambit, the letters Aleph and Tav, the first and last letters of the Hebrew alphabet, were emblematic of the \textit{Shekhinah},\textsuperscript{1135} while tav alone was the sign of salvation.\textsuperscript{1136} No doubt a similar concept undergirds the passage in Ez. 9:4, whereby YHWH instructs the Temple scribes to write upon the forehead of the righteous the mark (lit., 1ח, or as it appears in paleo-Hebrew, X) which circumscribes this elect group from those who are to perish. To this registry we may also add the mark of Cain which is perhaps tangentially related to this concept. Another passage which runs along similar lines is Isaiah Is. 44:5, where we read:

\begin{quote}
This one will say, 'I am the \textsc{lord}'s';
and that one will call on the name of Jacob;
And another will write on his hand, 'Belonging to the \textsc{lord},'
And will name Israel's name with honor.
\end{quote}

As a parenthetical aside it is of some interest that this type of \emph{χαρακτήρ} (and sealing thereby) is surely to be seen as the background for Rev. 7: 1-4, where it is said that the elect are sealed with the Name upon their foreheads, the Name of both the Father and the Son, alerting us that the author and his community thought that Jesus' name was as important as the Tetragrammaton.

\textsuperscript{1133} For a succinct review of the kabbalistic speculation upon these two letters as divinely endowed see Stephen G. Wald, \textit{The Doctrine of the Divine Name: An Introduction to classical Kabbalistic Theology}, (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988), 52, 54.

\textsuperscript{1134} \textit{PGM XIII}, 555


\textsuperscript{1136} So Simon, \textit{Verus Israel}, 352.
Moreover, we should juxtapose these passages in correct apposition to those very prohibitions in the Old Testament concerning receiving a mark upon the body of anybody—especially those with cultic significance for another god (Lev. 19:28; 21:5; Deut. 14:1). And we should not forget that this notion of religious sealing via letters and symbols stands behind the fact that religious tattooing was rather prevalent in the ancient Greco-Roman world.1137

Thus, these ‘sealings’ must be seen as consecrations which sanctified the votary for cultic activity.1138 Certainly, the Old Testament conception of cultic impurity permeates the prohibitions about receiving marks upon the body. Let us turn our attention back again to the question of the origin of the nomina sacra.

If this letter-speculation already occupied itself with not only the names of God but also with His divine mercy then perhaps the contraction of name of Jesus in Hebrew (יְהוָּה) would have been seen as exemplifying this concept. The possibilities for this being a legitimate template for the origin of the nomina sacra are heightened further in light of the following considerations.

First, as Blau points out, the variant יְהוָּה was often written in place of the full Tetragrammaton and this may have helped fuel the transference from YHWH to the name of Jesus.1139 Secondly, the Greek equivalent, Ια (i.e., Ja), was used (linguistically) in its place among Greek speaking Jews. Other speculation on the import of the letters of the Name abounds, including Jesus’ name.1140 Of further possible interest is the notion that in the future world the elect would be able to speak out God’s Name according to its letters, and perhaps Jesus was seen as the fulfillment of this eschatological promise.1141 Indeed, insofar as Jesus was believed to have inaugurated the new

---

1137 See Herodotus 2.113; Lucian Syr. D. 59; III Mace. 2:29, where it is reported that Ptolemy Philopater branded Jews who were compliant with his programs and put upon them an ivy leaf, the symbol of Dionysian worship.


1139 Blau. DAJZW, 123. See also Aune, “Ἰά,” 1.

1140 As one example Schmidt cites the fact that Ἰησοῦς may have seemed to early Greek Christians to be purposeful mimicry of one of Jesus’ major salvific activities (ἰδομαύτη) as Matt. 1:21 indicates. Schmidt, Die Bedeutung des Namens, 16.

1141 b. Pesahim 50a. Regrettably, it is impossible to know if this notion reaches back into New Testament times.
dispensation then perhaps his name was seen as a surrogate for the Tetragrammaton, and, since both it, and its power, were now available God had indeed revealed his full name in this new dispensation through the name of Jesus. With this said we still have another option left, one that has already been hinted at.

Another option is that Jesus’ name was a cipher not so much for divine attributes, but for the Tetragrammaton itself. To begin this exposition let us cover some background material. First, we note the import that was given to the name Joshua in Jewish circles, for it contained both vowels of the Tetragrammaton. Not without further interest is the comment made by Clement of Alexandria in the *Stromata* (VI. XVII) concerning Jesus’ name and *Yod*. “And, in...the Decalogue, by the letter *lota* [= *Yod*], signifies the blessed Name, presenting Jesus, who is the Word.”

Now apparently an analogous situation arose in the rabbinic formulation of the Name as it applied to these two respective consonants. For *Yod*, beyond what we have already had occasion to mention, in the name ‘Israel,’ was claimed to be intimately bound with the Tetragrammaton because it has *Yod* as its initial consonant. Likewise, the initial syllable of the form לְלֵיִבּ is imputed to be on the heart of every angel for the names of the angels are bound with God’s (e.g. Micha-el; Gabri-el, etc). Thus, whether *Yod*, *He*, or ’El, any theophoric name which consists of these basic constituents of God’s various names could be construed as being bound indissolubly with the name of God, for as Dornseiff notes, “Die Buchstaben des Namens Jahwe לְלֵיִבּ und ל bezeichnen die Seinsgrade der Gottheit.”

Thus, it may be that early Jewish Christians understood the name “Jesus” to be similar to the Tetragrammaton insofar as the former, when suspended, would produce a cipher which would be an identical *nomen sacrum* (i.e. יְהֹוָה) as the Tetragrammaton. Thus, יְהֹוָה, the well-accepted surrogate for יְהֹוָה, would also be the contracted form of the Hebrew name of Jesus.

---

1142 Following Blau, who states, “Es ist nämlich anzunehmen, dass in der andeutenden Umschreibung „Jose” beide Vocale des Tetragrams beibehalten sind, wie in יְלֵיִבּ, wo EPOPE dieselben Vocale hat, wie ELOHE.” Blau points out that this is found as a variant for YHWH in *J. Nedarim* 42c. See Blau, *DAJZW*, 131.

1143 j. *Taan*. 65d.


1145 Dornseiff, *Das Alphabet*, 141.
Interestingly, this argument gains currency even if one posits a Greek milieu for this postulated transformation of the ubiquitous Greek name for YHWH (i.e., Ἰερεῖον), for this could have also been construed as a nomen sacrum for Jesus. 1146 Perhaps then, the name of Jesus was thought to be a surrogate for the Name and then took on the same outlines of the letter-speculation of the Tetragrammaton.

The final possibility for explicating the origin of the nomina sacra revolves around the issue of the meaning of the name of Jesus and is related to our previous option. First, we have two collateral lines of evidence that may allow us to infer that the name of Jesus may have been envisioned as being equatable with the Hebrew word for salvation. Foremost in this connection is the fact that in Hebrew Jesus’ name is actually Joshua, and in Hebrew Joshua means, “Yahweh saves.” In fact, we can see how this name was appreciated when we note Philo, who in his De Mut. Nom. (121-2), relates his view of the name of Joshua (=salvation):

But, moreover, Moses also changes the name of Hosea into that of Joshua; displaying by his new name the distinctive quality of his character; for the name Hosea is interpreted, ‘what sort of person is this?’ but Joshua means ‘the salvation of the Lord’ being the name of the most excellent possible character...

The second thread that supports the supposition that the name of Jesus might have been conflated with the notion of salvation is found in Sir 46:1 which states:

Joshua son of Nun was mighty in war, and was the successor of Moses in the prophetic office. He became, as his name implies, a great savior of God’s elect, to take vengeance on the enemies that rose against them, so that he might give Israel its inheritance.

We would do well here to remember the concept we encountered earlier where Justin expressly (Dialogue, 75) equates Jesus with Joshua and his activities:

Now from the book of Exodus we know that Moses cryptically indicated that the name of God himself...was also Jesus. For it is written: ‘And the Lord said to Moses, say to this people: Behold, I send my angel before thy face, to keep thee in thy journey, and bring thee into the place that I have prepared for thee. Take notice of him, and obey his voice; do not disobey him, for he will not pardon thee, because My name is in him.’ Consider well who it was that led your fathers into the promised land, namely he who was at first named Auses (Oshea), but later renamed Jesus (Joshua). If you keep this in mind, you

---

1146 Eitrem conjectures on pages 10-11 of his work, Some Notes on the Demonology of the New Testament, that the name Jesus is similar to the Greek version of the divine name as found in the heaviy Semitic magical formula in PGM IV 3007-3086 (the so-called ‘Pibèches’ exorcism). Here Eitrem notes that Ἰερεῖον, and its variant (Ἰερείον), looks suspiciously like the genitive case IU. For a thorough examination of the numerous variants of the Tetragrammaton in Greek see Adolf G. Deissmann, Bibelstudien. Beiträge zumeist aus den Papyri und Inschriften zum Geschichte der Sprache, des Schriftums und der Religion des hellenistischen Judentums und des Urchristentums, (Marburg: N.G. Elwert’sche, 1895), 1-20.
will also realize that the name of him who said to Moses, ‘My Name is in him,’ was Jesus.

Another fascinating narrative in line with this type of speculation is found in Justin’s Dialogue 113. Justin chides his Jewish opponents for entangling themselves in incessant speculation over the numerous name changes which are found in the Old Testament (e.g. Abram changed to Abraham), and yet they somehow never seem to come to grips with the significance of the name change to Joshua. For, as Justin states in Dialogue 113:

But why do you not similarly investigate the reason why the name of Oshea the son of Nave (Nun), which his father gave him, was changed to Jesus (Joshua)? But since not only was his name altered, but he was also appointed successor to Moses, being the only one of his contemporaries who came out from Egypt, he led the surviving people into the Holy Land...

The power believed to be resident in the name of Jesus is elaborated upon further by Justin, who falls back again upon the Joshua typology in 132, where he states in a comparison of “Oshea” in I Sam. to Joshua when the livestock automatically followed the people of Israel into the Promised Land they did so, “guided by the name of power.”

It is completely clear that the early Church viewed Jesus as a sort of Joshua-redivivus figure and subsequently, it became possible to make the leap from Jesus’ name to ‘Jesus as the embodiment of salvation.’ This connection between Jesus the Savior and his name may have been the source of the speculation on his name and its placement as the first nomen sacrum.
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