

Christological Name Theology in three Second Century communities

Michael D. Harris
Marquette University

Recommended Citation

Harris, Michael D., "Christological Name Theology in three Second Century communities" (2013). *Dissertations (2009 -)*. Paper 270.
http://epublications.marquette.edu/dissertations_mu/270

CHRISTOLOGICAL NAME THEOLOGY IN THREE SECOND CENTURY
COMMUNITIES

by

Michael D. Harris, B.A., M.A.

A Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School,
Marquette University,
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Milwaukee, Wisconsin

May 2013

ABSTRACT

CHRISTOLOGICAL NAME THEOLOGY IN THREE SECOND CENTURY COMMUNITIES

Michael D. Harris, B.A., M.A.

Marquette University, 2013

This dissertation seeks to consider the possible backgrounds for second century Christian name theology, the distinct regional applications of “Name” theology to Christology, and also to compare Rome, Syria, and Alexandria to one another and reveal how that application was different in each of the three regions. In order to understand the backgrounds for this theological idea, the first three chapters investigate the variety of theological uses of the word “name” in the Hebrew Bible, in other Jewish literature, and in the New Testament. The three communities are represented by *1 Clement* and *Shepherd of Hermas* from Rome, *Ascension of Isaiah* and *Odes of Solomon* from Antiochian Syria, and *Gospel of Truth* and *Excerpta ex Theodoto* at Alexandria. All the second century Christian texts considered in this study make use of earlier Jewish ideas about the name of God or special names given by God. All of them adapt that theological term to their own immediate concerns; however, this study discovers some common traits among all of them. The name is given soteriological importance in each text. That salvation is determined in some way by possession of the name by the believer. Finally, in different ways each text places importance on the way the name interacts with creation. These common points serve as a basis for comparison of all the material undertaken in this study.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Michael D. Harris, B.A., M.A.

As I submit this dissertation, I am glad to have the opportunity to offer thanks to some of the people who have helped and supported me during its composition.

First, I thank the Marquette Theology Department for the support it has given me in the form of a Dissertation Fellowship, as well as the opportunity to work for several years as a Teaching Assistant. These appointments put me in a position to develop as a teacher and as a researcher, and the confidence of the department has continued to be a great encouragement to me.

I would like to thank my board, Dr. Michel René Barnes, Dr. Deirdre Dempsey, Bishop Alexander (Golitzin), and Dr. Andrei Orlov. I appreciate their willingness to read my work, and their comments have improved it at many points. Dr. Dempsey especially has tolerated frequent questions about Semitic languages that have come, as often as not, whenever I happened to see her in the library. Both Bishop Alexander and Dr. Orlov have encouraged my work in classes and in the Jewish Roots of Christian Mysticism Seminar.

As my director and teacher, Dr. Barnes has sharpened my thinking, and hopefully my expression of that thinking. He has provided an example of scholarship and pedagogy that I hold as a model for my own. I have learned from him at every stage of my work at Marquette, as his student in the graduate classroom, as his T.A. in the undergraduate classroom, and finally as I have written, and rewritten this dissertation. Along the way, I have also learned something about the importance of good food and good film for theological method, or at least for maintaining a degree of sanity while doing theology.

His comments and suggestions helped at numerous points to move my research along. At other points, it was his prodding that drew out the conclusions I had come to but was not yet able to articulate. I am grateful for his mentoring and for his friendship.

My fellow students at Marquette have also provided stimulating conversation, and intellectual challenges. The group with whom I took courses has continued as conversation partners, sounding boards, and friends. In particular, I want to mention and thank Anthony Briggman, Bob Foster, Dan Lloyd, and Mike Novak for their part in making doctoral studies enjoyable as well as profitable.

Without the support of family, this dissertation would never have come to completion. My parents, Dale and Elisabeth Harris, have expressed faith and confidence in me from before the beginning of my education. Their encouragement continued as I waded through graduate school, and I thank them for the encouragement and the advice they have offered. If stereotypes are to be trusted, many people cannot count on the support of their in-laws, but I have been unusually blessed in this regard. Barry and Joan Liffiton have gone out of their way to support, to ease the path, and even to cajole when needed. Perhaps the most enthusiastic support has come from my children. Both Renée and Ezekiel were born while we have lived in Milwaukee, and have always known Papa to have class papers or a dissertation to attend to. I am glad to be able to share with them the excitement that it is now finished.

My greatest thanks go to my wife, Donna. She encouraged me to go to graduate school in the first place and begin the journey that has led here. She has enthusiastically embraced a life that is somewhat different from what we expected when we were first

married. Her support, her encouragement, and her love have a lot to do with my arrival at this point, and I look forward to the next chapter of our lives together. Thank you Donna.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	i
CHAPTER	
INTRODUCTION	1
1. THE <i>SHEM</i> THEOLOGIES OF THE HEBREW BIBLE	14
2. NAME THEOLOGIES IN JUDAISM	51
3. THE ὄνομα THEOLOGIES IN THE NEW TESTAMENT	93
4. NAME THEOLOGY IN ROME: FIRST CLEMENT	124
5. NAME THEOLOGY IN ROME: THE SHEPHERD OF HERMAS	163
6. NAME THEOLOGY IN SECOND CENTURY SYRIA: THE <i>ASCENSION OF ISAIAH</i> AND THE <i>ODES OF SOLOMON</i>	199
7. NAME THEOLOGY AT ALEXANDRIA IN THE SECOND CENTURY: THE <i>GOSPEL OF TRUTH</i> AND <i>EXCERPTA EX THEODOTO</i>	240
CONCLUSIONS	275
BIBLIOGRAPHY	286

Introduction

By way of introducing the prayer that concludes his epistle to the Corinthians, Clement writes

We will ask, with earnest prayer and supplication, that the Creator of the universe may keep intact the specified number of his elect throughout the whole world, through his beloved servant Jesus Christ, through whom he called us from darkness to light, from ignorance to the knowledge of the glory of his Name.

To hope upon your Name, the primal source of all creation ...¹

This brief quotation touches upon the richness that is present in the Name Theologies of the second century. The Name is associated with the preservation of the church, it can be known, and that knowledge is the opposite of darkness and ignorance, and so represents salvation. In the last line, almost in passing, the Name is credited with having a role in the creation.

During a seminar on early pneumatology Michel Barnes made the observation that Name Theology had been an important way of discussing Christology during the second century, but that by the middle of the third it had dropped almost out of the discussion. The disappearance of a significant set of theological vocabulary intrigued me, and this dissertation represents an attempt to understand the purposes to which the vocabulary of Name Theology was put during what passes for its heyday.

I should begin by clarifying my terminology, since there can be confusion about what I mean by Name Theology. I am interested in those passages that refer to the Name

¹ *1 Clem.* 59.2-3.

of God as a Name, not in the various names given to God. This study is concerned with Hebrew uses of *šēm*,² Greek references to God's ὄνομα, and their equivalents in Ethiopic, Syriac, or Coptic. I am not directly interested in Hebrew passages that use the tetragrammaton, or Greek passages that represent that Name by the euphemism κύριος. I am interested in uses of the tetragrammaton or κύριος only insofar as they occasionally help to inform my reading of *šēm* or ὄνομα in the same passage. I am particularly interested in those instances in the Christian literature where that Name is applied to the Son of God.

Uncovering how the Name was used in the second century, however, requires an understanding of how that term had been used in the Jewish and Christian literature that came earlier, and so a significant portion of this study addresses those prior examples from the Hebrew Bible, other Jewish literature, and the New Testament. Unlike the tetragrammaton itself, references to the Name of God as a Name—and the later phenomenon of relating that Name to Jesus Christ—has received little concentrated attention in earlier scholarship. Within the Hebrew Bible, only the Deuteronomic *Shem* theology has received extensive treatment.³ There has been no similar investigation of a *Shem* Theology outside that corpus, or in Jewish literature outside the Hebrew Bible. In that literature, the Name is used for a range of theological purposes besides what is claimed for the Deuteronomic *Shem* Theology. Much of that content is taken up by

² I will use *shem* to refer to the Hebrew Bible's theological concept of God's name. When discussing the Hebrew word as a word, I will transliterate *šēm*.

³ Significant recent scholars in this discussion include Moshe Weinfeld, Tryggve Mettinger, Ian Wilson, and Sandra Richter. For fuller bibliographic details see my Chapter 1.

Christian writers of the second century. Unfortunately the Deuteronomic *Shem* Theology is the most commonly cited origin for the early Christological Name Theology; however, the interpretation of the central passages for *Shem* Theology remains controversial in the modern literature. There is not a scholarly consensus as to whether *šēm* in these passages refers to YHWH himself (by circumlocution), to a quasi-hypostatic entity separate from YHWH, or to a simple ownership formula that says nothing about divine presence. The lack of consensus demonstrates the lack of exegetical clarity about the uses of *šēm* in the Hebrew Bible, and early Christian theology pursued a variety of exegetical solutions to deal with this terminology. I disagree with the assumption that the Deuteronomic understanding of the Name provides the direct theological background for those Christian solutions, however. Even assuming the most hypostatic interpretation of *Shem* Theology as represented in the work of Moshe Weinfeld or Tryggve Mettinger, the Deuteronomic *šēm* is a static and passive hypostasis, and it does not influence the way that the Christian writers I address in the last four chapters talk about the Name.

In the scholarship about Christian sources, Lucien Cerfaux suggested that the Name was an important aspect of the Christology of early Jewish Christianity, especially as it is represented in Acts.⁴ Quispel made similar observations in his earliest study of the *Gospel of Truth*.⁵ Following much of Quispel's argument, Jarl Fossum studied several Valentinian texts containing theologies of the Name as a part of his argument that

⁴ Lucien Cerfaux, "La première communauté chrétienne de Jérusalem," *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 16 (1939) 5-31, especially 24-26. Cerfaux finds the term *name* to have mostly to do with the Apostles' authorization and power to perform miracles.

⁵ Gilles Quispel, "The Jung codex and its significance" in H.C. Puech, G. Quispel, and W.C. Van Unnik, *The Jung Codex: A Newly Discovered Gnostic Papyrus* (London: Mowbray, 1955).

Samaritan theology lies behind Gnosticism.⁶ Charles Gieschen has also written about the place of the Name in early Christology.⁷ With the exception of Gieschen's work, however, no one has attempted to bring together the different second century texts in order to analyze their uses of the Name, or how their uses differed.

Most of the analyses that have come before have been very brief, since this handful of second century texts were only a small part of their larger projects. Cerfaux surveys all of Jewish Christianity extant in Jerusalem and the Name takes up only three pages. Quispel and Fossum are principally interested in the Gnostic material, and the other texts are treated only tangentially. Gieschen's article is largely concerned with New Testament examples; the second and third century evidence accounts for less than a fourth of his article. The brevity of the previous work has led to two problems with the accounts they have produced. Treating the texts as a single group produces too flat an analysis. On the other hand, isolating them entirely from one another and analyzing them individually results in a project that is merely descriptive. None of the studies has been able to pursue the question of what the Name Theology in these texts is used for, how each text relates the Name to their immediate concerns, and very importantly, how they compare to one another in their use of this shared Name Theology.

I have organized this study geographically, and compared the texts along those lines in order to consider what role their differing regional contexts might play in either

⁶ Jarl Fossum, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1985), 76-191. Fossum emphasizes *Gos. Truth, Exc. Theod., and Gos. Phil.* in his study. It is from Fossum that I have taken the term *onomanology* as a way of designating the Theology of the Name.

⁷ Charles A. Gieschen, "The Divine Name in Ante-Nicene Christology," *VC* 57.2 (2003) 115-158.

their available source materials or their development of those sources. This has proven a fruitful course. Although the authors do not draw on significantly different sources based on their location, each region appears to have incorporated Name Theology into its own distinct set of local concerns.

The provenance of the two Roman texts is not controversial. Both *1 Clement* and *Shepherd of Hermas* are widely regarded as coming from a Roman milieu, although from different sociological groups within the Roman community.⁸ There is some disagreement about the exact location and dates for *Ascension of Isaiah* and *Odes of Solomon*, but a definite majority affirms Syria in the vicinity of Antioch for both texts. Clement of Alexandria's *Excerpta ex Theodoto* can also be assigned to Alexandria for purposes of this study, in spite of some diversity of provenance for the source material. It is not known where Theodotus himself lived and taught, and much of the material in the *Excerpta* comes from sources other than Theodotus. Nonetheless, I have chosen to analyze the text in an Alexandrian context, because Clement had access to all of the material it contains at the end of the second century (and beginning of the third) in Alexandria, and he judged it to be useful for his account of Valentinian thought. As a result, the *Excerpta* are relevant to understanding the kind of theology about the Name that was extant in Alexandria at that time.

The only document that requires further comment at this point is my decision to locate the *Gospel of Truth* at Alexandria. Several different origins are proposed for *Gospel of Truth*, but in my view they all effectively point to Alexandria as the best

⁸ Specific bibliographic information can be found in the individual chapters.

context for analysis. It has often been suggested that *Gospel of Truth* is Valentinius's own composition. Pearson takes this position, and argues that it must be dated to his "earlier Alexandrian period."⁹ A common suggestion is that it represents a sermon preached by Valentinius in his attempt to become bishop of Rome. This has the appeal of explaining the document's silence on certain points of Valentinian thought, and its reticence about expanding upon those distinctive points that are found. If this were the case, and *Gospel of Truth* were composed at Rome for a Roman audience, the author's reticence would seem to indicate that it did not express a particularly Roman perspective. He apparently felt it necessary to edit himself in an attempt to meet with approval. Any Roman perspective would only be detectable as something that the author appeared to placate, and that would only be the writer's perception about Roman theological convictions. The theology that could be detected therein would in fact be one that Valentinius developed at Alexandria. Taking a very different perspective, Raoul Mortley has speculated that at least the closing paragraphs of *Gospel of Truth* are actually a 4th century response to Arianism. If he is correct then *Gospel of Truth* better represents, along with the 3rd Century *Gospel of Philip*, further evidence that in Valentinian circles Name Theology persisted much longer than in other forms of Christianity as an important way of speaking of the Son. I believe that internal characteristics of Valentinianism can explain most of the content of these paragraphs, and that the theology of this section is sufficiently similar to what is found in *Excerpta ex Theodoto* to justify including it in a study of the second

⁹ Birger A. Pearson, *Gnosticism and Christianity in Roman and Coptic Egypt* (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 67.

century. As such, it is best associated with early Valentinian development at Alexandria, even if the author is not Valentinus himself.

An additional comment regarding the Valentinian associations of both *Gospel of Truth* and the *Excerpta* is necessary at this point. There has been a tendency to separate Valentinian and other Gnostic thought from what is often considered proto-orthodox Christianity. As the discovery of additional Valentinian texts, and investigations into the development of Valentinian theology has made more apparent, however, such a hard distinction does not accurately describe the situation, especially in the second century church.¹⁰ In Rome, Valentinus and his teaching were well enough regarded to be considered for the office of bishop. Clement read Valentinian writings in order to refute their errors, but he did not reject everything that he found in them, and incorporated what he found to be valuable into his own theology. A complete understanding of Christianity in the second century cannot exclude Valentinianism.

One last issue remains for this introduction, and that is the question of whether the Name exercises or represents distinct divine activity at all, or is simply “a circumlocution for God.”¹¹ My answer to this question is two-fold. First, in certain instances it is

¹⁰ Robin McL. Wilson describes the difficulty in establishing the authorship or date of the *Gos. Truth* because of its divergence from the Valentinianism of Irenaeus in “Valentinianism and the Gospel of Truth,” in *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism*, vol. 1, ed. Bentley Layton (Leiden: Brill, 1980), 133-145. Michel Desjardins calls for the need to read “Gnostic” texts within a Christian context in “Rethinking the Study of Gnosticism,” *Religion & Theology* 12 (2005): 370-84. Einar Thomassen makes the case for Rome, that early Valentinian teachers were active within the broader phenomenon of Roman Christianity (“Orthodoxy and Heresy in Second Century Rome,” *Harvard Theological Review* 97:3 [2004]: 241-56).

¹¹ I would like to thank Robert Foster, who read and commented on several parts of this dissertation, and challenged me on this issue.

certainly not a circumlocution for God, but something else entirely. For the sake of convenience, I will restrict myself here to several examples from scripture, since they are more likely to be familiar. In Solomon's prayer dedicating the temple in 1 Kings 8, he draws a clear distinction between God's Name, which is located in the temple, and YHWH himself, who remains in heaven. The distinction is so striking that it gives rise to the theory of a unique *Shem* Theology in the Deuteronomist's work. In a second example from the New Testament, John 17 shows Jesus speaking of the Name as a possession that he has from the Father, that he passes on to his disciples, and that allows for the preservation of believers. In that passage, Jesus is not using ὄνομα as a circumlocution for God; rather, he describes something that God is able to use for the salvation of believers, that the Father can give to the Son, and that the Son can share with his followers.

In other cases, of course, the distinction between God and the Name is not so sharp, and "the Name" does appear to be used as a circumlocution for God. One possible example is Isaiah 30:27, "Behold, the Name of the LORD comes from far, burning with his anger, and in thick rising smoke..." The Name can be read here as a fully hypostatic entity that operates on its own apart from God, but the most common way of reading the passage is to understand "the Name of the LORD" to refer to YHWH himself. In this and similar passages the authors have chosen *šēm* or ὄνομα instead of other more common options like the arm or the breath of the Lord. The project of this study is to explain what differentiates the Name to make it useful as a circumlocution in those passages where it is used as one.

Summary of Contents

This dissertation investigates the variety of uses to which second century Christians in three locations put the theological terminology of God's "Name." I have discovered a wide range of ways that Christians appropriate the traditions about the Name. Very seldom do they attempt to explain the ambiguity present in scriptural passages. Most often the authors pick up certain terminology about the Name (for example calling it holy, or referring to blasphemy against the Name), or they employ certain ways of using that terminology (for example, calling upon the Name in specific contexts) that are characteristic of one or another part of the Hebrew Bible. Even when they appropriate language from the Hebrew Bible, however, they do not always take it directly from that source. In many cases, the Name Theology found in a second century author is mediated through theological perspectives represented in other Jewish literature of the period and the New Testament.

I begin by examining the Jewish backgrounds in three chapters on the Hebrew Bible, non-canonical Jewish literature, and the New Testament. In these chapters, I am not attempting to argue for a single comprehensive understanding of what *šēm*, ὄνομα, or their translations actually mean. I am primarily interested in how the texts and the theological traditions they represent can be understood to say a wide range of things about the Name. Because I am interested in them as theological background for the second century literature, I have not attempted to give equal weight to each use of the word "name," but instead have focused on those kinds of uses that are reflected in the second century literature. The first chapter focuses on the Hebrew Bible rather than the LXX because the scholarly discussion regarding the Name in Judaism has been centered around the phenomenon of a "*Shem* Theology" found in the Deuteronomic corpus. As I

described earlier, I disagree with the notion that this theology should be read as the primary source of later Name speculation. Hebrew uses of *šēm* outside this corpus provide stronger examples of the categories that will later be taken up by Christian writers, and so I will describe the theological trajectories and the theological terminology that are important in the rest of the Hebrew Bible.

Israel's various *šēm* traditions were used and developed during the Second Temple period as well, and that development lies along side Hebrew Bible traditions in the background of the second century Christian appropriation of "the Name." Chapter two deals with Jewish literature outside of the Hebrew Bible—this includes the Deuterocanonical books from the LXX. The Similitudes of *I Enoch* represent the largest blocks of material, but significant texts from other Jewish writings provide examples of different theological perspectives on God's Name. These Jewish uses fall roughly into four categories: Soteriological, Cosmological, Concealment of the Name, and other uses that display a high view of the Name. The third chapter takes up the New Testament references to God's Name. In the New Testament, soteriological uses dominate. Beyond that commonality, most of the New Testament authors display a preference for one or another of the theological uses of Name Theology. They also, in varying ways, begin to apply Name Theology to Jesus Christ.

Chapter four introduces the first of the Christian texts that form the subject matter for this study, Clement's epistle to the Corinthians, commonly called *I Clement*. I will show that Clement makes use of many elements from Jewish Name Theology to describe a soteriology that relies upon the relationship between the Name's cosmological power and its power to uphold the church. He argues that the believer's salvation depends upon

their acknowledgment of that power. Clement's immediate concern is the division within the Corinthian church, and I will show that he introduces Name Theology into his argument because it allows him to describe that division as an assault on the Name's cosmological and ecclesiological work. It therefore also poses a threat to the salvation of the schismatics themselves. Clement's Name Theology is of particular interest for this study because the Name Theology he introduces into the argument is adapted to a specifically Christian ecclesiology, but without being applied to the Son of God. Clement is the only author in this study for whom this is true.

Chapter five considers the second Roman text, the *Shepherd of Hermas*. Through the majority of the composition, Hermas makes use of a Name Theology that is nearly indistinguishable from Clement's. In *Similitude* 9, which represents the last stage of composition of the *Shepherd*, Hermas first applies the Name to the Son. He does so uniformly throughout that *Similitude*. In other regards, Hermas has the same assumption as Clement about the Name's cosmological role being related to the church and to the salvation of individual believers. Taken together, Clement and Hermas can be understood to represent a Roman understanding of Name Theology that emphasizes the initiating and preserving aspects of the Name's creative power as particularly relevant to its soteriological role.

In chapter six I will consider the Name Theology present in two texts from the area of Syria and Antioch, *Ascension of Isaiah* and *Odes of Solomon*. Their concern with the Name is not the same as that in Rome, although it is still related to soteriology. Instead of giving the Name a cosmogenic role, the cosmological issue is reduced to one concerning the location of the Name's authority and activity. The texts disagree with

regard to whether that authority can be exercised on earth or only in heaven. I will relate this disagreement to their similar disagreement concerning the secrecy of the Name, and how both relate to their understandings of salvation. I will also compare this distinction to a theological conflict that scholars (R.G. Hall, M. Simonetti, and E. Norelli, among others) have identified in Syria at the same time about the role of the prophet and the location of prophecy, in which *Ascension of Isaiah* is understood to represent the perspective that the prophet must ascend to heaven to receive revelation over against the possibility that revelation could be given on earth.

The Alexandrian evidence comes from two Valentinian sources, *Gospel of Truth* and *Excerpta ex Theodoto*. In these sources, I find that the basic associations between cosmology, soteriology, and the Name are present as well. The cosmological association is altered because of the inherent anti-material stance of the texts, so that the Name plays a creative role in the structure and existence of the immaterial pleroma rather than the material cosmos. As in the other texts, the revelation of the Name is essential to soteriology. The greatest difference between the Valentinian texts and the other four is that *Gospel of Truth* and *Excerpta ex Theodoto* understand the Name of God to be a fully hypostatic being, who is identical with the Son. None of the other second century witnesses to this theology treat the Name as a being; they treat it as an aspect of divinity or as an instrument of power that may be possessed by the Son, but is not identical with him. After presenting the way in which these two texts understand the hypostatic Name to function in their systems, I will consider the ways in which they resemble or differ with the other Name Theologies from Rome and from Syria.

Chapter 1

The *Shem* Theologies of the Hebrew Bible

Aloys Grillmeier locates the origins of Christological Name Theology in Jewish sources, ultimately in Hebrew Scripture: “The old-established Shem-theology of the later books of the Old Testament appears to have been continued and applied to Christ.”¹ By this he appears to mean the *Shem* Theology of Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic corpus. Grillmeier is correct that Christological Name Theology is indebted to Hebrew Bible traditions, but I disagree with the implication that the Deuteronomic expression of Name Theology is taken up by early Christians. In this chapter I will present the various forms of Name Theology that appear in the Hebrew Bible. I will not attempt to give a comprehensive treatment of the theological uses of *šēm* in the Hebrew Bible, but instead I will give greater emphasis to those expressions that are actually taken up by Christians in the second century. The exception to this rule is the use of *šēm* that scholars have identified in the books that make up the Deuteronomic corpus, because of the dominance of that account in the scholarship on *šēm* in the Hebrew Bible.² It is also for the sake of

¹ Aloys Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition: Volume 1* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1975), 41. Grillmeier is following Jean Danielou (*The Theology of Jewish Christianity*, [London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1964] 147-63) for this point.

² Gerhard von Rad, *Deuteronomium-Studien* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1947). English translation: *Studies in Deuteronomy* (trans. David Stalker. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1953). Gerhard von Rad, *Das fünfte Buch Mose: Deuteronomium* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1964). English translation: *Deuteronomy* (trans. Dorothea Barton. OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1966). Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972). Tryggve Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth: Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies* (Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1982). Ian Wilson, *Out of the Midst of the Fire: Divine Presence in Deuteronomy* (SBLDS 151; Atlanta: Scholars, 1995). Sandra Richter, *The*

engaging with this scholarship that I have approached this material from the Hebrew text rather than the LXX, which would have been the text for the later Christian writers. I will include discussion of the LXX alongside the Hebrew at the few points where the texts differ in a way that would have been important for the second century writers. Because the Deuteronomic *Shem* theology is the most commonly recognized theological expression of *šēm* in the Hebrew Bible, I will turn first to a discussion of those texts.³

Part One – Deuteronomic Shem Theology

I. The Name in a Chosen Place

1. Relocation of YHWH

Since Gerhard von Rad popularized the notion of a Deuteronomic Name Theology⁴ it has been common to view the *šēm* language in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic material as expressing a particular view of divine presence. The most significant characteristic of this view is that the Name is considered to have its own separate existence from YHWH. In the Deuteronomic theology, YHWH and the Name are not interchangeable, as they sometimes are in Zion or Priestly theology. The Name is located in a particular place on earth, whereas YHWH himself transcends the cosmos and is located exclusively in heaven.

Deuteronomic History and the Name Theology: l'šakkēn šē mō šām in the Bible and the Ancient Near East (BZAW 318; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2002).

³ I will use *shem* to refer to the Hebrew Bible's theological concept of God's name. When discussing the Hebrew word as a word, I will transliterate *šēm*.

⁴ See note 2 above for von Rad's relevant publications.

The problems that these texts address—which are gathered under the scholarly term, “re-location”—comprise a key component of Deuteronomic *Shem* theology.⁵ Scholars use the offerings of first fruits described in Deuteronomy 26:2-15 to argue that Deuteronomy separates YHWH from the Name, locating YHWH in heaven and the Name in the temple. Verse 15 locates YHWH in heaven, separating him from the earth: “Look down from your holy habitation, from heaven, and bless your people Israel and the ground that you have given us.”⁶ This is one of two places in Deuteronomy where some scholars see YHWH “relocated” to heaven in a way that excludes earth (the other is 4:36: “Out of heaven he let you hear his voice, that he might discipline you; and on earth he let you see his great fire, and you heard his words out of the midst of the fire”).⁷ Weinfeld understands Deut 26:15 as an explicit corrective of priestly ideas about divine immanence. The phrase “from heaven” clarifies “holy habitation” so that no reader might make the mistake of understanding the temple as the intended referent.⁸ Mettinger holds a similar interpretation of the verse, but identifies it as a Deuteronomic addition to an “original Deuteronomy.” He claims that the verse has no implications for the presence of Name Theology in the book, but instead reflects an emphasis on transcendence in the revision.⁹

Not all scholars accept the theory that divine transcendence governs Deuteronomic theology. S. Dean McBride allows that the Name language is designed to

⁵ Mettinger, *Dethronement*, 78.

⁶ Unless otherwise noted, biblical quotations are taken from the NRSV.

⁷ Other references include heaven in declarations of the universality of YHWH’s dominion.

⁸ Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 198.

⁹ Mettinger, *Dethronement*, 53.

describe a certain kind of divine presence at the temple, but argues that the divine presence of the Name does not limit God's presence to that place, nor does it create the hard distinction between God and his Name that von Rad, and later Weinfeld and Mettinger, proposed.¹⁰ Taking up McBride's attempt to correct von Rad's emphasis on the distinction between YHWH and the Name, Ian Wilson offers a different interpretation of the material in question. He argues that the text does not present two different kinds of hypostatic presence (YHWH in heaven, the Name in the sanctuary), but rather that Deuteronomy describes God as present both in heaven and on earth. Deuteronomy 26:15 is not decisive, he claims, and Deut 4:36 does not actually show YHWH restricted to heaven. Rather, it presents YHWH as present in both. Wilson argues that this demonstrates that YHWH's presence in heaven need not exclude his presence upon earth in Deuteronomy, and therefore the distinction in ch. 26 need not be understood as establishing an ongoing separation between YHWH and his Name.¹¹

The most prominent text outside of Deuteronomy for the discussion about a distinctly Deuteronomistic perspective is Solomon's dedication of the temple in 1 Kgs 8. In v. 27 Solomon specifically excludes the possibility that the temple is built to "contain" YHWH himself. Rather Solomon refers repeatedly to YHWH in heaven. Solomon's paradigmatic statement is given in v.30: "Hear the plea of your servant and of your people Israel when they pray toward this place; O hear in heaven your dwelling place; heed and forgive." The repeated phrase is a request that YHWH "hear in heaven."

¹⁰ S. Dean McBride, "The Deuteronomistic Name Theology," (Ph.D. diss., Harvard, 1969), 209.

¹¹ Wilson, *Out of the Midst*, 68-73.

Several times (vv. 39, 42, 49) the fuller phrase appears, defining heaven as “your dwelling place.”

The normal Ancient Near East tendency (which Name Theology advocates discern in Priestly materials) is to see the temple as the dwelling place of the divinity.¹² This idea is opposed in the speech by the emphasis on heaven as the place from which YHWH hears prayers. Most of those prayers are requests that YHWH would hear the pleas of individual Israelites or of the nation as a whole in times of trouble within the land.¹³ Mettinger is typical of scholars who see this emphasis on divine transcendence, and the expansion of YHWH’s power beyond a particular location, as a response to the destruction of the temple and the exile.¹⁴ By removing YHWH to heaven, he is insulated from the ill-effects of these historical events. To allow YHWH himself to fall victim to the invasions and destruction would diminish him. In heaven, YHWH is not limited to acting within the temple or even the land, but can act anywhere, even as 1 Kgs 8:46 says, in “the land of the enemy, far off or near.” Scholars have identified several phrases that emphasize such a distinction between YHWH and the Name, and I will use them to organize my discussion of the Deuteronomic Name Theology.

¹² For ANE context, see the articles gathered under the title “Temples and Sanctuaries” in *ABD*, especially William A. Ward, “Egypt,” *ABD* 6:369-72; John F. Robertson, “Mesopotamia,” *ABD* 6:372-76. Weinfeld summarizes his perspective on the Priestly literature at *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 191-193.

¹³ Examples include individual sin (v. 32), military defeat (v. 34), famines resulting from drought (v. 36) or from other causes (v. 39). Solomon’s perspective broadens at the end of the passage, first by expanding to “foreigners” in the land in v.v. 43, Israel’s army on the battlefield in v. 45, and finally, the nation in exile and no longer within the borders of the land in v. 49.

¹⁴ Mettinger, 59-62.

2. The Place where YHWH has established his Name

The first of the distinctive expressions is לִשְׁכֵּן שְׁמוֹ שָׁם (*lěšakkēn šēmô šām*) translated as either [the place where YHWH has chosen] “to cause his Name to dwell there” or “to establish his Name.” The former translation emphasizes the separate individual existence of the Name (it dwells in a place) and is usually favored by scholars who see evidence for a strong Name Theology appearing in the book of Deuteronomy; von Rad says it “verges closely upon a hypostasis.”¹⁵ Scholars like von Rad, Clements, and Mettinger¹⁶ read Deut 26:15 as a “relocation” of YHWH to heaven because it follows on the heels of the distinctive Deuteronomic phrase in v. 2 “the place which the LORD your God shall choose, to make his name to dwell there (*lěšakkēn šēmô šām*).” The fact that in a number of places in Deut (12:5, 12:11, 14:23, 16:2, 16:6, 16:11, 26:2) the verb *škn* is connected with the Name suggests to these scholars that the author conceived of YHWH’s Name as distinct from YHWH. YHWH remains in heaven, and the place on earth that YHWH chooses is a dwelling for the Name only. Weinfeld describes this phrase as one of a set of phrases that were used systematically and consistently.¹⁷

This understanding of the nature of *škn* and its cognates leads some to see Deuteronomy affirming a hypostatic Name who is present on earth in the temple.

Weinfeld stresses the connection between *škn* in Shem theology and re-locating YHWH

¹⁵ Von Rad, *Studies in Deuteronomy*, 38; Weinfeld, *Deuteronomic School*, 197; Mettinger only in redactions of Deut.

¹⁶ Von Rad, *Deuteronomy*, 90; Ronald E. Clements, *God and Temple* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1965), 90-95; Mettinger, *Dethronement*, 53.

¹⁷ Weinfeld, *Deuteronomic School*, 193-194.

in heaven: “There is not one example in the deuteronomic literature of *God’s dwelling* in the temple or the building of a house for *God*. The temple is always the *dwelling of his Name*, and the house is always built *for his Name*.” Speaking about the cognate noun *miškān*, F. V. Reiterer writes: “Only one who can make use of a dwelling needs the dwelling.”¹⁸

Other scholars, however, have argued for another way of reading the Deuteronomic language that does not lend itself as well to understanding the Name as a separate, hypostatic entity. McBride prefers to translate *lēšakkēn* as “establish,” rather than as “cause to dwell.”¹⁹ In her 2001 dissertation, Sandra Richter opts for McBride’s translation, “establish,” and argues that *lēšakkēn šēmô šām* is best understood as an Akkadian loan phrase into Hebrew whose actual function is as an expression of ownership, possession, and control.²⁰

Deuteronomy 16:11 presents a problem for those interpreting it as completely consistent with a relocation of YHWH to heaven. Rather than the contrast that is set up in Deut 26 between the Name which dwells in the chosen place (26:2) and YHWH who confines himself to heaven (26:15), Deut 16:11 reads, “and you shall rejoice before the LORD your God... at the place where the LORD your God will choose, to cause his Name to *škn* there.” Since the worshipers in the chosen place are “before the LORD,” it

¹⁸ F. V. Reiterer, “*šēm*,” *TDOT* 15:167-168.

¹⁹ S. Dean McBride, “The Deuteronomic Name Theology,” 77- 117, esp. 88-89, translates “established” and offers numerous examples of the establishment of names as a concern having to do with the perpetuation of the name bearers fame. While rejecting the translation “cause his name to dwell,” McBride nonetheless understands the Name established at the chosen site to describe some sort of special divine presence. 207-210.

²⁰ Sandra Richter, *The Deuteronomic History*.

appears that YHWH is personally in the chosen place. The remaining references in Deuteronomy, at 12:11-12 and 14:23, to a place where the Name is said to *škn* describe the location for activities that are also said to be carried out “before YHWH” (*lipnê yhwh*). Wilson argues that these examples indicate a belief in the localized presence of YHWH at the temple, and that the Shem theology of Deuteronomy is intended to complement rather than to correct that belief.²¹ According to his survey of source critical studies of Deut 12:11-12, 14:23, and 16:11, scholars have not attempted to divide the expression *lipnê yhwh* from *lēšakkēn šēm*. They have instead left them to be reconciled as the product of a single source. Wilson takes this as confirmation of the thesis that Deuteronomy did not recognize a conflict between the Name “dwelling” in the temple and YHWH being present on earth, and thus did not introduce a new concept of divine presence through the Name.²²

All are agreed that the *šēm* formula is closely tied to the “election” formula centralizing Israel’s worship at the temple. Deuteronomy 16 contains some of the strongest “centralizing” material of the *šēm* passages. It explicitly forbids offering the Passover sacrifice in people’s home villages. Instead, they are required by v. 16 to travel to a single central location for this purpose, to “the place which the LORD your God will choose, to cause his Name to *škn* there.” Centralization is seen as one of the primary objectives of the author of Deuteronomy, and an ongoing concern of the Deuteronomic theology. The Name is initially used to further that concern by defining in what way the central cult site is unique and why it should be privileged above decentralized, local,

²¹ Wilson, *Out of the Midst of the Fire*, 158-159, 197,

²² Wilson, *Out of the Midst of the Fire*, 196-197.

options. The central location (unspecified in Deuteronomy) is unique because it is chosen by YHWH, and because it is the place where the Name will *škn*. This idea appears three times in Deut 16 (vv. 2, 6, and 11). The first two are in the description of Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread, the third one in a verse insisting on the centralization to the chosen place of the Feast of Booths.

The *lēšakkēn šēm* formula appears in three additional texts outside Deuteronomy, Jer 7:12, Ezra 6:12, and Neh 1:9. Because these texts use *škn*, rather than one of the later equivalents, scholars have suggested that they depend on Deuteronomy at these points. Jeremiah 7 is a warning to the nation that because of their disobedience, God will abandon Jerusalem, in spite of the presence of the temple there, just as he had abandoned Shiloh: “Go now to my place that was in Shiloh, where I caused my Name to *škn* at first, and see what I did to it for the wickedness of my people Israel.”²³ The oracles have to do with Israel’s possession of and sovereignty over Jerusalem, which is dependent upon YHWH’s continued association with the temple.

The references in Ezra and Nehemiah represent some of the very latest uses of *lēšakkēn šēm*. In Ezra 6:12 the phrase is found in the midst of a letter written by the Persian king Darius to the governor of the province beyond the river. There is

²³ Jer 7:12. In the references to the temple in Jer 7, YHWH calls it a house which is “called by my name” (Jer 7:10, 11, 14). Mettinger says that the phrase in 7:12 is related to Deuteronomy’s *lēšakkēn šēm* formula (Mettinger, *Dethronement*, 63), and since he does not find evidence of Name Theology from Jeremiah he concludes that these verses “derive from a late, deuteronomistic editing of the book” (Mettinger, *Dethronement*, 65). Jack R. Lundblom, however, argues for the unity of the oracles, and shows that v.12 is integral to the message about the security of Jerusalem (Lundblom, *Jeremiah 1-20* [AB 21A; New York: Doubleday, 1999], 454-470). Richter follows Lundblom’s exegesis in formulating her conclusions about the interpretation of the Name in the passage (*The Deuteronomistic History*, 91-93).

disagreement about how an antiquated Hebrew expression was included in a Persian document,²⁴ but in any case, the letter gives evidence that *lěšakkēn šēm* was still understood to relate to the temple – in this case temple reconstruction. In Nehemiah's opening prayer for Jerusalem he appears to paraphrase the promise of Deut 30:1-5. At v. 1:9 Nehemiah replaces Deuteronomy's "land which your fathers possessed" with "the place which I have chosen, to establish my Name," interpreting the reference to "the land" as a reference to the city of Jerusalem. Although Nehemiah applies the phrase to Jerusalem rather than to the temple, he still uses it to describe a trend toward centralization.²⁵

3. *The Place where YHWH has "placed" his Name*

²⁴ Finding such a characteristically deuteronomistic phrase in a recording of an official Persian letter leads many commentators to assume either deuteronomistic editing of the letter as placed in the book of Ezra (e.g. Loring Batten, who favors the text given in *1 Esdras*, which lacks the expression, as more original [*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah* (London: T&T Clark, 1913), 147]), the influence of Jewish scribes (with deuteronomistic sympathies) in the composition of the letter (H. G. M. Williamson, *Ezra-Nehemiah* [WBC 16; Waco: Word, 1985], 83; F. Charles Fensham, *The Books of Ezra and Nehemiah* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982], 91), or to conclude that the letter is an invention. Joseph Blenkinsopp allows that the "deuteronomistic allusion to the residence of the Divine Name" could have been due to the influence of Jews in the court, but taken together with the overall tone of the letter, concludes that it is a "free composition" (*Ezra-Nehemiah: A Commentary* [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1988], 126-7).

²⁵ Batten, *Ezra and Nehemiah*, 187. Richter argues that Nehemiah is also concerned with possession of the land-place and that this is the content of the name formula in Nehemiah as well as the rest of the Deuteronomistic history (*The Deuteronomistic History*, 95). McBride believes that in this passage the land has become the chosen place, displacing the temple as the primary referent. He sees the same idea possibly at work in Ezra (*Deuteronomistic*, 183-4).

The phrase *lāsûm šēmô šām* “to put his name there” is closely related to *lēšakkēn šēmô šām*. The two phrases are sufficiently similar in structure and in usage for many scholars to consider them almost synonymous.²⁶ Deuteronomy 12:5 serves as a transition to the discussion of *lāsûm šēm* because this verse juxtaposes the *lāsûm* formula with a use of *škn*. Israel is urged in Deut 12:3 to destroy the Canaanite places of worship, to tear down their altars, destroy the Asherim and graven images, and notably to “destroy their name out of that place.” They are then to seek out YHWH’s chosen place: “But to the place in which YHWH your God will choose out of all your tribes [to place his name] to place it, you will seek and there you will come.”²⁷ The precise language of this verse is debated. The MT pointing yields a noun: “as *his habitation* to put his name there.” The repointing favored by many scholars yields a version of the *lēšakkēn šēm* formula (substituting a pronominal suffix for the noun *šēm*).²⁸ Repointed in this way, *lēšakkēnô*

²⁶ Weinfeld acknowledges the antiquity of *lēšakkēn šēm*, but treats the two phrases as synonymous for the author of Deuteronomy, who “endowed it with a specific theological meaning,” namely, an “abstract notion of God” (*Deuteronomistic School*, 193-94). McBride agrees that the terms are to be taken synonymously (“Deuteronomistic,” 195). Mettinger understands the *lāsûm* formula to have replaced the *lēšakkēn* formula in reaction to the destruction of the temple, but still considers them both to be ways of expressing the presence of God in Deuteronomistic terms (Mettinger, *Dethronement*, 54-62). Richter, who does not believe they express divine presence, calls them “synonymous reflexes” (along with *lihyôt šēmô šām*) and points to Samaritan Pentateuch and LXX versions that suggest interchangeability (*Deuteronomistic History*, 43-47). She suggests that the *lāsûm* formula was in fact used as an explanatory gloss on the less understandable *lēšakkēn* formula, and that it eventually replaced the older formula as its meaning was lost (*Deuteronomistic History*, 95).

²⁷ Richter’s translation (*Deuteronomistic History*, 63). She uses the brackets to indicate the doublet.

²⁸ Driver, *Deuteronomy* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1902), 140-141 prefers the MT reading. Those who follow repointing the text to reflect the *lēšakkēn* idiom include McBride, “The Deuteronomistic Name Theology”, 178; and Richter, *Deuteronomistic History*, 45-49; Not including it in the indexes: Weinfeld, Mettinger, von Rad, *Studies*,

can be interpreted as a doublet to *lāśûm*, strengthening the argument that the two are to be understood synonymously.²⁹ In the context of this chapter, it seems clear that the references to a chosen place in v. 5 (as well as vv. 11, 14, 18, 21, and 26) must be to a central sanctuary, not to the city or the land. The remaining occurrences in Deuteronomy³⁰ confirm that *lāśûm šēm* is used in the same way as *lēšakkēn šēm*.

Outside of Deuteronomy *lēšakkēn šēm* is far more common than the *lāśûm* version. *Lāśûm šēm*, however, does occur in five places in the Deuteronomic History, all of them in the books of 1 and 2 Kgs. In 1 Kgs 9:3, the text picks up the idiom and connects it to the temple that Solomon has built, associating the temple with Deuteronomy's chosen place. "I have consecrated this house which you have built, and put my Name there forever." In contrast to Deut, however, in 1-2 Kings the Name is not "put" only at or in the temple. The Name is also "put" in the city, Jerusalem. In fact 1 Kgs 9:3 is the only text in the Deuteronomic History that allows for an exclusive temple reference. 2 Kings 21:4 and 7 apply the Name to the "house" as well as to the city of Jerusalem. YHWH is quoted as having specified Jerusalem. "In this house, and in

von Rad, *Deuteronomy*, includes it with vv 11 and 14 as examples of "to make his name dwell there."

²⁹ Emmanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), 42. This interpretation contributes to Richter's understanding of the *lēšakkēn* phrases as meaning "establish" rather than "dwell."

³⁰ The phrase "to put his name" occurs twice more in Deut. In 12:21 the text makes a distinction between offerings that must be brought to the chosen place, and those that are simply being killed for food, which can be slaughtered at home. In 14:24 provision is made for those who live too far from the place where the LORD "will choose to put his name" to travel to the place with money rather than the tithe of their produce and buy back appropriate goods upon arrival. This instance follows immediately after "the place which he will choose, to make his name dwell there" in 14:23. Although not placed as closely as the couplet in 12:5, these two references also must be taken as referring to the same idea

Jerusalem, which I have chosen out of all the tribes of Israel, I will put my Name forever.” 1 Kings 11:36 and 14:21 make no mention of the temple at all, and are concerned, instead, with the Davidic king. Rehoboam is said to have ruled in Jerusalem, “the city which the LORD had chosen ... to put his Name there,” and Jeroboam is told that although he will rule over ten tribes, he will not rule over Judah so that David will always have a descendent to rule in Jerusalem, “the city where I have chosen to put my Name.” These verses contain a broader concern than Deuteronomy’s concern with the central sanctuary as the object of the Name, and represent an evolution from applying Name terminology to the temple to applying it to Jerusalem.³¹ The same development is also apparent in Nehemiah’s broadened application of the original *lēšakkēn šēm* formula, which I described earlier. Both Name formulae are used to reinforce centralization, not to define an active presence of God.

4. *Where YHWH’s Name will “be” – simple locative statements*

The third phrase to be considered is a simple locative statement that the Name is or will be at the chosen place.³² This phrase is used only three times in the Deuteronomic History, twice in Solomon’s dedicatory prayer, and once in discussing the sin of Manasseh. Unlike *šûm*, which the Deuteronomic History uses to refer to both Jerusalem

³¹ 1 Kgs 11:36 can in fact be read as an anti-temple polemic. David’s offer to build a house for YHWH was rejected on the grounds that YHWH would build a house for him. Later, a house for YHWH would be built by a Davidic monarch, Solomon. Now that the Davidic dynasty was to be punished, Jeroboam is made a similar offer – YHWH will build a house for him.

³² Richter, *Deuteronomic History*, 48, calls this phrase a periphrastic reflex of the phrases using *lēšakkēn* or *lāšûm*. McBride also treated them as virtual synonyms, saying that they “correspond exactly” (“Deuteronomic Name Theology,” 195).

and the temple, the simple locative statements are consistently applied only to the temple. Jerusalem is mentioned as the place that YHWH chose, but the Name is directly associated with the house.

2 Kings 23:27 records the last use of the expression in the Deuteronomistic History as it describes the sin of Manasseh. It refers to the temple rather than Jerusalem. “I will cast off this city which I have chosen, Jerusalem, and the house of which I said, My Name shall be there.” Richter points out that this passage makes the clearest distinction between the chosen city and the house where the Name shall be.³³ If McBride is correct in his analysis that the “sem theologumenon ... assured the reality of God’s dynamic presence at the chosen shrine without localizing him there,”³⁴ then the passage in 2 Kgs could be understood as an attempt to separate this idea from the abandoned city of Jerusalem in order to preserve the possibility of God’s presence in some other mode.³⁵

The other place this phrase is used in the DH is in Solomon’s prayer in 1 Kgs 8, which uses numerous Name Theology expressions, but uses just the verb “to be” for locating the Name in the temple both in v. 16 and in v. 29. In v. 16 (following the MT):

³³ Richter, *Deuteronomistic History*, 67. Richter also sees 1 Kgs 8 distinguishing between city and house. Because of a need to explain the fact of the exile, it also reverses the permanence of the chosen status as it appears in 1 Kgs 21:7 explaining it here as a consequence of the depth of Manasseh’s sin. She understands this to demonstrate the later provenance of the periphrastic form of the idiom, which is confirmed by the Chronicler’s preference for it.

³⁴ S. Dean McBride, “Deuteronomistic Name Theology,” 209.

³⁵ However, see D. E. Fleming, “‘House’/‘City’: An Unrecognized Parallel Word Pair,” *JBL* 105 (1986): 689-693 for the view that these two function together rather than in distinction.

Since the day that I brought my people Israel out of Egypt, I chose no city in all the tribes of Israel in which to build a house, that my Name might be there; but I chose David to be over my people Israel.³⁶

The same verb is used in v.29, where Solomon cites YHWH saying of the house “My Name shall be there.” Verse 16a introduces the passage by connecting the choice of Jerusalem to the building of the temple, which is built for the Name. The construction of the temple is just completed, and so the remainder of the address repeats Solomon’s warrant: the house is “built for [the] Name.” The association of the Name with the house is clear. The distinction between the house and the city – which was very clear in 2 Kgs 23:27 – is possible in the MT of 1 Kings, but not clearly intended. The other versions of 1 Kings preserve a longer text that seems to rule out the idea that Solomon’s address intended to separate the choice of Jerusalem from the identification of the Name with the temple. 2 Chr 6:5-6 uses 1 Kings as its source, and the parallel there reads:

Since the day that I brought my people out of the land of Egypt, I chose no city in all the tribes of Israel in which to build a house, that my Name might be there, *and I chose no man as prince over my people Israel; but I have chosen Jerusalem that my Name may be there and I have chosen David to be over my people Israel.*

This longer version appears to have been the text extant in 4QKgs at Qumran.³⁷ The LXX does not contain the full parallel but does contain the statement “but I chose that my

³⁶ LXX reads: Ἀφ’ ἧς ἡμέρας ἐξήγαγον τὸν λαὸν μου τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ἐξ Αἰγύπτου, οὐκ ἐξελεξάμην ἐν πόλει ἐν ἐνὶ σκῆπτρῳ Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ οἰκοδομῆσαι οἶκον τοῦ εἶναι τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐκεῖ· καὶ ἐξελεξάμην ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ εἶναι τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐκεῖ καὶ ἐξελεξάμην τὸν Δαυὶδ τοῦ εἶναι ἐπὶ τὸν λαὸν μου τὸν Ἰσραὴλ. This is similar to the reading of both LXX and MT in 2 Chr 6:5-6, and stresses Jerusalem rather than the house as the place where the name is.

³⁷ 4Q54 ii.XXX; DJD 14.180.

Name should be there in Jerusalem.”³⁸ All of these variants indicate an original text that explicitly connected the Name with Jerusalem as well as with the house. The reference to the presence of the Name in 8:29, although unambiguously applied to the house, certainly refers to the same promise as does 8:16, and should therefore not be read to exclude the city. Solomon’s address in 1 Kings treats the house as the primary subject of the promise of the presence of the Name, and the Name is promised to Jerusalem by extension. By the time 2 Kgs 23:27 is composed, its author wants to make a distinction between Jerusalem (which is destroyed) and the divine benefit and favor associated with the Name.³⁹

5. *A house built for the Name (bayît-šēm combinations)*

The other prominent use of “Name” in 1 Kgs 8 is Solomon’s description of his enterprise in building the temple as building a house (*bayît*) for the Name. This expression depends upon 2 Sam 7:13: “He shall build a house for my Name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever.”⁴⁰ In 1 Kgs 8, Solomon claims this promise to David as his own warrant for building the temple. He recounts the narrative of 2 Sam 7 in 8:16-21, using *bayît* and *šēm* together four times, at vv. 17, 18, and twice in 19. The reader already expects Solomon to make this association between his own building project and the promise to David because Solomon had earlier declared his intention to

³⁸ My translation.

³⁹ Targum uses *škn* in 8:16. Alexander Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic: The Former Prophets According to Targum Jonathan* [Vol. 2] (Leiden: Brill, 1959), 232.

⁴⁰ Many commentators consider this v.to be a Deuteronomic addition to an older tradition. McBride argues that the verse is important to the overall structure, which anticipates the building of a temple, and that only “for my name” is deuteronomic, correcting the original statement that the temple would be built “for me,” that is, for YHWH himself (“Deuteronomic Name Theology,” 187-88).

fulfill the promise in this way.⁴¹ The narrator set up the expectation that a temple was needed in 1 Kgs 3:2 by saying that the people offered sacrifices on the high places because there was no house for the Name of YHWH. The series of *bayît/šēm* references in 1 Kgs 8:17-20 brings this expectation to fulfillment. Later in the address, Solomon again picks up the expression “house ... built for your Name” as he describes the prospect of defeat or exile, and the possibility of restoration. Vv. 44 and 48 use similar language to describe the posture of the people: they will direct their prayers “toward” YHWH, toward the chosen city, toward “the house which I have built for your Name.” Verse 48, which envisions the people taken captive to the land of their enemies, inserts the land into the sequence before the city.

The question arises as to whether 1 Kgs 8 refers to a hypostatic Name that occupies the temple, or means that the temple is built as a memorial or to honor YHWH. Most scholars take the first position. Weinfeld includes this phrase in the “whole set of phrases built up by the deuteronomistic school in order to give expression to the new theology.”⁴² Mettinger also identifies “built for the Name of YHWH” as a significant contribution to the idea that, in contrast to YHWH himself, the Name dwells in the temple.⁴³ On the other hand, Richter argues that 2 Sam 7 is a discussion about David’s and YHWH’s reputations, and that the similar uses of *šēm* in 1 Kings are best interpreted as about YHWH’s reputation or renown as well. In so doing, Richter excludes the possibility that Solomon’s allusions to Nathan’s prophecy have to do with divine

⁴¹ 1 Kgs 5:17-19 [ET 5:3-5, LXX follows MT order at this verse]

⁴² Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*, 193

⁴³ Mettinger, *Dethronement*, 49-50.

presence at the temple.⁴⁴ In either case, the passage draws another connection between the Name and the temple, whether the temple (or Name engraved upon it) establishes the Name/Reputation, or serves as the residence for the Name.

6. *The Name “called over”*

Combining the Name with the verb “to call” yields a collection of related expressions that appear throughout Hebrew literature. These expressions can be grouped roughly into two uses, one that serves to describe a relationship or its establishment, and the other describes the act of worship or of a request for aid. That “to call a name upon” can indicate ownership is well attested for both Greek and Hebrew.⁴⁵ Weinfeld calls it both common and ancient in Hebrew literature and describes the Deuteronomic distinction to be the application to the city or temple as opposed to land.⁴⁶ Mettinger finds its application to the temple to be a late (exilic and post-exilic) phenomenon, and so says that it is best “understood in light of the Name Theology.”⁴⁷ The expression itself refers only to claims of ownership and control, however, and the Deuteronomic use of the phrase need not be different from that of others,⁴⁸ as both de Vaux and Richter argue.⁴⁹

⁴⁴ Richter, *Deuteronomic History*, 66-78.

⁴⁵ BAGD ἐπικαλέω 1bβ; HALOT “קָרָא,” *niphal* 5 (1130).

⁴⁶ Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 325.

⁴⁷ Mettinger, *Dethronement*, 64.

⁴⁸ HALOT lists this usage applied to Jerusalem: Jer 25:29, Dan 9:18,19; Israel: Deut 28:10, Jer 14:9, Is 63:19, 2 Chr 7:14, Sir 47:18; the temple in our passage as well as Jer 7:10,11,14,30, 32:34, 34:15, 2 Chr 6:33; the ark: 2 Sam 6:2 1Chr 13:6; the peoples Amos 9:12; the prophets Jer 15:16.

⁴⁹ Roland de Vaux, “Le lieu que Yahvé a choisi pour y établir son nom” in *Das ferne und nahe Wort: Festschrift für Leonhard Rost* (BZAW 105; ed. Fritz Maass; Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1967), 219-228, here 223; Richter, *The Deuteronomic History*, 81-85.

Grammatically, these examples frequently employ the passive voice for ἐπικαλέω and further clarify that the Name is called “upon” something by means of the preposition ἐπί in the LXX or על (ʿl) in Hebrew. In the second case, where people call on the Name of YHWH, they are requesting aid in some matter of concern. In this case, the concern might have to do with help in battle, more mundane matters of life, or be simply an act of worship. The LXX typically uses the middle voice in these cases, and the Hebrew generally uses בָּשֵׁם (*bišmî*). Both uses of these expressions are found in the Deuteronomic materials.

In the Deuteronomic material, the paradigmatic example is the encouragement in Deut 28:10 that, if Israel is obedient, it will be set above all the nations who will fear it because they will see that “the Name of YHWH is called upon you (Israel).” Israel’s status as the possession of God will be apparent to the nations around them because of the blessings it enjoys. A similar usage is found in 1 Kgs 8:43 to define YHWH’s relationship to the temple: “that your Name has been called over this house which I have built.”⁵⁰ As in Deuteronomy, the intention is that Israel’s neighbors will recognize YHWH’s blessings upon Israel and thus know that Israel, and in this case the temple, were associated with and possessed by YHWH. Some of these are usually translated “called by my/his Name,” whereas others are more often translated “my/his Name is invoked upon.” Both ideas are present in the same Greek and Hebrew expressions because invoking the name upon something or someone is what establishes the relationship of possessor and possessed between them. This relationship is then displayed

⁵⁰ My translation.

by the possessed being called by the name of the possessor. Jeremiah, also frequently associated with Deuteronomic language, makes extensive use of the statement that the temple, the land, or the people have the Name called upon them.

The Deuteronomic material also contains many examples of call language referring to either worship or a request to God for aid by means of “calling on the Name of YHWH.” This use does not have an exclusively, or even predominantly cultic application. In 2 Kgs 5:11 Namaan expects Elisha to “call on the Name of YHWH his God” for healing.⁵¹ Other texts seem to have military issues in mind when people call on the Name of YHWH. Elijah’s contest in 1 Kgs 18 with the prophets of Baal, however, gives us perhaps the clearest example of what Elijah actually asked for in calling on the Name of YHWH. Having already challenged the prophets of Baal in v. 24 that they and he should first “call on the name” of their respective gods,⁵² Elijah takes his turn in vv. 36-37:

And at the time of the offering of the oblation, Elijah the prophet came near and said, ‘O LORD, God of Abraham, Isaac, and Israel, let it be known this day that thou art God in Israel, and that I am thy servant, and that I have done all these things at thy word. Answer me, O LORD, answer me, that this people may know that thou, O LORD, art God, and that thou hast turned their hearts back.

Elijah calls on YHWH for an answer that will vindicate him and his message, for an answer that will demonstrate the supremacy of YHWH, and one that will restore the faith of the onlooking Israelites.

⁵¹ LXX has only “call upon the Name of his god.”

⁵² LXX translators distinguish in 18:24 between the prophets of Baal who are challenged to “cry out,” βοᾶτε, on the name of their god, whereas Elijah uses the standard language of ἐπικαλέσομαι. In the rest of the passage, the distinction is dropped and only forms of ἐπικαλέω are used for both sides.

II. Name as “Fame”

Other uses of *šēm* are not as bound up in the debates concerning Deuteronomic Shem Theology. A name can express the fame or reputation of its possessor. As I indicated above, Richter understands the house “built for his Name” in 2 Sam 7 as referring to reputation rather than divine presence. Whether or not the authors of 2 Samuel and 1 Kings understood these references as having to do with YHWH’s fame or reputation, there are other verses which can establish that use of *šēm* for YHWH, including 2 Sam 7:23 and 26 (repeated in 1 Chr 17:21, 24) 1 Kgs 10:1, and Josh 9:9.⁵³ In 2 Samuel,⁵⁴ immediately after the disputed interchange among David, Nathan and YHWH, David offers thanks and praise to YHWH for the promises YHWH has made. Twice in this section David refers to God’s reputation as his Name, in 8:23 “has made as Name for himself” and in v. 26 saying that God’s Name will be magnified if he keeps the promise to establish David’s house forever. The Name references are also included in the Chronicler’s version. Each of these references to the Name is clearly an indication of YHWH’s fame or reputation. Both connect that Name to YHWH’s activity in a political, rather than a cultic context. YHWH’s Name is established or is magnified by his

⁵³ Robert Boling simply translates Joshua 9:9 as “fame” without further comment (Robert G. Boling and G. Ernest Wright, *Joshua* [AB 6; New York: Doubleday, 1995], 253-258).

⁵⁴ McCarter connects these uses to the references to YHWH’s “great name” in 1 Sam 12:22, 1 Kgs 8:42, Jer 10:6 and Jer 44:26. All of these except Jer 44:26 are also related to YHWH’s preservation of his people and to the fame that spreads abroad because of it. He emphasizes that the phrase is related to the welfare of the kings and the people (P. Kyle McCarter, Jr, *II Samuel* [AB 9; Garden City: Doubleday, 1984], 237-8).

preservation of his people. In 2 Samuel and 1 Chronicles by making his people victorious in battle; in Josh 9:9 by bringing Egypt to its knees in order to deliver his people.⁵⁵

The analysis of the Deuteronomic texts and of the scholarly debate surrounding them leads to two conclusions that are significant for this study. The first is that there is no consensus about the understanding of *šēm* that is expressed in the Deuteronomic corpus. At the very least the debate demonstrates the difficulty of reading these texts as defining a dominant and consistent theology of the Name, a difficulty that would have faced early Christians as much as modern exegetes. My inclination is to understand the strongest advocates for a Deuteronomic *Shem* theology to have over read the evidence. If however, I allow for the interpretations of scholars such as von Rad, Weinfeld and Mettinger, my second conclusion concerns the nature of the hypostatic Name for which they argue. This hypostatic Name appears to be, according to the Deuteronomic corpus, a static and a passive hypostasis, present only at the temple, and credited with no action beyond “presence.”

⁵⁵ The example in 1 Kgs 10 is ambiguous. The “Name” that the Queen of Sheba had heard of could certainly be understood as a reference to fame since she had heard about it from so far away. If it is to be read in line with the other examples we see that YHWH’s name as a reputation is related to his care for (in this case exaltation of) his chosen people. Mordechai Cogan understands the “name” to have been based on YHWH’s grant of wisdom and fortune to Solomon (*1 Kings* [AB 10; New York: Doubleday, 2001], 311).

Part Two – Name Theologies outside Deuteronomistic Material

I. The Name as the Presence of YHWH

Outside the Deuteronomistic works, Name is used in Hebrew Scripture to describe the Divine Presence in at least two different ways. The line between these two categories is very fine and in most cases is a matter of the interpreter's opinion. On the one hand, the Name can be viewed as interchangeable with YHWH himself in the text, thus serving as a metonymy to describe YHWH's presence.⁵⁶ It can also be used to describe what Reiterer in his *TDOT* article has termed a "special manifestation of YHWH."⁵⁷ In these cases the Name is read as being more distinct from YHWH himself than in the former. Parallel structure provides the best guide for understanding the Name either as a circumlocution for YHWH or a separate mode of his presence. I will treat the categories together because both are used for the same theological purposes.

⁵⁶ Hans-Joachim Kraus refers to the name as meaning "life, identity, presence." He goes on to describe the Name in the Psalms as a "reflection of the holiness of Yahweh," and calls the name "Yahweh's external self manifestation." It is as this self manifestation that Kraus finds the greatest theological importance attached to the Name, since this is how Israel (and later the church) knows YHWH, through his "double," the name. He understands the name-theology of the psalms to be essentially Deuteronomistic, however, based on Psalm 74:7 (*Theology of the Psalms* [Minneapolis: Augsburg Pub. House, 1986], 20-21). The "dwelling place of your name" in this verse is the noun *miškān* (Greek σκῆνωμα) rather than the Deuteronomic verbal phrase *lēšakkēn šēm* "to cause [your] name to dwell." It certainly refers to the structure of the tabernacle/tent, without necessarily implying anything Deuteronomistic. There are only three occurrences of *miškān* in the Deuteronomic History, three in Jer, and not at all in Deut.

⁵⁷ Reiterer, *šēm* *TDOT* 15:136; As mentioned in the note above, Kraus also makes use of "manifestation" in his description of the theology of Name in the Psalms (*Theology of the Psalms*, 21).

The Psalms make frequent use of the Name as a representative of God's presence. Psalm 20 (LXX Psalm 19) is a prayer for victory in battle. Two verses illustrate the difficulty in separating "special manifestation" of presence from uses that represent a circumlocution for YHWH.

Ps 20:1 The LORD answer you in the day of trouble!
 The Name of the God of Jacob protect you!

Ps 20:7 Some take pride in chariots, and some in horses,
 but our pride is in the Name of the LORD our God.

In the first reference the Name is parallel with YHWH.⁵⁸ As the first stanza continues, no other divine attributes are mentioned or placed parallel to YHWH as "the Name" is in the first verse. The subjects of the remaining verbs are simply third person suffixes that refer back to YHWH (or possibly to the Name) in verse one.⁵⁹ The "Name of the God of Jacob" itself is credited with protecting the faithful soldier.⁶⁰ Here it is most likely interchangeable with YHWH. Verse 7 (LXX 19:8) also credits the Name with victory on the battlefield, but in this verse it is no longer parallel to YHWH himself. Instead it is held up as the subject of Israel's boasting and is contrasted with the tangible war assets in which their opponents might boast, like chariots or horses.⁶¹ It stands in parallel to the

⁵⁸ Peter Craigie confirms the parallelism between YHWH and the Name and believes that it intends to evoke "specifically the protective dimension of the Lord's activity. He points the reader to Genesis 35:3 in light of the phrase "The name of the God of Jacob" (*Psalms 1-50* [WBC 19; Waco: Word, 1983], 186).

⁵⁹ Goldingay, *Psalms* (3 vols.; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006), 1.303-304.

⁶⁰ Sigmund Mowinckel suggests that this psalm was used in preparation for battle (*The Psalms in Israel's Worship*, [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1962], 1.225).

⁶¹ Goldingay, *Psalms*, 1.307-308. Goldingay, however, treats all the instances of the name as referring to YHWH himself (1.597). Craigie suggests an allusion to the regulation recorded in Deuteronomy 17:16 prohibiting Israelite kings from holding large numbers of horses, forcing them to rely instead upon YHWH (*Psalms 1-50*, 187).

only other attribute of YHWH mentioned in Psalm 20, “His right hand” in v.6. This suggests that in contrast to v. 1, the reference in v. 7 ought to be read as a separate actor or at least a manifested presence.⁶²

Similar uses are found in other places in the Psalms.⁶³ The MT and targum of Ps 75:2⁶⁴ attribute God’s judgment upon the wicked to the Name itself: “We give thanks to you, O God; we give thanks; your Name is near.”⁶⁵ People tell of your wondrous deeds.” Here, the psalmist places the Name in a tangible active role, in contrast to the static portrayal in the Deuteronomic History. The Name is locatable—it is approaching—and it comes to judge.⁶⁶ The nearness of God’s Name indicates the immanence of God’s judgment as described in the rest of the Psalm.⁶⁷ The Name appears to stand in for God

⁶² A third reference, in v. 5 (v. 6 in LXX, Hebrew, Vulgate) is textually debated. The MT reads “in the name of our God we set up our banners.” The LXX, Peshitta, and Vulgate all translate this as “we shall be magnified.” The targum is unclear. David Stec translates it as “we will be equipped for war,” understanding it as an interpretation of the banners in the MT, but identifies a variant reading “we shall be established,” that could support the reading of the other ancient witnesses against the MT (*The Targum of Psalms* [Collegeville, Minn: Liturgical Press, 2004], 55).

⁶³ Psalm 54:3 (Heb) 53:3 (LXX, Vulgate) 54:1 (ET) Psalm 54 shows David crying out for help against Saul’s pursuit “Save me, O God, by your Name.”

⁶⁴ ET 75:1; LXX, Vulgate 74:2

⁶⁵ The Peshitta, LXX and Vulgate (followed by some English translations) read “we call on your Name,” suggesting a Hebrew text with *qr*’, rather than *qrb* which appears in the extant Hebrew text. This creates another example of calling on the Name of YHWH in the Psalms, but one that is somewhat out of step with the other uses. Most other cases present Israel calling on YHWH purely in worship or in time of military need. Readers of the Peshitta, LXX and Vulgate would find also calling on YHWH for judgment upon evil, apart from any context implying battle or other problems with neighboring nations.

⁶⁶ Goldingay, however, suggests that the nearness is a time reference. (cf GKC 158a on causal clause) Goldingay compares this verse to the judgment on Assyria in Isaiah 30:27 when the Name “came from afar” (*Psalms*, 2.441).

⁶⁷ Marvin Tate translates, “we give thanks and your Name is near,” and “assumes that the Name/Presence comes near when thankful praise is given to God” (*Psalms 51-100* [WBC 20; Waco, TX: Word, 1990], 255-56).

and to be the means by which judgment is dispensed. God's power, to which the psalmist looks forward on the basis of the approaching Name, includes judgment at a time of God's own choosing in vv.3 and 7-9, the power to sustain the earth in v. 4, and authority over rulers in vv. 5-6 and 11.⁶⁸

There are two additional comments to make about how the Psalms speak of the Name as a manifestation of YHWH. The first is that the Name is frequently seen as a means by which YHWH preserves Israel in conflicts with its neighbors, whether political or in actual battle. Eschatological aspects of salvation are secondary to the immediate political or military concerns.⁶⁹ The second is that even though God's manifestation as the Name is often associated with battle and with action on the battlefield, it can be associated with the temple and the cult at the same time. Psalm 20, discussed above for its association with battle, provides several examples of this. The sanctuary, Zion, and the sacrificial system are all mentioned in vv. 3-4 [ET 2-3].⁷⁰

May he send you help from the sanctuary,
and give you support from Zion.
May he remember all your offerings,
and regard with favor your burnt sacrifices. Selah

⁶⁸Tate gives an account of earlier attempts to assign the Psalm to a specific historical context, but concludes that there is nothing in the Psalm to support any of them against the others. He suggests that it is most likely "provided the people at worship with a chance to praise Yahweh and to hear his promise to judge the wicked and exalt the righteous in the context of the community" (*Psalms 51-100*, 258).

⁶⁹Kraus emphasizes the saving role of the name in the psalms, calling it "a spring of salvation, deliverance, help and protection." He understands this saving nature to be the understanding of the Psalmists references to God acting "for his name's sake." Kraus explains this as expressing the assurance that God would indeed be present and save (*Theology of the Psalms*, 20-21).

⁷⁰LXX and Vulgate 19:3-4.

These cultic considerations contribute to the psalmist's expectation of divine aid, which is delivered in v. 7 through the active presence of God's Name.⁷¹

The poetry in Isaiah also uses the Name as a reference to YHWH himself. Like the Psalms, the Isaianic references are about God's deliverance of his people. In Isa 30:27 God's delivering Name

...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;⁷²

The nations that have abused Israel and Judah (here Assyria) are now to be dealt with for the sake of God's people. Even if the anthropomorphisms are deemed to be purely metaphorical, the Name has an existence in the same way that it does in Ps 75.⁷³ It may not have lips or tongue or breath, but it is undeniably present and active in Isaiah's verses. Also like the Name in Ps 75, this Name is approaching and is bringing judgment. The judgment in this case, however, is not general judgment upon evil, but is specifically aimed at Assyria and has to do with Israel's deliverance from the political situation in the region. As with Ps 75, the LXX does not preserve exactly the same sense as the Hebrew of the MT, but the variations do not have to be read as discomfort on the part of the LXX translators with such anthropomorphic descriptions of the Name. It casts Isa 30:27 as a time reference instead of describing the Name coming "from far away." Brevard Childs

⁷¹ Psalm 74:7 is another example of the name in a cultic context. See note 56 above for my comments against a possible Deuteronomistic interpretation of this verse.

⁷² Von Rad points to this verse as an example of early uses of Name that "speak loosely" and have an undefined relationship between the Name and the world (*Studies in Deuteronomy*, 38).

⁷³ J. Alec Motyer, *The Prophecy of Isaiah* (Leicester, UK: Inter-Varsity, 1993), 251.

suggests that the interest of the Hebrew verse is political, and directed against Assyria,⁷⁴ however I. L. Seeligmann understands the translation to have been motivated by a desire to stress the certainty that prophecy would eventually come to fulfillment.⁷⁵ This latter perspective, which is stressed in the LXX, is in agreement with the overall perspective of Isaiah.

God's saving presence is described in Isa 63, a prayer for the restoration of the exiled community to its prior state. In 63:16 the Name is Israel's "Redeemer from of Old." In contrast to the deliverance described in the Psalms, this redemption does not take place primarily on the battlefield: the military victories of Israel's history are simply one part of the longer process of Israel's restoration as God's people. Israel's isolation from the sanctuary illustrates its need for restoration in Isa 63:18: "but now our adversaries have trampled down your sanctuary." Isaiah 30:27-28 is also placed in a context about the long term protection and restoration of Jerusalem. The examples in Isaiah—while similar to those in the Psalms since both look to the Name for salvation and redemption—is more interested in the long view. The examples in Isaiah that deal with the Name's battle actions do so explicitly with regard to how they impact the ability of the people to worship in Jerusalem without foreign interference. The Psalmists perspective remains focused on the "situation on the ground" and the success and preservation the lives of the warriors in battle. In both cases, the Name is described with a more active presence than is found in the Deuteronomic material.

⁷⁴ Brevard S. Childs, *Isaiah* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 227.

⁷⁵ Isaac Leo Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah: A Discussion of its Problems* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1948), 110.

The various Priestly writings also make use of the Name as substitute for God himself in order to describe his presence. Those scholars who discern a Deuteronomic Shem Theology contrast that theology with what they find in the Priestly material. The Deuteronomists substitute the Name for YHWH himself in an attempt to insulate YHWH from the realm of the profane. The priestly writers, they suggest, indulged in the kind of anthropomorphism of YHWH that the Deuteronomic Name Theology was meant to correct. Jacob Milgrom, however, calls both the P and H components of Leviticus's Priestly theology anti-anthropomorphic. Milgrom supports that characterization with evidence that both P and H employed the Name as a euphemistic replacement term for YHWH himself in order to isolate him from the possibility of defilement.⁷⁶ The question that must be addressed is whether the Name itself in the Priestly materials is more anthropomorphic than the Deuteronomic Name.

Ezekiel's use of *šēm* suggests that while he can use it as a substitutionary term for YHWH, he does not portray it as an actor in the way Isaiah and the Psalms do. In Ezek 43:8 YHWH says:

When they placed their threshold by my threshold
and their doorposts beside my doorposts,
with only a wall between me and them,
they were defiling my holy Name
by their abominations that they committed;
therefore I have consumed them in my anger.

The offensive acts are committed in proximity to YHWH—who is said to be in the temple. They they are said to defile the Name, not YHWH himself. Nonetheless, even in

⁷⁶ Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus: A new Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 3 [in 3 vols]; New York: Doubleday, 1991-2001), 2.1735-6, also 1.254-60.

this case the Name does not act; YHWH is the one who consumes the sinners. Elsewhere, YHWH is said to act “for the sake of his Name,”⁷⁷ but the Name itself is a passive figure in Ezekiel. In the portions of the Pentateuch identified as Priestly, the presentation is the same. They have the same concern for preventing anything from impinging the holiness of the Name⁷⁸ as is seen in Ezekiel, but in all cases the Name remains passive. The Priestly material does not attribute physical existence to the Name, since the Name is subject to profanation, but not to defilement as is proper to material objects such as people or the structure of the tent itself. Ezekiel’s two references to the defilement of the Name are exceptions to an otherwise consistent distinction within the Priestly traditions.⁷⁹

Psalms and Isaiah describe the presence of YHWH by a Name that takes action and provides salvation to God’s people. Ezekiel and material from the Priestly traditions are more similar to the Deuteronomic material in this regard. The Name they present is one that does not act, but appears to be a circumlocution for YHWH by which they indicate God’s holiness.

II. Call language and the Name

I will consider instances of Name being called upon by people together with those of the Name being called over something. A significant block of texts combining “call” with the Name is found in Genesis. All of them are examples of the patriarchs (or those in

⁷⁷ Ezek 20:9, 14, 22; 36:21-22; 39:7. In 36:23 that acting is defined as “sanctify[ing] my great name.”

⁷⁸ See the section on the “Holy Name” for more discussion.

⁷⁹ Ezek 43:7-8 as seen above. Milgrom suggests that “defilement” enters this passage because it is primarily concerned about the abominations taking place adjacent to the (physical) temple (*Leviticus*, 2.1801).

the time of Enosh in Genesis 4:26) “call[ing] on the Name of YHWH.” In Gen 21:33 Abraham calls upon the Name of YHWH, calling him God Everlasting, after planting a tamarisk tree and sealing a treaty with Abimelech.⁸⁰ Abraham or Isaac is said to have called upon the Name of YHWH in three other instances: Gen 12:8, 13:4, and 26:25. Altars feature prominently in each passage, and two of them are stories about the construction of those altars.⁸¹ The connection to altars indicates that calling on the Name of YHWH is an act of ritual worship in the patriarchal narratives of Genesis.

The Book of Isaiah presents a less linguistically consistent collection of texts.⁸² Isaiah 63:19 describes Israel as becoming no different from the nations: “We have become ... like those upon whom your Name is not called.”⁸³ Israel’s unique identity lies in having the Name invoked upon them, marking them as YHWH’s possession. Isaiah 63:19 differs from most examples of this way of identifying Israel in that the text expresses concern that this identity will be lost. The Hebrew compares Israel to the

⁸⁰ Gordon Wenham identifies this as a narrative describing the founding of the shrine at Beersheba (*Genesis 16-50* [WBC 2; Nashville: Nelson, 1994], 94). Whether this is an epithet of YHWH that is simply chosen as appropriate for the circumstances – enforcing a permanent treaty agreement—as E. A. Speiser argues (*Genesis*, [AB 1; Garden City: Doubleday, 1964], 159)—or an example of Abraham’s willingness to participate in local religious practices is irrelevant to this discussion. In either case, the act appears to be a ritual or cultic act directed towards a deity.

⁸¹ Genesis 13 records Abraham’s return to the altar he built in chapter 12.

⁸² The basic usages of the verb “to call” with the Name are present, but instead of the consistent phrasing that is found in Jeremiah and in the Deuteronomic History, the occurrences in Isaiah are grammatically variable.

⁸³ This example does fall into the grammatical pattern seen in other “identity” examples. The Hebrew says that the name is called upon (על) them, the LXX uses a passive form of ἐπικαλέω and an ἐπί prepositional phrase.

nations, the LXX to an earlier time,⁸⁴ but both understand that Israel's loss of the Name means loss of identity, and that it is due to their cultic failure.

The concern for cultic matters in the closing chapters of Isaiah is reflected in the use of the expression "call on my/his Name." Israel's political or military situation often gives rise to the need to call upon the Name. The book of Isaiah, however, is concerned about Israel's failure to call on the Name. Isaiah 64:6 and 65:1 bemoan the fact that Israel has failed to worship YHWH appropriately. Both expect the consequences of Israel's failure to call upon the Name will be severe. The prophet says that they will be delivered over to their sins in Isa 64:6. YHWH's assessment is more descriptive. After the statement in 65:1⁸⁵ that he waited patiently on "a nation that did not call upon [his] Name," the consequences described in vv. 13-16 involve pain and anguish and finally the unfaithful lose the Name they had previously possessed in 65:15. "You shall leave your Name to my chosen to use as a curse, and the Lord GOD will put you to death; but to his servants he will give a different name."⁸⁶

In contrast to the expectation of immediate consequences that is expressed in Isa 63-65, Isa 12:4 focuses on a longer term: "And you will say in that day: 'Give thanks to YHWH, call on his Name,'⁸⁷ make known his deeds among the nations; proclaim that

⁸⁴ "We have become as at the beginning, when you did not rule us, nor was your name called upon us."

⁸⁵ This verse uses the active rather than the more common middle voice for "call upon" as worship.

⁸⁶ Eugene Ekbald includes these verses as "oracles of salvation" because of the salvation by those Israelites who are faithful servants of YHWH (See Eugene Robert Ekbald, Jr., *Isaiah's Servant Poem According to the Septuagint: An Exegetical and Theological Study* [Leuven: Peeters, 1999], 257-8).

⁸⁷ The LXX uses βόάω rather than ἐπικαλέω as the verb in this instance.

his Name is exalted.” The prophet has in mind the deliverance and exaltation of the community in “that day,” an eschatological reference in this context.

Isaiah 41:25 is difficult to interpret. The different ancient versions of the verse yield somewhat different senses. The LXX reads “κληθήσονται τῷ ὀνόματί μου,” “they shall be called by my Name.” The use of the passive and the lack of an ἐπί phrase strengthen the case that for the LXX, this verse simply associates the one from the East and the one from the North⁸⁸ with YHWH. Seeligman sees this interpretive translation as being in line with the LXX translators’ tendency toward universalizing.⁸⁹ The ones that YHWH stirs up are not Israelites (Cyrus is the presumed subject), but they will be identified with YHWH by being called by his Name.

The Hebrew texts for Isaiah 41:25 are less clear. The Masoretic reads *bišmî* and so seems to favor the interpretation that the verse refers to worship or invocation of YHWH by the figure in question. This is the traditional interpretation reflected in most English translations, which have something like the RSV, “he shall call on my name.” The Syriac and Vulgate seem to retain this understanding in their translations. A second Hebrew reading involves repointing the verbs as *niphal*. This changes the meaning to “he was called by my Name,” along the lines of Isa 63:19 above. The text can be further emended, based on 1QIs^a, to produce a third interpretation: that YHWH calls him by name.⁹⁰ This last option removes the Divine Name from the discussion altogether.

⁸⁸ While it is not impossible to read ὄνομα in this verse as a hypostasis that acts in calling the ones from East and North, that interpretation seems too strained.

⁸⁹ Seeligmann, *The Septuagint of Isaiah*, 117.

⁹⁰ Deirdre A. Dempsey, “The Verb Syntax of Second Isaiah and Deuteronomy Compared,” (Ph.D. diss., Catholic University of America, 1989), 44, 46.

Goldingay and Payne continue to prefer the traditional text, saying that it reflects the expectation that foreigners would eventually recognize YHWH, and particularly that it fits “the attitude to Cyrus [the one from the North] expressed elsewhere in Isaiah 41 by means of other terms.”⁹¹ For the purposes of identifying how the verse would be understood in different parts of the diaspora, it appears that the Syriac, and some Hebrew readers (although not at Qumran) understood this verse to be a reference to worship or at least acknowledgment of YHWH by a Gentile ruler. In contrast, the Greek speaking communities using the LXX would have found a reference to YHWH’s possession of and association with that Gentile ruler.⁹²

“Call” language is associated with the Name both to express people’s worship or acknowledgement of YHWH, and also to describe their association with him. Even the examples in the latter category are frequently concerned with proper worship.

III. Holy Name

The Name is at times associated with variations of the word holy (*qdš* or *ἅγιος*). Holiness has to do with those things that “belong to the sphere of God’s being or activity,”⁹³ as opposed to the mundane of normal human existence. As such, objects or people described in this way are separated from the common or profane and dedicated to cultic use. There is an element of danger often associated with holiness—it is assumed

⁹¹ John Goldingay and David Payne, *Isaiah 40–55: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary* (2 vols.; ICC; London: T&T Clark, 2006), 1.201.

⁹² Ekbalid finds this interpretation to be more positive than the MT view of the rulers (*Isaiah’s Servant Poem*, 55).

⁹³ Philip P. Jenson, *Graded Holiness: A Key to the Priestly Conception of the World* (JSOTSS 106; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992), 48.

that it is not safe to break down the barriers that are established between the holy and the common. Because of the Priestly tradition's concern with holiness, it is not surprising that the most common way of speaking of the Name in these materials is as the "holy Name." Only a few references to the Name in Leviticus and Ezekiel do not have some connection with holiness. It must also be considered distinctive of this tradition because the majority of the references to the "holy Name" occur in Ezekiel and Leviticus, and most of the remainder are from the Psalms.

When Ezekiel and Leviticus speak of the holy Name, it is with a concern to protect the holiness of the Name. Most often the concern is manifested as a desire to protect the holy Name from being "profaned," or made common.⁹⁴ That profanation could happen through sacrifices that were touched by a ritually contaminated priest or by other similar actions by the people, thus bringing the common world into the realm of the cult.⁹⁵ The Name could also be profaned by continued Canaanite rituals, whether performed by Israelites or by other occupants of the land. According to these texts, the risk could extend beyond the temple courts, and beyond those people under the covenant.⁹⁶ In addition to the normal terminology about the Name being profaned, God

⁹⁴ Leviticus 20:3, 22:2, 22:32; Ezekiel 20:39, 36:20,21,22, 39:7 This is in fact the dominant perspective in Leviticus regarding the "name" with or without the qualifier "holy." Since the Holiness Code of Leviticus is greatly concerned to contrast the Holy with the profane, the fact that the Name is protected from being profaned indicates that it is thought of in terms of holiness even when the word Holy is not mentioned.

⁹⁵ Jacob Milgrom observes that "profane the name of YHWH" always refers to sins in a cultic context (*Cult and Conscience: The Asham and the Priestly Doctrine of Repentance* [Leiden: Brill, 1976], 86).

⁹⁶ Milgrom *Leviticus A New Translation*, 46-48 describes these two concerns as reflecting the two different theologies combined in Leviticus. The theology of the H redactor is concerned with the whole land, the whole people, and includes non-ritual violations. The

also expresses concern that his Name not be defiled twice in Ezekiel⁹⁷ or pronounced in the context of a curse.⁹⁸ The Levitical legislation that mentions the Name is designed as a safeguard to prevent those activities that have the potential to profane the Name.

Ezekiel does not discuss specific regulations, as Leviticus does, but it shares the concern that the Holy Name not be profaned. Ezekiel also describes the ways in which the faithlessness of the nation profanes the Name, and conveys YHWH's concern for his Name. In addition to the legal measures enforced by the priesthood, God is said to act "for the sake of" his Name and to be "jealous" for his Name. In an interesting statement in Ezek 39:7, YHWH declares that he will make his Name known in order to prevent it from being profaned. In this statement, Ezekiel connects the holiness of the Name to a phrase that is distinctive of Ezekiel, "and then they will know that I am YHWH." In other cases profanation was caused by the people intentionally violating God's laws; in chapter 36 the profanation is not caused by the conduct of the people, but by the state in which the world found them. Their exile from the land YHWH gave them reflects badly upon YHWH, suggesting that his was a common name rather than a great one.⁹⁹ He will make his Name known in such a way as to undo this diminished evaluation of his Name,

P theology limits its concern to the holiness of the priests and to what takes place "within the camp."

⁹⁷ Jenson summarizes the distinctions between profanation and defilement (*Graded Holiness*, 48-52).

⁹⁸ Milgrom, *Leviticus A New Translation*, 1437. God is particularly "vexed by the illegitimate use of his Name" in that Milgrom finds evidence of two levels of blasphemy – cursing YHWH is punished, but cursing his name results in death. cf Exodus 23:21.

⁹⁹ Moshe Greenberg, *Ezekiel 21-37* (AB 22A; New York: Doubleday, 1997), 728-729. On *qiddeš šēmô* see Moshe Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1-20* (AB 22; New York: Doubleday, 1983), 384.

presumably by restoring Judah to the land. In both Ezekiel and in Leviticus the distinctive concern of the priestly texts is the protection of that Name.

The second place where the term “holy Name” is frequently employed is in the Psalms.¹⁰⁰ The use of “holy Name” in the Psalms has a more positive character than that of Leviticus and Ezekiel, however. The “holy Name” is a Name worthy of praise in the Psalms, which use a wide range of words to express this. The worshiping community trusts in or glories in the Name, they bless the Name, and they give thanks to the Name. The holiness is not so much a characteristic that must be protected, as it is the basis on which YHWH ought to be worshiped and praised. YHWH’s holy Name is praised when Israel calls on him to exercise his supremacy over its neighbors on its behalf in Pss 97, 99, 103, 105, and 106. In Ps 30, it is praised for the preservation of health, and in Ps 33 for his authority over creation. Since the Psalms were used in worship, some examples are explicitly placed in a cultic setting: Pss 30, 99, 105, 106, 111, and 138. This variety illustrates the wide range of contexts within which the “holy Name” could be described outside of Leviticus and Ezekiel.

The conclusion of this chapter is that there are a variety of ways that *šēm* is used in the Hebrew Bible, and that it is used for a variety of theological purposes. The most natural way to read the use of *šēm* in the Deuteronomic theology is that it is used in conjunction with election formulae to centralize worship by declaring special ownership of the place where that Name is or is placed. If one does understand the Deuteronomic *šēm* to refer to a hypostasis that exists separately and in a different place from YHWH,

¹⁰⁰ Also three references in psalms recorded in 1 Chr16:10, 35 and 29:16.

that hypostasis is a passive one that does very little other than be present at the chosen place. The *shem* theologies of the rest of the Hebrew Bible present *šēm* in a very different light. The Name represents a way of describing God's presence on earth to effect change. The Psalms associate it with the deliverance of God's people in battle; Isaiah associates it with their deliverance on an eschatological scale. Across the Hebrew Bible the Name is an appropriate recipient of worship, as the people "call upon the Name," and in the Priestly traditions (especially Leviticus and Ezekiel) that is manifested in a concern to protect the holiness of the Name.

Chapter Two

Name Theologies in Judaism

In the previous chapter I have explored the scriptural background to Name Theology by examining different Scriptures' use of the word Name (*šem* or ὄνομα) in reference to the Name of God. To do this, I examined texts within the Deuteronomic corpus, about which there is a scholarly debate surrounding the presence of an active and intentional *Shem* Theology, and also outside that corpus in texts where *shem* is usually assumed to function differently. In this chapter I intend to investigate Jewish literature that falls outside of what becomes the Old or New Testament canon in order to highlight elements from these texts that can inform us about the theological perspectives that preceded or were contemporary with the second century Christian material on which my study is ultimately focused. In the next chapter, I will address the beginning of Christian appropriation of this theological language in the New Testament.

I have chosen to limit the texts in this chapter to those that have a probable provenance no later than the second century. It has at times been the practice to attempt to use later Jewish texts to provide information about traditions reaching back into early Judaism. Scholarship in this field is currently involved in developing methodologies for utilizing the content of these texts without skewing the picture they produce of first century Judaism.¹ While this dialogue continues, my choice has been to remain conservative and to exclude texts that date from a later time.

¹ Andrei Orlov, *Enoch-Metatron Tradition* (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2005), and Peter Schäfer, *Origins of Jewish Mysticism* (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2009) represent

In this chapter, my approach is to organize these texts according to four theological themes that correspond to streams of thought that become important in second century Christian expressions of Name Theology: Soteriology, Cosmology, Concealment, and generally High Onomanology. The last is a broad category that covers a multitude of smaller themes, but the first three are more discrete. To the degree possible, I will proceed by identifying a major text for each topic that well represents the Name Theology of the text in which it appears, and is sufficiently comprehensive to introduce most aspects of the theme under discussion. In those themes that appear to be primarily associated with a particular kind of Judaism, the chosen text will come from within that tradition. My discussion of the subject will then proceed as a commentary on that selection, introducing related texts at appropriate points.

Part One – Soteriology

The first question on which this chapter will focus will be central in many of the Christian adaptations of Name Theology—the soteriological role of the Name. With a few exceptions, which will be noted, the examples of the Name being given a distinctly soteriological role are found in the Enochic Literature (especially the Similitudes of *I Enoch*) and from the Dead Sea Scrolls.² Of the various passages from these two

differing perspectives on how and whether the later texts ought to be used in the description of early traditions.

² The Similitudes of *I En.* have a complex compositional history, in that they are a collection of traditions that have been brought together into a single text which has gone through subsequent redactions. Two similar versions of the compositional history are given by George W. E. Nickelsburg and Michael Knibb (Nickelsburg, “Discerning the Structure(s) of the Enochic Book of Parables,” in Gabriele Boccaccini, ed. *Enoch and the*

collections, *I En.* 48 provides a dense concentration of soteriological themes and therefore offers a convenient starting point. It will become apparent from the number of points of contact with other passages in *I Enoch* that ch. 48 is representative of the Similitudes as a whole on the issue of the saving work of the Name. Only one significant theme – the danger inherent in denying the Name – is not directly mentioned in the chapter. Material from Qumran, like that from the rest of the Similitudes and *I Enoch*, will be introduced as different themes are encountered in the logic of ch. 48.

I. Naming the Son of Man

Chapter 48 is part of the second Parable (45-57), and it is concerned with the Son of Man, who is a messianic figure in the Similitudes.³ Specifically, ch. 48 is concerned

Messiah Son of Man [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007], 23-47; Knibb, “The Structure and Composition of the Parables of Enoch,” in Boccaccini, *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*, 48-64). Nickelsburg dates the redaction to the late first century B.C.E. or possibly the early first century C.E. (“Discerning the Structure(s),” 47).

³ Matthew Black refers to him as “a heavenly Messiah appearing as God’s vice-regent at the Last Judgement” (*The Book of Enoch or I Enoch, A New English Translation with Commentary and Textual Notes* (SVTP 7; Leiden: Brill, 1985), 182). For a convenient discussion of the Son of Man in 1 Enoch, see the essays in Gabriele Boccaccini, ed. *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), especially Sabino Chialà, “The Son of Man: The Evolution of an Expression,” 153-178; Helge S. Kvanig, “The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch,” 179-215; John J. Collins, “Response,” 216-27; Gieschen, “The Name of the Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch,” 238-49; Leslie Walck, “The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch and the Gospels,” 299-337. Also see James C. VanderKam, “Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and the Son of Man in 1 Enoch 37-71,” in *The Messiah*, ed. Charlesworth, 169-91; M. Casey “Use of the term ‘Son of Man’ in the Similitudes of Enoch,” *JSJ* 7 (1976): 11-29; D.C. Olson, “Enoch and the Son of Man in the Epilogue of the Parables of Enoch,” *JSP* 18 (1998): 27-38. For general background on its use in Second Temple Judaism, see: John J. Collins, “The Son of Man in First-Century Judaism,” *NTS* 38.3 (1992): 448-66; F.C. Burkitt, “The Nontitular Son of Man: A History and Critique,” *NTS* 40 (1994): 504-21; M Casey, “Idiom and Translation: Some Aspects of the Son of Man Problems,” *NTS* 41 (1995):

with the naming of the Son of Man, an event which takes place at the beginning of time, before creation. Verse 1 describes the heavenly setting, vv. 2-3 depict the naming itself.

And in that hour that son of man was named in the presence of the Lord of Spirits,
and his Name, before the Head of Days.
Even before the sun and the constellations were created,
before the stars of heaven were made,
his Name was named before the Lord of Spirits.⁴

There is debate concerning the nature of this event. Some have treated it merely as the choosing of the Son of Man. Matthew Black speculates that the naming derives from an original Hebrew *qr'* and that it ought to be understood as describing only the call of the Son of Man to an appointed task, based on an interpretation of Isa 49.⁵ In this reading, the Lord of Spirits calls him by name and designates him for a particular work. These verses certainly refer to the selection and assignment of the Son of Man – v.6 makes clear that “choosing” is part of the concern of the chapter.

On the other hand, the emphasis on the Name of the Son of Man throughout the chapter supports the conclusion that the Name itself is important, and thus vv. 2-3 have to

168-82; T.B. Slater, “One Like a Son of Man in First Century CE Judaism,” *NTS* 41 (1995): 183-98.

⁴ *1En.* 48:2-3. (George W. E. Nickelsberg and James C. VanderKam, *1 Enoch 2: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 37-82* [Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2011], 62).

⁵ Black, *Book of Enoch*, 210. The importance of Isa 49 for understanding *1 En.* 48 is generally accepted, but see Leslie Walck, “The Son of Man in Matthew and the Similitudes of Enoch” (Ph.D. diss., The University of Notre Dame, 1999), 140-59 for an argument that the background to this chapter ought not to be limited to Isa 49 and that call narrative ought not control its interpretation. Walck traces the overemphasis on Isa 49 to Messel, *Der Menschensohn in den Bilderreden Henochs* (ZAWBeih. 35; Giessen: 1922), and concludes that it depends on importing too much unjustified context. (Walck, “The Son of Man,” 144). (I had access to Walck’s original dissertation, but it has now been published as *The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch and in Matthew*, London: T&T Clark, 2011.)

do with the Son of Man being given that Name, not simply being called by it. Dillmann understands this verse to represent a prime example of *tšw* ‘ meaning *appellari* or *nominari*.⁶ Acknowledging the relationship to Isa 49, but following Dillmann’s rendering, are Michael A. Knibb, E. Isaac, and Charles Gieschen.⁷ Leslie Walck considers the naming to involve both designation and name giving. He connects the naming reference to numerous Isaianic passages, showing that in *I Enoch*’s background material designation and name giving are not exclusive, but go hand in hand.⁸ I think it is best to understand, with the majority, that in addition to the calling, these verses refer also to the Son of Man being given a Name in the presence of the Lord of Spirits before the creation of the universe. I will say more about these creation statements in the next section of this chapter. At this point I will simply point out that the timing remains significant: the Son of Man receives this Name prior to any act of creation.

If the Son of Man is indeed given a name in 48:2-3, the question remains as to what that name is. Gieschen says that “[t]here is no doubt that “the name” by which the Son of Man “was named” is the Divine Name because there are numerous references to

⁶ Dillmann, *Lexicon Linguae Aethiopicae*, col 1301.

⁷ Michael A. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments* (2 vols.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978), II.133; Isaac, “1 Enoch” in *OTP* II35; Gieschen, “The Name of the Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch,” in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*, (ed. G. Boccaccini; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 240. Gieschen consistently quotes Isaac’s translation for ch. 48, but Black’s translation for ch. 69.

⁸ Leslie W. Walck, “The Son of Man,” 143. Nickelsburg and VanderKam appear to follow a similar interpretation, emphasizing the naming of the Son of Man, and the pre-existence of his name, but reading the passage as having to do primarily with his designation. *I Enoch* 2, 168-170.

“the Name of the Lord of the Spirits” throughout the Similitudes.”⁹ I believe that he is correct, but that a more complete demonstration is required that it is indeed the Name of the Lord of Spirits with which the Son of Man is named. I will return to this question in the discussion of v.5.

II. Three Soteriological Descriptions

Verse 4 lays out three ways that the newly named Son of Man will serve in a soteriological way.¹⁰

He will be a staff for the righteous,
that they may lean on him and not fall;
And he will be the light of the nations,
and he will be a hope for those who grieve in their hearts.¹¹

First, he will be a “staff for the righteous” providing them with the support they require.

This description of salvation is not unique within *I Enoch*. The most similar statement is in ch. 61. The angels are taking cords and measures to the righteous “so that they may lean on the Name of the Lord of Spirits forever and ever.”¹² *First Enoch* 41:8 expresses

⁹ Gieschen, “The Divine Name in Ante-Nicene Christology,” 124.

¹⁰ Sabino Chialà suggests that the three messianic functions come from Isaiah modifying what he finds to be a generally Danielic scene (“The Son of Man: The Evolution of an Expression,” in Boccaccini, *Messiah Son of Man*, 161).

¹¹ *I En.* 48:4. (Nickelsberg/VanderKam, 62).

¹² *I En.* 61:3. I have altered the translation slightly, changing “rely” to “lean” in order to highlight the similarity between 61:3 and 48:4. Both translate the Ge‘ez *tamarguaza*. Black posits an original Hebrew *niš‘ān ‘al* in 61:3. He also tentatively suggests that 61:5 ought to be emended to “lean on the Name of the Elect One,” rather than the manuscript’s “day of the Elect One,” but he does not follow up on the speculation, and the idea has not been taken up in later scholarship. (*Book of Enoch*, 232) The emendation is unnecessary; the passage reads better with a parallelism between the “Name of the Lord of Spirits” and “the Elect One,” as is similar to what occurs in 48:5 with its juxtaposition of the “Name of the Lord of Spirits” and “the Son of Man.”

the related idea that the Lord “strengthened the spirits of the righteous in the Name of his righteousness.”¹³ At Qumran, the *Rule of the Blessings* also provides an example of strengthening through the Name. God strengthens the Messianic figure: “all the nations will serve you, and he will make you strong by his holy Name.”¹⁴

The second description designates the Son of Man as a light for the nations. This phrase is the second element from Isa 49, the call narrative on which *I En.* 48 is modeled.¹⁵ Light is a common soteriological motif, especially when contrasted with darkness. In the immediate preceding context of the second parable, heaven itself is said to be transformed into light,¹⁶ and the fate of the condemned is described as Darkness.¹⁷ I have already mentioned the strengthening of the righteous in *I En.* 41:8, but a more

¹³ If *I En.* 45.3 speaks of souls that “grow strong within them,” as translated by Dillmann and Charles, then it could be included. However, ch. 45 principally has to do with the unrighteous, who have *denied* the Name. As such, Black’s interpretation that it refers to the souls of the unrighteous becoming “heavy” within them is to be preferred. Black, *Book of Enoch*, 205.

¹⁴ 1Q28b V.28. (García Marínez and Tigchelaar, *Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 1:109). This, and subsequent translations from the Dead Sea Scrolls is from this edition. *Rule of the Blessings* is an appendix to *Rule of the Community* (1QS). A further possible example from Qumran occurs in one of the fragments of the *Damascus Document*: 4Q269 4ii.1-2. In *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated*, Garcia-Martinez offers this reconstructed translation, based on comparison with other fragments: “[...and they res]tore the stre[ngth in the leprosy] ... the holy [me]n who are stre[ngthened by his holy name ...]”. In the later *Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, this fragment was demoted to a supporting role, and does not appear in the text. Apparently replacing it is 4Q266 5i.8-9: “and those of firm power in what has been reveal[ed ...] 9 [... those who hold] fast to [his] ho[ly] name [...]” (*Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 587) Certainly this reconstruction intends some benefit to the subject through the Name, but no more can be said than this.

¹⁵ It is found at Isaiah 49:6 “I will give you as a light to the nations that my salvation may reach to the end of the earth.” The other place the expression is found is at Isaiah 42:6.

¹⁶ *I En.* 45:4

¹⁷ *I En.* 46:6

complete quotation is appropriate here in order to highlight the way the light-darkness contrast is used.

For the sun (makes) many revolutions for a blessing and a curse,
and the course of the path of the moon is light to the righteous and darkness to
the sinners, in the Name of the Lord
who made a separation between light and darkness,
and divided the spirits of men,
and strengthened the spirits of the righteous in the Name of his righteousness.

Light and Darkness represent the distinction maintained between the righteous and the unrighteous. That distinction is maintained in and by the Name of the Lord. In addition, *1 Enoch* describes this distinction in terms of the original cosmological separation of light from darkness, suggesting that the same Lord who keeps them separate also keeps righteousness and sin separate. One of the Psalms from Qumran preserves a similar association between God's cosmological separation of darkness from light and the saving power of his name: "[...] have relied [upon] your name. And invo[ke] [...] Israel. Lean [on yhw, the God of gods, he who made] the heavens [and the earth and all that is in them, w]ho separated [light from darkness ...]." ¹⁸

Finally, *1 En.* 48:4 describes the newly named Son of Man as the hope of those who are troubled. This stands in contrast to the statement in 46:6 that those who do not extol the Name of the Lord of Spirits have no hope. Aside from this indirect contact with the Name, none of these three references mention the Name. They refer to the Son of Man himself. In the following sections, however, I will argue that the ground for the Son

¹⁸ 11Q11 ii.8-12 The connection imagery also appears outside the Similitudes at 1 Enoch 108:12, the closing chapter of the book. "Indeed, I will bring forth in shining light those who have loved my holy name..." Also, again at Qumran: "And he will make his light shine upon you and make you know his great name" (4Q452 1i.1).

of Man's soteriological activity, including these three terms, is in fact the Name that he is given in vv. 2-3, and that the salvation described here in v. 4 is shown to be onomanological in v. 7 where the righteous are said to be saved "in his Name."

III. Worship

The next point has to do with the worship described in *I En.* 48:5. In addition to demonstrating worship being offered to the Name, these verses also allow for the conclusion that the name that was given to the Son of Man in 48:2-3 was indeed the Name of the Lord of Spirits.

All who dwell on earth shall fall down and worship¹⁹ before him,
And will glorify and bless and celebrate with Song the Name of the Lord of
Spirits.

These two lines indicate that the way in which those who dwell on earth worship before the Son of Man is by glorifying, blessing and celebrating the Name of the Lord of Spirits. This comes shortly after the Naming that takes place in vv. 2-3. The best explanation is that worshipping before the Son of Man is equated with celebrating the Name of the Lord of Spirits because the Son of Man possesses that Name, having been given it in the

¹⁹ The basic meaning of *sagada* is to prostrate oneself. Leslau gives "bow down, prostrate oneself, pay homage, adore, worship, worship by prostration" (cf. the similar definitions Dillmann, *Lexicon*, 398-399). This is essentially the same range as that for *hwh*, the most common Hebrew biblical term for worship. The word used for worship could be translated simply as "submission," but as Baukham argues, the context demands that it be understood as divine worship ("The Throne of God and the Worship of Jesus," 59). Dunn, who is skeptical of most examples of worship of figures other than God the Father, acknowledges this passage as describing the "only one other than God who is properly worshipped in Second Temple Jewish literature" (*Did the First Christians*, 71).

preceding verses.²⁰ Richard Bauckham evaluates the worship of the Son of Man figure: “Worship of the Son of Man is appropriate because his participation in the divine sovereignty includes him in the unique identity of God which is recognized in worship.”²¹ I would add to Bauckham’s statement that in this chapter the way the Son of Man is “included” is by being given the divine Name at the beginning.

And so we see that “all who dwell on earth” worship before the Son of Man because he possesses the Name of the lord of Spirits. There are numerous examples from Qumran of the standard language of praising or blessing God’s Name in response to salvation.²² A single example found in 4Q177 will serve to show the connection that the material from Qumran typically assumes between earthly salvation and rendering the Name of God its due honor. “[... those who f]ear God will sanctify his name and enter Zion with joy, and Jerusalem [...]”²³ This accords with the general emphasis in soteriology at Qumran, where the expectation included restoration to leadership over Israel, and material blessings.²⁴

²⁰ Pieter M. Venter treats this worship as part of the way the Parables associate the Son of Man with the Lord of Spirits, (“Spatiality in the Second Parable of Enoch,” in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*, 411-12).

²¹ Richard Bauckham, “The Throne of God and the Worship of Jesus,” *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 43-69, here 59.

²² 1QH^a x.30; 4Q511 63-64ii.2; and 4Q512 29-30.5 have salvation as the context of blessing.

²³ 4Q177 iv.15

²⁴ Paul Garnet writes “Salvation includes material benefits. These are mostly triumph over enemies, long life and everlasting progeny. In the later period this aspect seems to fill the Community’s vision, in contrast to the earlier stress on “spiritual” blessings which we find in the Hymns.” *Salvation and Atonement in the Qumran scrolls*, (Tübingen: Mohr, 1977), 114. See also Marcus Bockmuehl, “1QS and Salvation at Qumran,” in *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism* (ed. D.A. Carson, Peter T. O’Brien, and Mark A. Seifrid; vol. 1 of *Justification and Variegated Nomism*; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001).

The connection is somewhat different in *1 Enoch*. In *1 En.* 39 Enoch relates that he desired to be among the righteous and the chosen who praised and extolled the Name of the Lord of Spirits, and that it is his rightful place because he also extols the Name in this way.²⁵ His reason for continually offering this praise is that “he has established me in blessedness and splendor, according to the good pleasure of the Lord of Spirits.”²⁶ Enoch offers praise in response to a spiritually conceived salvation, in contrast with the earthly salvation involved in the triumphant entry into Jerusalem envisioned in 4Q177.

First Enoch 48 emphasizes the respect that is due to the Name. The opposite of that respect is described in numerous other places, where the Similitudes exhibit a strong concern about the danger of “denying” the Name of the Lord of Spirits. The Second Parable itself is introduced as “concerning those who deny the Name of the dwelling of the holy ones and of the Lord of Spirits.”²⁷ Those people are contrasted with the righteous, and because of their denial of the Name they cannot ascend to heaven.²⁸ Again in chapter 46, there is mention of those who “do not extol the Name”²⁹ and “deny the Name.”³⁰ Among their other crimes, their own refusal to acknowledge the Name leads

381-414. On this soteriology as a distinguishing feature between Qumran and the Similitudes, see Gabriele Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 144-49.

²⁵ *1 En.* 39:7-9

²⁶ *1 En.* 39:9 I have followed Black’s translation here. Nickelsburg and VanderKam appear to indicate that Enoch was established for the task of praise and blessing: “for he established me for praise and blessing.” Black’s interpretation and translation (based on the lexical analysis of the preposition *ba* as opposed to *la*) is more in keeping with the emphasis on praise of the Name resulting from the saving work it performs.

²⁷ *1 En.* 45:1

²⁸ *1 En.* 45:2

²⁹ *1 En.* 46:6

³⁰ *1 En.* 46:7

them to persecute the righteous, who depend on the Name.³¹ The consequence for all this is given in v. 6. “Darkness shall be their dwelling, and worms will be their couch. And they will have no hope to rise from their couches, because they do not extol the Name of the Lord of Spirits.”

Prior to the second Similitude, there is at least one and possibly two references to those who deny the Name. The first is in 38:2, which deals with the destiny of those who have denied the Name of the Lord of Spirits. The word for “Name” is not universally attested in the manuscripts, and scholars have come to different conclusions concerning it.³² If it is, indeed, a later scribal addition, it is probably because of the pervasiveness of the concept of the denial specifically of the Name in the Similitudes. The second reference, in 41:2, is accepted by all the editors.³³ It describes the sinners who are bound for judgment and being driven away from the secrets of heaven and the dwelling places of the chosen and holy. They are said to be those who denied the Name of the Lord of Spirits. As scholars have recognized, the Similitudes place a great emphasis on the proper

³¹ *I En.* 46:8

³² Dillmann, Charles, Knibb, and most recently Nickelsberg/VanderKam reject it, translating to the effect of “denied the Lord of Spirits.” This decision considers the addition of “name” to be a later addition bringing the expression found here at the head of the Similitudes in line with the typical usage found in the Similitudes. Isaac, the *OTP* editor, and Black follow the minority of texts that contain the Name reference. See textual notes in August Dillmann, *Das Buch Henoch: ubersetzt und eklärt* (Leipzig: Vogel, 1853), 18, 141-143; Knibb, *Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 1.110; Black, *Book of Enoch*, 347.

³³ Ironically, the only manuscript to omit it is Tana 9, which adds “name” at 38:2.

recognition of the Name, and that the failure to do so signals ultimate failure and exclusion from the possibility of salvation.³⁴

IV. Purpose

Verses 6-7 bring to a conclusion the soteriological references to the Name in ch. 48. They reveal that the ultimate purpose for the choosing and the Naming that take place in vv. 2-3 is the salvation of the righteous. Verse 7 is the final point that makes it preferable that we understand vv. 2-3 to indicate that the Son of Man is given a Name when he is chosen, not simply that he is designated. It indicates that “in his Name they are saved and he will become the avenger of their lives.” In the context of the verse, it could be either the Lord of Spirits or it could be the Son of Man whose Name is meant. All other references to salvation in this chapter associate it with the Son of Man. Earlier in v. 7 it is the Son of Man who would “preserve the portion of the righteous;” which probably refers to the preservation of the righteous themselves.³⁵ Their righteousness consists in the rejection of unrighteousness in the world, particularly described as hating all its ways “in the Name of the Lord of Spirits.” In v. 4 the Son of Man is called “a staff to the

³⁴ Black calls denial of the Name “the offence above all offences” (*Book of Enoch*, 195), and cites Charles, “the very head and front of their (the sinners’) offending” (*The Ethiopic Version of the Book of Enoch* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906], 71) and Dillmann, “ihre Grundsünde” (*Das Buch Henoch*, 143) in support. Dillmann goes on to say that this sin is “the one on which all their others are based.”

³⁵ Black (*Book of Enoch*, 208, 211) takes Ge’ez *kefl* to translate Hebrew *ḥālaq*, and be a reference to the rewards due the righteous. At the same time, he allows for the possibility that it might translate *gôrāl* and mean “party, followers” as it must in 46.3. In this case the interpretation would be the one I have adopted. Black is following F. Nötscher (*Zur theologischen Terminologie der Qumran-Texte* (Bonn: Hanstein, 1956) 170-71) for the definition. Nötscher produces evidence from Qumran for this rendering. The roughly contemporary Gospel of John uses similar language at John 17.

righteous,” “the light of the Gentiles,” and “the hope of those who are troubled.” Chapter 48 is focused on the work of the Son of Man. As a part of that focus, in this chapter the Lord of Spirits does not take saving action himself, but has chosen the Son of Man for that purpose. In spite of the fact that “Lord of Spirits” stands closer to “his Name” in the sentence, the Son of Man is a better fit. It seems most likely, therefore, that in chapter 48 it is the Son of Man in whose Name (given in vv. 2-3) they are saved. This further strengthens the conclusion that the name in question is the Divine Name. Although here the saving Name is that of the Son of Man, in other places, the Similitudes more often refer to salvation through or in the Name of the Lord of Spirits.³⁶

First Enoch 50:2-3 is the best example in *I Enoch* of salvation through the Name of the Lord of Spirits. Like ch. 48, it deals first with the righteous, who are said to be victorious through the Name. Moving on from the righteous to the “others,”³⁷ they have the possibility of salvation through the Name, although without the additional honor through the Name that is heaped upon the righteous of Israel.

In the Dead Sea Scrolls, the association between the Name and salvation can be earthly, as was apparent in 4Q177. According to Paul Garnet, this is particularly the case with the later material.³⁸ A further example of the earthly perspective on the salvation that the Name secures is in the War Scroll.

³⁶ e.g. *I En.* 50:3

³⁷ Black, Dillmann (and others) understand the others to refer to foreigners or non-Israelites, thus Black’s translation: “Gentiles” (Black, *Enoch*, 213).

³⁸ Paul Garnet discerned a shift emphasizing the material benefits in the later scrolls, but the presence of spiritual salvation as well in the material associated with the “founder” and the early days of the community. (*Salvation and Atonement*, 114).

Goliath from Gath, gallant giant, you delivered into the hands of David, your servant, for he trusted in your powerful Name and not in sword or spear. For the battle is yours! The Philistines you humiliated many times for your holy Name.³⁹

Not all examples from Qumran are oriented towards deliverance from earthly situations. At the end of the Damascus Document, the Name itself appears to have provided protection leading to salvation. Those who are steadfast in obedience to the covenant are promised that one day they will prevail, and that “God will atone for them, and they shall see his salvation, for they have taken refuge in his holy Name.”⁴⁰ The more typical association between the Name and salvation, however, is that the promise of salvation spurs the beneficiary to worship or praise the Name of the Lord: “And blessed be his Name, because he has saved the soul of the poor.”⁴¹ Vermes’ arrangement of 4Q381 represents the sequence well: the supplicant calls on the Name, awaits the salvation that results, and wears that salvation (or Name?) as a garment.

[I will make] thee known, for thou has made me know;
I will have insight, for thou has given me insight...
For on thy Name, my God, we shall call,
and we shall wait for Thy salvation.
And they will put it on like a garment⁴²

The salvation the Name provides in these passages is equally spiritual and forward looking as is that in *1 Enoch*, although it is not ordinarily achieved through the Name.

³⁹ 1QM xi.1-3

⁴⁰ CD-B xx.34

⁴¹ 4Q434 1.i.1

⁴² 4Q381 15.8-10 Eileen M. Schuller dates 4Q381 “to the Middle to Late Hasmonean period,” (*Non-Canonical Psalms from Qumran* [HSS 28; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986], 1). This dating fits the time frame during which Qumran’s theology still included a spiritual emphasis in salvation (Garnet, *Salvation and Atonement*, 114, which argues that the transition occurs sometime early in the Herodian period.).

Part Two – Cosmology

The association between creative activity and the Name is found in a variety of different texts, from a range of backgrounds. The one that has the greatest concentration of elements, and has received the most scholarly attention is *1 En.* 69, making this text a convenient starting point. Unlike the section on soteriology above, this choice should not be taken to indicate that association of cosmology with the Name is particularly identifiable with *1 Enoch*. Cosmology also features in such texts as *Jubilees*, and *Prayer of Manasseh*, neither of which betrays any particular sectarian position.⁴³ Rather, this passage is chosen because it provides the best lens through which to view the Name's role in cosmology.

I. The Powerful Name: *1 Enoch* 69:14-15

This (satan) told Michael to show him the hidden Name, that they might pronounce it in the oath, so that those who revealed all that was secret to the children of men might tremble before that Name and oath. And this is the power of this oath, for it is powerful and strong, and he (God) had placed this oath 'AKA' in the hand of Michael.

The oath will be credited with the cosmological work in the coming verses, but the passage begins by explaining the source of the oath's power to do that work. The Name becomes a part of the oath, and only because of the Name's presence does the oath have power.

⁴³ Charlesworth surveys the broad range of positions scholars have taken on provenance and original language for *Prayer of Manasseh* (*OTP* II.625-628), as well as the difficulty in finding any identifying theological positions (*OTP* II.630-632).

The Name is called the “hidden Name” in v.14. This is the only time that *I Enoch* refers to the Name as hidden or secret, but as Black argues, the hidden Name must refer to the ineffable Name of God.⁴⁴ Later in this chapter I will take up the theme of the secrecy of the Name, which is more important in other texts than it is in *I Enoch*. At this point, it is important only to emphasize that the Name in question is in fact the divine Name, the same Name that the Son of Man was given in *I En.* 48. The angel wanted the Name so that he could calculate its numerical value, and Black has made the case, based upon the results the angel apparently produces,⁴⁵ that the versions of the Name in question were YHWH Adonai and YHWH Sabaoth.⁴⁶

Jubilees provides a similar example of the Name being associated with an oath, and providing the force of that oath. “And now I will make you swear by the great oath – because there is not an oath which is greater than it, by the glorious and honored and great and splendid and amazing and mighty Name which created heaven and earth and everything together – that you will fear Him and worship Him.”⁴⁷ Jubilees is usually understood to be a retelling of Genesis from a theological perspective similar to that of *I Enoch*.⁴⁸ The oath Isaac makes his sons swear is made powerful because of the cosmogenic Name that is included in it. Isaac piles up adjectives in an attempt to express

⁴⁴ Black, *Book of Enoch*, 248.

⁴⁵ ‘AKA’ in v. 15, as well as BIQA in v. 13.

⁴⁶ Black, *Book of Enoch*, 247. Nickelsburg calculates BIKa as YHWH elohim rather than sabaoth. (*I Enoch* 2, 307).

⁴⁷ Jubilees 36:7 trans. O. S. Wintermute in *OTP* 2.124.

⁴⁸ Nickelsburg, *I Enoch* 1, 71-75; James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees: A Critical Text* (Louvain: E. Peeters, 1989). Boccaccini summarizes the recent history of scholarship in his “Preface: The Enigma of Jubilees and the Lesson of the Enoch Seminar,” *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees* (ed. Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibbá; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), xiv-xix.

the greatness and the power of the Name, but the key effect for which it is brought into the story is that an oath empowered by the Name that has the power of creation is certainly binding upon Isaac's sons. Fossum, followed by Gieschen, finds this to be part of a tradition of the Name as a hypostasized power that serves as a cosmogenic agent.⁴⁹

Like Isaac, the "satan" in *1 En.* 69 wants to employ an oath that has a great deal of power – ostensibly in order to frighten the watchers and bring them under control.⁵⁰ For the oath to have that power, it must contain the Name: "this (the Name which causes the watchers to tremble) is the power of the oath, for it is powerful and strong." Everything that the oath accomplishes in the cosmological poem that makes up the rest of chapter 69 can thus be attributed to the Name being in it. The logic in *1 Enoch* is the same as that in *Jubilees*: the Name can be relied on as a powerful binding oath because it is the Name that binds together creation.

II. Foundations: *1 Enoch* 69:16-17

In *1 En.* 69:16 we begin to learn of the actual cosmological work of the Name containing oath, which is the reason for the fear of the watchers. Both *Jubilees* and *Prayer of Manasseh* use variations of the common phrase "who made heaven and earth" to describe divine creation.⁵¹ The language is used to indicate the all encompassing

⁴⁹ Fossum, *Name of God*, 255-56; Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*, 75.

⁵⁰ Black suggests that this may have been intended as the stated object, but is stated as a ruse (*Book of Enoch*, 248).

⁵¹ *Pr. Man.* 2 "ὁ ποιήσας τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν"

quality of God's creative authority, and is quite familiar from Scripture.⁵² The phrase is not used in *1 Enoch*; however, it serves as an outline for the description of the work of creation that begins in v. 16.

The description begins with the heavens, which are "suspended" through the power of the oath before the creation of the world. Suspended is *tasaqla*,⁵³ which means to hang or suspend something, but often emphasizes that something is affixed firmly into that suspended position.⁵⁴ The heavens should not be understood to be perched precariously, but to be established firmly in their position by the power of the Name in the oath.

Verse 17 describes the creation of the earth. It is founded, through the use of the Name-oath, "upon the waters." This reflects the ancient cosmological scheme in which the earth rests upon a "world ocean." Like the heavens, the earth is also firmly established on what would otherwise be an unstable foundation by the power of the Name containing oath.⁵⁵

⁵² Examples include Gen 14:19, 22; Exod 20:11, 31:17; 2 Kgs 19:15; 2 Chr 2:11 [2:12 ET]; Pss 113:23 [115:15 ET], 120:2 [121:2 ET], 123:8 [124:8 ET], 133:3 [134:3 ET], 145:6 [146:6 ET], and Isaiah 37:16. 2 Esdras 19:6 [Neh 9:6] represents an expansion of the formula, similar to that in *1 Enoch*.

⁵³ Passive of *saqala*

⁵⁴ See Dillmann, *Lexicon*, 350-351, especially definition 3 for the passive form *tasaqla*, "adhaerere, adhaerescere, amplecti, affixum esse, pendere ab. (all in column 351) This aspect presumably is what makes the word suitable for references to crucifixion.

⁵⁵ Nickelsburg finds that both contribute to the depiction of the oath as strong and powerful: "That the heaven hangs from nothing is as miraculous as the notion tha the earth 'is founded on the waters' ... In any case, the language of foundation will be reiterated in v. 19 and fits well with this section's emphasis on the strength that derives from the divine oath." (*1 Enoch* 2, 308).

III. Organizing and Ordering: vv 17b-23

The passage from 69:17b-23 describes the ongoing work that the Name-Oath does in creation. This can be described as establishing and maintaining order. *I Enoch* expands upon the brief synopsis of God as creator of heaven and earth by listing a sequence of heavenly and earthly phenomena upon which God exercises his power and authority. Bounds are created for the sea, and it is kept within them. The sun, moon, stars, waters, winds, and spirits are all kept in their proper courses by the power of the Name. In the middle of this sequence 69:19 contains the statement that “through the oath are the depths (*qly*) made fast.” This statement finds a close parallel that helps to clarify it in the *Prayer of Manasseh*.

The *Prayer of Manasseh* purports to be the prayer of confession referred to in 2 Chronicles 33:18, but is most likely a composition from the second or first century B.C. in the area of Jerusalem.⁵⁶ In v. 3, the Name “seal(s) the deep.” For “the deep,” the Syriac has *těhômâ*, a term borrowed from Hebrew,⁵⁷ and the Greek has ἄβυσσος.⁵⁸ These are the terms used at Genesis 1:2 by the Peshitta and LXX respectively to say that “darkness was over the face of the deep.” *Prayer of Manasseh* places this statement at the

⁵⁶ James H. Charlesworth, “Prayer of Manasseh,” *OTP* 2.625-628.

⁵⁷ Charlesworth, “Prayer of Manasseh,” *OTP* 2.635.

⁵⁸ *Prayer of Manasseh* 3 (Ode 12.3 in *Septuaginta: Psalmi cum Odi*, ed. A. Rahlfs, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967).

conclusion of its own series of statements about God's creative activity. The "deep" is to be understood as that same primeval chaos as in Genesis 1.⁵⁹

The Name then is used to "seal" that chaos and keep it under control. The idea is to hold back the destructive force, allowing the order that had been instituted to continue and flourish. This work of guarding creation from being overwhelmed by the primeval waters was done by the power of the Name, which is described as glorious and as powerful, fearful, or terrible. Fossum regards the sea and the *těhôm* to be identical.⁶⁰ I think it is better not to insist on identity, but to view them simply as parallel phrases. They are so arranged in *Prayer of Manasseh* because both lines describe cosmological actions upon similar related entities. The sealing performed by the Name is an act of containing the deep within boundaries that it cannot violate because of the strength of the seal used, and doing so for the purpose of establishing order, in the same way that the sea is "bound and established by the command of his word." Once again, just as it did for the watchers of *I Enoch* and for Jacob and Esau in *Jubilees*, the creative power of the Name inspires fear.

⁵⁹ On the nature of the *těhôm* or primeval "deep," see Alexander Heidel, *The Babylonian Genesis* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951), 98-101; Speiser, *Genesis*, 8-13; Wenham, *Genesis 1-15*, 8-10, 15-16; and Waschke, "*těhôm*," *TDOT*, 15.574-581. Fossum also connects the theme of the sealing of the deep with traditions regarding the Shetiyya Stone, the stone upon the Temple Mount around which the temple was constructed and upon which the Ark rested. This would be an attractive cosmological connection, except that during the period we are investigating, it still appears to have been understood to have been placed there during the time of Samuel and David (Louis Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews*, V.15-16, citing *m.Yoma* 5.2).

⁶⁰ Fossum, *Name of God*, 249. Compare pairings of the two terms in Job 28:14; 38:16; 41:23 (but for this last, only in LXX. Hebrew uses a different word for "deep.")

The series of *1 Enoch* is more extensive than the brief statement in *Prayer of Manasseh*, but it shares the emphasis on God maintaining the order of his creation by keeping those things in check that might otherwise run amok. As in *Prayer of Manasseh*, the binding of the sea is juxtaposed⁶¹ with the sealing of the depths. Again as in *Prayer of Manasseh*, *1 Enoch* takes up the language of Gen 1:2, using the same root (*qly*) to refer to the depths as had been used in translating the depths over which darkness rested before creation.⁶² The depths in *1 Enoch* ought likewise to be taken to be a reference to the abyss, or *těhômâ* of Gen 1:2. In light of this, it is best to understand *1 Enoch*'s "made fast" as intending the same imposition of order by the power of the Name that is described in *Prayer of Manasseh*.⁶³

IV. Response to the Name's Cosmogenic Authority: *1 Enoch* 69:24

The power of the Name that is in the oath empowers the oath to effectively order creation, keeping the elements of the cosmos in their proper places. In v.24 those elements respond to the structure imposed by the oath by praising, glorifying and extolling. The Name is certainly involved in this praising, glorifying and extolling; however, it is a matter of textual criticism and interpretation to determine its precise role in the sentence. Knibb translates the preposition *ba*⁶⁴ as "in," and thus has "they give

⁶¹ Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 2, 309.

⁶² The Ge'ez appears to be a translation of the LXX rather than a Hebrew text, and so the direct relationship is between *qly* and ἄβυσσος.

⁶³ Contra Nickelsburg, who emends the text of v.19 to read that "through the oath the <pillars of the> deep were made firm," rather than the deep itself.

⁶⁴ Present in Rylands Ethiopic Manuscript 23 – Knibbs primary text.

thanks and praise and exalt in the Name of the Lord of Spirits for ever and ever.”⁶⁵ Black treats the Name as the object of these acts, and presumably follows Berl. and BM 492, which lack the preposition: “they will praise and glorify and extol the Name of the lord of spirits for ever and ever.”⁶⁶ The expression is unusual. I can find no LXX or NT examples of anyone praising, glorifying or extolling in the Name of the Lord.⁶⁷ This argues for the originality of the prefix, since it seems less likely that a copyist would have added it. The Ethiopic particle *ba* has a wide lexical range, however, and the fact that two of the manuscripts did not contain it (and a third omits the reference to the Name entirely) suggests the possibility that it was best understood as indicating that “they will praise and glorify and extol *on account of*”⁶⁸ the Name of the Lord of Spirits.” This rendering locates the statement within the basic flow of the passage. They give thanks because of the governing power that the Name allows the oath to have over them.

The following verses add another element to the understanding of the proper response to the Name’s governing authority. Verses 26-29 function as the conclusion to the third parable, but are typically understood to be a separate composition from what

⁶⁵ Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, I.206, II.164

⁶⁶ Black, *Enoch*, 66

⁶⁷ “Blessing” (εὐλογέω) in the name is similar to praise, and is a more common expression (Deut 21:5; 2 Sam 6:18; 1 Chron 16:2; Psa 128:8). The only scriptural example of giving thanks in the name is Eph 5:20.

⁶⁸ Leslau, “*ba*, etc.,” *Comparative Dictionary of Ge‘ez*, 82. Leslau gives greater prominence to definitions like “by reason of, because of, out of, on account of...” than does Koehler-Baumgartner for the corresponding Hebrew prefix *b-*. (*HALOT* 1.103-105). 1 Enoch was likely translated from Greek, and the Greek preposition ἐν does allow for a translation “on account of” or “because of” (BDAG, ἐν, entry 9)

immediately precedes them.⁶⁹ Nonetheless, in the current form of *I Enoch*, these verses are linked with the section on the oath that comes before, and there are several verbal links that help to explain why a scribe might have inserted them at this place. In 69:24, as we have just seen, the spirits and the cosmological elements “praise and glorify and extol.” In 69:26, whoever the subject may be, “they blessed and glorified and extolled, because the Name of the Son of man had been revealed to them.” Just as in 24, the Name is the cause of their three fold expression of thanksgiving and worship. Here in ch. 69 that Name is the Name “of the Son of Man,” and so the relationship between the Name of the Son of Man and that of the Lord of Spirits must be considered.

I argued in the previous section that the Son of Man receives a Name in *I En.* 48:2-3, and that because that Name has the power to save in 48:7, and justifies worship before the Son of Man in 48:5, that it should be taken to be the Name of the Lord of Spirits. Since 48:2-3 indicate that the Son of Man possesses the Name of the Lord of Spirits, the Names referred to in 69:24 and 69:26 are best understood to both refer to the same divine Name.⁷⁰ What is important in chapter 69 is that the Name of the Son of Man is the same Name that was placed into the oath for the purpose of establishing and holding together the created order. Because of its cosmological power, “they” react with praise when this Name, which had been hidden in 69:14 is revealed in 69:26. “They”

⁶⁹ They are either regarded as being transposed from some other place within the Similitudes, as Black, 249 suggests, or as the proper conclusion to the third parable which has been replaced by the later addition of the oath section, 69:13-25 (Charles and Dillmann, cited in Black, *Book of Enoch*, 249, and apparently in Knibb, *Ethiopic Book of Enoch* 2.162).

⁷⁰ As Black argued regarding *I En.* 69:13-15, *Book of Enoch*, 247.

probably referred to the elect in the original setting,⁷¹ but the insertion here illustrates the connection between the Name's control of natural phenomena and praise being offered to that Name, which was also present in chapter 48.

V. Judgment: *1 Enoch* 69:27-29

A final note about the cosmological role of the Name in ch. 69 is that after the Name of the Son of Man is revealed in 69:26, the Son of Man goes on to sit on the throne⁷² and be given the authority to judge and purify the earth in vv. 27-29.

Interestingly, a description of judgment is presented in 48:8-10 as the opposite of the salvation “in his Name” from 48:7. Ultimately, unlike the righteous, for whom the Son of Man would be a staff for support,⁷³ the unrighteous would have “no one to take them with his hand and raise them. For they have denied the Lord of Spirits and his Anointed One.”⁷⁴

Part Three – Concealment

The idea that the Name is in some way concealed (whether secret, hidden, or unknowable) is frequently treated in scholarship, however, much of the material usually cited is of a late date. Kabbalistic literature is a particularly rich source of these

⁷¹ The consensus is that the subject changes at v.26. As Dillmann observes, “the bad angels [of v.25] would also not rejoice over his revelation.” (*Das Buch Henoch*, 214.) Black rejects the notion that the subject of the verses was originally the “spirits (of nature) of 69.24” (*Book of Enoch*, 249), which is what the present text indicates.

⁷² Dillmann questions whether this originally refers to God or the Messiah, (*Das Buch Henoch*, 215.

⁷³ *1 En.* 48:4

⁷⁴ *1 En.* 48:10

traditions.⁷⁵ Looking to the textual evidence that we have from the second century C.E. and before, the evidence is somewhat more limited. As we have already seen, *I Enoch* has a single reference to the “hidden Name,”⁷⁶ and a few others to the revelation of the Name; but the concealment of the Name is a minor theme within *I Enoch*’s fairly extensive onomanology.

Much of the rest of the pre-second-century material refers, in fact, to the ban upon speaking the Name. In these cases, the Name is ineffable, but certainly not secret since the ban would only makes sense if the Name is sufficiently known that it could be pronounced. The actual legislation against speaking the Name is most easily discussed in the context of the holiness of the Name, and so I will consider most of them in the final section of this chapter.⁷⁷ Two passages are useful at this point.

In the *Apocalypse of Abraham*,⁷⁸ Abraham is guided by the angel Yahoel on a heavenly journey. Upon hearing the voice of God, Abraham finds himself face down upon the earth unable to move. God tells Yahoel to raise up and strengthen Abraham “through the mediation of my ineffable Name.”⁷⁹ This Name, which reinvigorates

⁷⁵ Alan F. Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports About Christianity and Gnosticism* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1977) 197-99

⁷⁶ *I En.* 69:14

⁷⁷ *m. Sanh.* 7:5; CD xv.2-3

⁷⁸ Late first or early second century C.E. Although *Apoc. Ab.* is only preserved in Old Slavonic, it is thought to be translated from a Greek translation of a Semitic (Hebrew or Aramaic) original. It is generally considered to be a Jewish composition with some Christian or Bogomil interpolations. For attempts to reconstruct its translation history see the introduction in *OTP* 1 by Rubinkiewicz (*Apocalypse of Abraham*, *OTP* 1.681-688), and more recently Alexander Kulik, who concludes that the original was more likely Hebrew than Aramaic (*Retroverting the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha: Toward the Original of the Apocalypse of Abraham* [Text-Critical Studies 3; Leiden: Brill, 2004]).

⁷⁹ *Apoc. Ab.* 10:3.

Abraham, also has the power to shake the heavens. Yahoel tells Abraham that the seventh heaven shakes (or is moved) by “a power through the medium of his ineffable Name in me.”⁸⁰ By saying that God’s Name is in him, Yahoel refers to the fact that his name is the combination of *YHWH* with *el*,⁸¹ and probably a reference to the angel of Exod 23:21 who was said to possess the divine Name.⁸² Because of this, Yahoel mediates the ineffable divine Name and its power to both Abraham and upon all creation. He is assigned the task of maintaining proper order in all realms: heavenly, earthly, and even Hades.⁸³ Andrei Orlov has described Yahoel as a paradoxical figure in that he manifests the presence of God, but does not allow that presence to receive worship.⁸⁴ That paradox extends to his name “Yahoel” as well. It makes the ineffable become speakable, and yet retains the authority to allow Yahoel to order the cosmos.

Joseph and Aseneth 15:12x contains a similar case of an angel who bears an ineffable name.⁸⁵ After a heavenly man appears to Aseneth and gives her the message

⁸⁰ *Apoc. Ab.* 10:8. Rubinkiewicz allows for the suggestion that 10:8 (although not 10:3) is part of an interpolation from 10:6-10:12 (*Apocalypse of Abraham*, OTP 1.684), although he appears to consider it to be an insertion of a source that was originally Jewish, and offers Hebrew retroversions in the notes (OTP 1.694). Kulik treats both 10:3 and 10:8 as deriving from the Greek translation of the original Hebrew (*Retroverting*, 55-56).

⁸¹ R. Rubinkiewicz, *Apocalypse of Abraham*, OTP 1.693.

⁸² Fossum, *Name of God*, 318; Andrei Orlov, “Praxis of the Voice,” *JBL* 127 (2008): 64; James Dunn, *Did the First Christians Worship Jesus: The New Testament Evidence*, (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox, 2010), 69.

⁸³ *Apoc. Ab.* 10:6-13.

⁸⁴ Andrei Orlov, “Praxis of the Voice: The Divine Name Traditions in the Apocalypse of Abraham,” *JBL* 127 (2008): 53-70, here 63.

⁸⁵ *Joseph and Aseneth* is dated to between the first century B.C.E and the second century C.E. It was written in Greek, most likely by a Greek speaking Jew from Egypt. See C. Burchard’s introduction, OTP 2.177-201; also, Burchard, et al., *Joseph und Aseneth*, (PVTG 50; Leiden: Brill, 2003). See also Davila, *Provenance*, 190-95. Davila allows for the possibility of Christian or Samaritan composition, but leaves the matter open. The

that her confession has been heard and accepted, she asks to know his name, so that she could praise him forever. He refuses, and in so doing indicates the perspective of the text on the ineffability of certain heavenly names. He refuses to give his name because it is “written by the finger of God in the beginning of the book before all (the others), ... And all names written in the book of the Most High are unspeakable (ἄρρητος), and man is not allowed to pronounce nor hear them in this world, because those names are exceedingly great and wonderful and laudable (ἐπαινετός - praiseworthy).” The Name in question may not be the Divine Name itself, although Gieschen makes a case that it is.⁸⁶ Regardless of whether or not the Name is the Divine Name, it derives its ineffable quality from its origin with God in heaven. The Name is not absolutely ineffable, however. The angel says that it cannot be pronounced “in this world,” which suggests that it could be pronounced in heaven, or some part of heaven. If so, then the prohibition has more to do with the risk of violating the boundaries between earthly and heavenly things.

A third text presents an onomanology that shares several motifs with those I have just considered, but contrasts with them in certain ways. The *Prayer of Jacob* is a brief magical text, which is actually rather late for this survey. It may date from as early as the

selection I am considering comes from the “long recension,” which is defended as original by Burchard in *Joseph and Aseneth*, and included in the text of that critical edition. The “short recension” is preferred by Marc Philonenko, *Joseph et Aseneth* (StPB 13; Leiden: Brill, 1968). Against the “prevailing scholarly consensus” for Jewish authorship, Ross Kraemer suggests that the text may be late (3rd to 6th century C.E.), and composed by a Christian in Syria (*When Aseneth Met Joseph: A Late Antique Tale of the Biblical Patriarch and His Egyptian Wife, Reconsidered*, [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998], summary on 296). He describes the question of authorship as being ultimately unresolvable, and although his proposal is intriguing, I will treat *Jos. Asen.* as a Jewish text that is no later than contemporary with the second century C.E.

⁸⁶ Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*, 130-131. Fossum further argues that the refusal itself indicates that the Name is the Divine Name (*Image of the Invisible God*, 113-16).

second or possibly first century C.E.⁸⁷ Like *Joseph and Aseneth*, it is most likely a Greek composition from Egypt.

The text claims that the Name, rather than being simply unspeakable or ineffable, is “secret.” The difference is noteworthy because several of the assumptions that *Prayer of Jacob* makes concerning the unique power of the Name are very similar to those of the other texts we have seen. God’s secret Name, his cosmological power and his power to redeem are important to the one who summons him. Cosmology is not directly attributed to the Name as it is in several texts, but redemption apparently is.

Creator of all ...
 Creator of the angels and archangels,
 the creator of the redeeming names;

I invoke you,⁸⁸

Later, when the text makes direct mention of the secrecy of the Name in v. 15, it is clear that the summoner believes that he knows the secret of the Name.

He who has the secret name *Sabaoth*
 God of gods; amen, amen.

The Name *Sabaoth* had appeared in the earlier list at v. 9, but the summoner regards this name as special and kept secret, although not from him. By invoking this name, the summoner believes that wisdom, empowerment, and immortality are available. The immortality to be enjoyed is probably the reason the name is called the “redeeming names” in verse two.

⁸⁷ Charlesworth, *Prayer of Jacob*, OTP 2.715. Charlesworth’s translation is the source for my quotations from this text.

⁸⁸ *Prayer of Jacob* 2-3.

Charlesworth reads this text as an example of the understanding in the Magical Papyri that “the Name was the essential part of a formula by which the individual could manipulate the gods and powers to grant immediately the expressed wish.”⁸⁹ In this approach to the Name, the *Prayer* reflects the same perspective as that of the ‘satan’ in *I En.* 69, who tries to ascertain the secret Name so that he could use its power. All the texts recognize the concealment of the Name as having to do with its power in both creation and salvation. On the one hand, the *Prayer of Jacob* and the ‘satan’ of *I En.* 69 believe that they can use that power to their own ends. *Apocalypse of Abraham*, *Joseph and Aseneth*, and the other characters of *I Enoch*, to whom the Name and the Son of Man are revealed, do not presume that this power is there to be manipulated, but instead should be acknowledged and praised.

Part Four – High Onomanology

I. Worship – Worship, Praise and Blessing

As in the Hebrew Bible, worship is indicated by a number of different terms that describe different acts. Several of these are directed to the Name in several texts from or associated with Qumran, as well as *I Enoch*. By extolling, blessing, calling upon and praising the Name, they treat it as an object of worship.⁹⁰

⁸⁹ Charlesworth, *Prayer of Jacob*, OTP 2.717. In contrast to this view, Goodenough believed that “the object of the prayer was a deeply spiritual one,” and that it amounted to a pious request for “participation in divinity” (*Jewish Symbols in the Greco Roman Period*, 203).

⁹⁰ The Hebrew term most often translated worship, *hwh*, is not used with regard to the name at Qumran. Geza Vermes’ translation at CD-B XX,19-20 “those who fear God and

Two texts from the *Similitudes of 1 Enoch* demonstrate the basis on which the Name is a recipient of worship. We have already seen that *1 En.* 48 connects the worship offered before the “Son of Man” to his possession of the Name and salvation of the righteous through it. *1 Enoch* 46, in which the Son of Man is first introduced, gives similarly soteriological reasons for the worship of the Name: “And they shall have no hope of rising from their beds because they do not extol the Name of the Lord of spirits ... and they deny the Name of the Lord of spirits” (*1 En.* 46:6-7, Black’s translation). Extolling the Name, acknowledging and proclaiming its highly exalted position, is necessary for any hope of the salvation, which we have already seen closely associated with the Name in *1 Enoch*. Outside the *Similitudes 1 En.* 108:9-12 provides a similar example. Speaking of those who loved God, it states: “Their spirits were found pure so that they might bless his [God’s] Name.” (v. 9) A few lines later God says “And I will bring forth in shining light those who have loved my holy Name” (v. 12). In both of these verses the true believer is expected to offer worship in the form of blessing or love⁹¹ to the Name of God.⁹²

The idea of blessing the Name is present at Qumran as well. It was, in fact, assumed to be a part of the daily life of the community: “When I start to stretch out my

worship his name” is misleading in this regard. He is interpreting *hšb*, which means “think on” or “esteem,” as “worship.”

⁹¹ Loving the Name of the Lord appears in four places in the LXX. *Psa* 5:12; 68:37; 118:132; *Isa* 56:6. In each case, those who love the Name of the Lord are being included in his blessings. In *Isa* 56:6, they are included in spite of the fact that they are “strangers” and “eunuchs” who would not ordinarily enjoy the benefits of the covenant.

⁹² Black suggests that v. 10 offers a third such reference in this chapter. Comparing it with 48.7, he asks, “Is ‘heaven’ *samāy* a mistake for *semeya* ‘my Name’?” If so, the phrase would read “They have been found to be such as loved my Name more than their life (lit. breath) in the world” (*Book of Enoch*, 324).

hands and my feet I shall bless his Name; when I start to go out and to come in, to sit and to stand up, and lying down in my bed I shall extol him.”⁹³ This quotation from the *Rule of the Community* is one of many examples of blessing the Name.⁹⁴ Several examples portray the blessing as a response to salvation, as the *War Scroll* does when it calls upon the priests, levites, and chief men of the array to bless the Name of God on the day when they defeat the forces of evil.⁹⁵

Praise being given to the Name of the Lord is closely related to the idea of blessing the Name. Qumran offers a few examples that describe the praise of the Name as a part of prayer: “And I, I will praise your Name.”⁹⁶ The expression is also common in the Deuterocanonical books of the Old Testament. Sirach 51:10-12 offers a dense sample of the two leading terms for praise being offered to the Name: εὐλογέω and αἰνέω.

I will praise (αἰνέω) your Name continually, and will sing hymns of thanksgiving. My prayer was heard, for you saved me from destruction and rescued me in time of trouble. For this reason I thank you and praise (αἰνέω) you, and I bless (εὐλογέω) the Name of the Lord. (Sir 51:10-12 NRSV)

Praise, αἰνέω, is directed to the Lord as well as to his Name, which is also the object of εὐλογέω, which can also be translated as praise. Both words mean speaking well of

⁹³ 1QS x.13

⁹⁴ 1QH^a x.30, xix.6; 4Q511 63-64ii.2, 63-64iv.2 are additional examples. If Davilla is correct in his reading of 4Q512 29-30.5, “he shall bless [his] Name” (as opposed to Baillet reading *šem* as *šām*, “And there he will bless”) then that text provides another example of this expression. Counting Davilla’s reading, 3 of these (1QH^a x.30; 4Q511 63-64ii.2; and 4Q512 29-30.5) have salvation as the context of blessing (*Liturgical Works*, [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000], 274).

⁹⁵ 1QM xviii, blessing the name in line 6.

⁹⁶ 4Q512 39.ii.1.

someone or something.⁹⁷ Sirach applies each term to the Name in other places,⁹⁸ and Tob 3:11 calls the Name “blessed,” εὐλογητός, the adjectival form of εὐλογέω.

These different terms indicate a variety of ways in which people gave honor to the Name of God through worship. Each of them contributes to the conclusion that the texts they represent were capable of expressing a high onomanology. The fact that they appear in such a wide range of texts from disparate groups in the Second Temple period indicates that an onomanology high enough to allow for some form of worship was not limited to Enochic, rabbinic, or Hellenistic Judaism, but was common to all three.

II. Call upon the Name

Another important term for worship is calling upon the Name of the Lord. *I Enoch* 45:3 refers to those who “called upon [God’s] glorious Name.”⁹⁹ We have already seen that one of the non-canonical psalms at Qumran connects salvation to calling upon the Name: “[...] for we call upon your name, and on your salvation [...]”¹⁰⁰ In *Judith* 16:2, Judith sings “before all Israel” and urges: “Raise to Him a new psalm; exalt him, and call upon his Name.” Despite the variations in soteriological perspective, all three emphasize the importance of calling upon the Name of the Lord, and connect that act to God’s salvation.

⁹⁷ αἰνέω BDAG, 27; LSJM, 39. εὐλογέω BDAG, 401-408; LSJM, 720-721. Di Lella points to the parallelism of the terms as playing an important role in the artistic structure of the poem (“Sirach 51:1-12: Poetic Structure,” 407).

⁹⁸ αἰνέω in 17:10 and εὐλογέω in 39:35.

⁹⁹ Charles’ translation.

¹⁰⁰ 4Q381 15.9

The *Genesis Apocryphon* preserved at Qumran contains at least one example of calling upon the Name as an act of formal sacrificial worship. It appears to retain this usage from biblical Genesis, in which references to calling upon the Name fall consistently into the model of an act of worship at an altar.¹⁰¹ After building an altar at Bethel, Abraham relates “upon it I offered holocausts and an offering to the God Most High, and invoked the Name of the Lord of the Universe there; I praised God’s Name and blessed God.”¹⁰²

However, as I noted in ch. 1, calling upon the Name of the Lord is not exclusively a cultic act. Isaiah provides numerous examples that are outside of formal worship, and more closely reflect the three uses above, which seem to portray worship, but not cultic practice. *1 Enoch 45* uses “calling upon the Name” outside of a cultic context, and reflects the same perspective as the warning in Isa 64-65 that Israel will fail to call upon the Name of the Lord and end up suffering the same fate as the nations who do not call upon his Name. The distinction in *1 En. 45* is between the elect and the sinners on the “day of suffering and tribulation.” The elect are those who have called upon the glorious Name of the Lord; the sinners are those who have not. As in Isaiah, those who fail to call upon the Name are excluded from salvation. By contrast, Judith’s song of victory is in response to salvation. Israel and Judith call on the Name of the Lord because of Israel’s deliverance from oppression and abuse through Judith’s victory over the Babylonian general Holofernes.

¹⁰¹ Gen 4:26, 12:8, 13:4, 21:33, 26:25. My discussion is in Chapter 1.

¹⁰² *1QapGen* xxi.2

III. Holiness and Blasphemy

Another broadly represented term is the designation of the Name as the *holy* Name. In the OT, this term is almost exclusive to writings from priestly circles, particularly Leviticus and Ezekiel, as well as the Psalms. By the first century, it is no longer limited to priestly circles, but is used more widely. The Dead Sea Scrolls and *I Enoch* show a great deal of concern for the holiness of the Name, in much the same way as the priestly writings. Those who oppose the Teacher of Righteousness are said to have dishonored “his holy Name.”¹⁰³ By contrast, in the Hymn for the Sabbath day, the community blesses “his holy Name for ever.”¹⁰⁴

Several of the texts concerning the holy Name have already been introduced in the section on soteriology since offering praise to the holy Name is a standard response to salvation, whether in a spiritual or earthly context. Thus the holy Name is the source of strength for the Messianic Prince,¹⁰⁵ and is the refuge for the faithful member of the community.¹⁰⁶ In persecution the benefits of salvation are not experienced in the present world but they are anticipated with such confidence that the believer “sanctifies” the Name, treating it as holy.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰³ 1QpHab ii.4 (García Martínez, 13).

¹⁰⁴ 4Q504 vii.5 a similar text at 4Q286 2.13 also refers to “your holy...” but the context is less certain. Vermes assumes “bless in community your holy name” (*Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, 379).

¹⁰⁵ 1QSb (1Q28b) v.28

¹⁰⁶ CD-B xx.34

¹⁰⁷ 4Q177 iv.15 the root is *qdš*.

Holiness is also manifested by the concern to protect the Name against blasphemy or profanation. Both Leviticus and Ezekiel prominently express the same concern.¹⁰⁸ The Name must be protected against blasphemy and defilement because of its holiness. This protective concern is even more widespread in Second Temple literature than are direct references to the “holy Name.”

In 2 Maccabees, a redaction of what was likely a Greek original from Egypt, composed around the turn of era, the people ask the Lord to remember “the blasphemies committed against his Name; and to show his hatred of evil.”¹⁰⁹ Rabbinic Judaism would preserve similar concerns about blaspheming the Name. The Mishna treats blasphemy as a capital offence. Sanhedrin 7 lays out procedures for accusing and trying someone for blasphemy. Two features demonstrate how seriously the rabbis took the need to avoid blasphemous use of the Name. First, a person must fully pronounce the Name in order to be liable of blasphemy.¹¹⁰ If the person stops short of speaking the full Name, real blasphemy has not taken place, in spite of the ill speaking the perpetrator may have intended against God. The second has to do with the careful procedures for taking testimony. The accused cannot be stoned on any but the strongest evidence and so the people who heard the blasphemy must tell the court what they heard. In order to prevent further offense against the Name, their testimony must use a circumlocution rather than the actual Name.

¹⁰⁸ See Chapter 1.

¹⁰⁹ 2 Macc 8:4 NRSV

¹¹⁰ *m. Sanh.* 7:5 (Neusner, 597)

Even this, however, is not finally sufficient evidence to execute. Once the case has finished, everyone is sent away except the judges and the witnesses. The most important witness repeats the exact words that he heard, this time including the Name. Upon hearing the quoted blasphemy, the judges tear their clothes. The other witnesses only confirm that they too heard what that witness said, so that the blasphemy does not have to be repeated. The Name has to be spoken in order for the court to execute the ultimate penalty, but even in quotation those words are devastating enough that they have to be minimized. In this way, the need to protect the sanctity of the Name is enshrined in rabbinic legal procedure.

4 Ezra, which probably comes from Palestine during the first century describes the judgment upon those who defile the Name: “For the Most High did not intend that men should be destroyed; but they themselves who were created have defiled (*coinquino*) the Name of him who made them, and have been ungrateful to him who prepared life for them.”¹¹¹

Not surprisingly, the concern to protect the Name against these offences was also present at Qumran, where it is part of the same theological perspective as the references to the Holy Name. In the Damascus Document, the covenanters are commanded to swear by the curses of the covenant rather than by the Name. “Neither should one mention the Law of Moses, for in it is the full enunciation of the Name. And if he swears and transgresses, he profanes (*hll*) the Name.”¹¹² The Name had been called upon to ensure

¹¹¹ 4 Ezra (2 Esdras) 8:59-60.

¹¹² CD xv.2-3

specific results, and the failure to fulfill the oath undermines the perception of its power and authority.

IV. Additional High Onomanology Texts

Finally, several examples of a high onomanology occur in texts which do not clearly fit in the categories discussed above. In many cases, these examples appear outside of the major themes treated in early Jewish literature, but appear in the second-century Christian literature.

In certain texts, God is said to act for the sake of his Name. This idea is related to the common understanding that one's name represents one's reputation. However, in God's case he acts for the sake of his Name in order to protect its holiness. The War Scroll indicates that God extends salvation to his people for the sake of his Name.

From of old you have kept us for your covenant. You have opened for us many times the gates of salvation. For the sake of your covenant you have removed our misery in your goodness towards us. You, God of justice, have acted for the sake of your Name."¹¹³

In the passage, "for the sake of your Name" and "for the sake of your covenant" serve as the double justification for the assumption that God will act. The community does not doubt that he will prevent the defilement of his Name.

¹¹³ 1QM xviii.7-8. The *Thanksgiving Hymns* contain a similar, if less full, example: "to lead the weak by the strength of your might [...] for your name and to show yourself mighty in [your] glo[ry.]" 1QH^a xxiii.7-8.

In 4 Ezra,¹¹⁴ Ezra asks his angelic interpreter to explain how it is possible that Israel is under foreign oppression as if the covenants no longer existed. He concludes in 4 Ezra 4:25: “But what will he do for his Name, by which we are called?” Ezra presumes that God must act, and must preserve Israel, for the sake of his Name. This accords with some biblical precedent,¹¹⁵ but as we will see in later chapters, this is not the way Christians will speak of God acting for the sake of his Name. The War Scroll and 4 Ezra each asks rhetorically what the Lord will do for the sake of his Name. Both assume that God will choose to save his people in order to assure fulfillment of the covenant, and thereby uphold his Name.

In the hymn of praise in Sir 39, Ben Sira urges his reader to praise and extol the Lord. Along with blessing the Lord with songs of praise, he says to “ascribe majesty to his Name.”¹¹⁶ The rest of the poem expands upon the introductory statement, and the greatness that is expressed by the rehearsal of God’s power over creation is summarized by the declaration of his majesty and greatness in 39:15.¹¹⁷ The chapter also concludes with another reference to the Name,¹¹⁸ but the ascription of majesty (μεγαλωσύνη) is noteworthy. This attribution is relatively uncommon but implies a very high

¹¹⁴ In the central chapters, which come from a non-Christian Jewish author, thus their inclusion here rather than with the Christian materials.

¹¹⁵ See especially Josh 7:9. “For the Canaanites and all the inhabitants of the land will hear of it, and will surround us, and cut off our name from the earth; and what wilt thou do for thy great name?”

¹¹⁶ Sir 39:15

¹¹⁷ James L Crenshaw describes the chapter as “a carefully crafted hymn extolling the creator for a well ordered universe.” “The Book of Sirach” *Interpreter’s Bible Commentary*, V.815. This description of the purpose of the hymn highlights the connection between praise of the Name and creation.

¹¹⁸ Sirach 39:35. Di Lella considers the repetition of the call to bless the Name to be a “double *inclusio*.” *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 459.

onomanology.¹¹⁹ Sirach contains further references to the Name.¹²⁰ Although none are particularly noteworthy, the cumulative effect is similar to that of the Psalms: the Name is to be praised, and often in the context of salvation.

A final passage is Philo's reference to the "Son of God" as the Name, among other designations, in *Conf.* 146: "The great archangel of many names ... is called the authority, and the Name of God, and the Word, and man according to God's image, and he who sees Israel." Philo does not do much with the Name other than place it on the same footing in this passage as the Logos. But given his extensive Logos theology, this association has been understood by scholars like Arai, Fossum and Gieschen to imply a high onomanology.¹²¹

Conclusions

I will now summarize the conclusions for the several sections of this chapter's investigation into non-Christian Jewish onomanology outside the Hebrew Bible. Many texts provide examples of offering praise or thanksgiving in the context of salvation; however, the only texts that seem to associate the Name of God directly with saving activity come from the Dead Sea Scrolls and from the *Similitudes of Enoch*. In these,

¹¹⁹ According to BDAG, μεγαλωσύνη is used only of God (623). Grundmann, says that 'μεγαλωσύνη' is used in the New Testament for the Divine Name ('μεγαλωσύνη,' TDNT 4.544).

¹²⁰ Praise or bless the Name (17:10 [in a creation context]; 47:10; 50:20; 51:1-3, 11-12); a priestly blessing in the Name of the Lord (45:15); concern not to misuse the Name (23:9-10). In the section on Solomon, Ben Sira includes the references to the house for the Name (47:13,18)

¹²¹ Arai, *Die Christologie des Evangelium Veritatis*, Leiden, 1964, 71. Fossum, *Name of God*, 109, 269. Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*, 108-110.

thanks is given to the Name for salvation, not simply in a soteriological context, or the Name is actually treated as the means by which God saves. There is also a distinction between the ways the Similitudes and the Scrolls speak of salvation. The salvation that is provided by the Name in the Similitudes is spiritually oriented or future directed. In contrast the Dead Sea Scrolls, particularly the later materials, have a view to the present, earthly deliverance from immediate threats. In this way, the salvation associated with the Name is very much like the more general view of salvation these texts are found to hold.

Cosmological notions of the Name's power and activity are more widespread than soteriological ideas. The Name is used to refer to the imposition of order onto an otherwise unruly cosmos. Through its power, cosmological phenomena, ranging from the sun, moon, and stars to the weather and the oceans, are kept in their proper courses. This cosmological activity is not a late addition to the order, but it has been from the very beginning responsible for the very foundations of creation. In grateful response to this cosmological preservation, the faithful respond with praise.

In exploring the theme of the Name's concealment, we saw that this theme is relatively minor in comparison to its prominence in the later kabbalistic literature. The examples we have share the same view of the Name's concealment: it is concealed because of its greatness and the great power associated with it. In *I Enoch*, that power is explicitly cosmological power. That perception results in two different approaches to the concealment, which are lexically signaled. In *Prayer of Jacob*, and *I En. 69*, the Name is called secret or hidden, and its power is sought out to be used. In *Joseph and Aseneth 15* and *Apocalypse of Abraham 10*, the concealment is respected, and the prohibition on use is emphasized by calling the Name "ineffable." Interestingly, the heavenly man of *Joseph*

and Aseneth makes the point that the prohibition is particularly linked to this world, implying that in heaven itself the Name might be pronouncable.

The final section sought to investigate other appearances of onomanological language that suggest a high onomanology. Certain texts were seen to associate the Name with the language or practice of worship. Emphasis on the holiness of the Name, and the related concern to prevent blasphemy against the Name are represented in texts from a wide range of sources; Qumran literature, the Enochic Similitudes, 2 Maccabees, Mishnaic legislation, and *4 Ezra* all share this concern. In addition to two references to the holy Name, Ben Sira also ascribes majesty (μεγαλωσύνη) to the Name of God. In addition, Qumran and *4 Ezra* both display the expectation that God will act, in both cases delivering Israel, out of a concern to protect the reputation of his good Name.

Chapter Three

The ὄνομα Theologies in the New Testament

Introduction

This chapter will show the several aspects of Jewish Name Theology that are picked up and adapted in the New Testament. While these texts serve as resources for second century Christians making use of onomanological themes, they first and foremost represent attempts by the earliest Christians to make use of the connotations that were already established in Judaism for God's Name. A few preliminary observations will serve to anticipate my results and to provide a framework for the chapter. New Testament writers begin to apply Name Theology to Jesus Christ, but they do not do so by making a simple transference of concepts related to the Name from YHWH to the Son. Instead, Name Theology is expanded to include application to the Son alongside references that continue to apply many of the same concepts to the Father. This is most apparent in Acts and in the Gospel of John, where there are enough references to see the names of both Father and Son referred to with some frequency.

I will proceed by examining the larger themes for which Name Theology is used in the New Testament, emphasizing several examples in each section. The book of Acts contains both the greatest number of references to the Name, as well as the widest range of uses. Other books, however, tend to work primarily within a preferred category. The well known passages from Philippians and Hebrews use the Name to describe the exaltation of the Son. Many examples from Acts and from John stress the soteriological activity of the Name. The book of Revelation, especially when viewed in contrast with

the Gospel of John, stresses the concealment of the Name, and the limited revelation of the secret Name in relation to salvation. Conspicuous by its absence is the cosmological function of the Name that was present in some of the Jewish material examined in ch. 2, and which will also be prominent in several second century Christian texts. The sequence in which I treat these themes—Exaltation, Worship, Soteriology, and the Relation of the Name to the World—is chosen for convenience of discussion; it is not intended to follow any order of composition or to reflect a development of onomanology within the New Testament.

I. Exaltation

In the hymn of Philippians 2, Christ Jesus is given “the name that is above every name” as part of the glorification of the second half of that hymn. The hymn is structured so that the first half (Phil 2:5-8) emphasizes the magnitude of Christ’s humility in incarnation and crucifixion by setting them in contrast with his prior status (ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ).¹ The second half (Phil 2:9-11) then describes his restoration to high status after his

¹ Scholars disagree about whether or not the hymn refers to Christ’s preexistent glory. The traditional interpretation, that “being in the form of God” describes the Son’s divinity prior to the incarnation, is represented by Ralph P. Martin, *A Hymn of Christ*, (Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press, 1997), 99-133; L.J. Lietaert Peerbolte, “The Name Above All Names (Philippians 2:9),” in *The Revelation of the Name YHWH to Moses. Perspectives from Judaism, the Pagan Graeco-Roman World, and Early Christianity* (ed. George H. van Kooten; Themes in Biblical Narrative 9; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 187-206, here 197, 201-2; Charles Gieschen “The Divine Name in Ante-Nicene Christology,” *VC* 57 [2003]: 115-58, here 128-29. James Dunn makes the argument that the hymn should be read in the context of mid first century Adam Christology and that it contrasts Jesus’ humility with Adam’s grasping, and says nothing one way or the other about the Son prior to the incarnation (*Christology in the Making* [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1980], 114-121). John Reumann provides a categorized summary of the options scholars have

crucifixion. At the center of this exaltation is the Name which he is given in v. 9. The name giving is parallel to the high exaltation of the previous line, and is used to define that exaltation.² Although the text says the name is above every other name, it does not explicitly say what the name is.³ There is a hint, however, in the concluding statement that at this Name (of Jesus) every knee will bow and tongue confess that he is Lord. This is not, however simply an acknowledgement of his superiority and authority in which κύριος = Lord in the sense of “master.” The declaration is an adaptation of Isa 45:23.

Isa 45:23 By myself I swear ... because to me every knee shall bow, and every tongue shall acknowledge God. (NETS)

Phil 2:9-11 Therefore God has highly exalted him and bestowed on him the Name which is above every name, that at the Name of Jesus every knee should bow ... and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.

Bert-Jan Lietaert Peerbolte works through the changes that take place between the LXX text and its adaptation in the hymn, and concludes that the most significant of these is the

chosen on this passage, along with a graphical representation of the three basic categories. All three assume a transition takes place in v. 9 (*Philippians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* [Anchor Yale Bible 33b; New Haven: Yale, 2008] 333-39). For my purposes, the question of the earlier status is less important than the later exaltation that begins in v. 9.

² Reumann calls the καὶ epexigetical, and says that the verbs are coincident (*Philippians*, 354-55).

³ Some scholars have understood the name here mentioned to be “Jesus” itself. Even skirting the fact that the name “Jesus” was bestowed at birth, the beginning of the kenosis rather than at the conclusion, saying that the name is Jesus does not account for the use of Isaiah. S Bénétreau makes the argument that the name is not in fact specified, and ought to be left as an unexplained mystery rather than identified as κύριος (“Le Nom Mystérieux de *Philippiens* 2,9,” *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* 89 [2009] 313-331). Gieschen understands the text to refer to κύριος, and interprets that as YHWH (“Ante-Nicene,” 128-29). Reumann gives a summary of the scholarly positions regarding the identification of the name, but concludes that it is κύριος (*Philippians*, 355, 373-74).

shift from God to Jesus.⁴ In the LXX, this comes in the midst of assertions of the absolute monotheism that is typical of this section of the book of Isaiah. In Isa 45:21-22 YHWH declares three times that there is none beside him. The statement that the Philippian hymn picks up is the logical conclusion: since there is no one with whom God shares standing, all will have to acknowledge him. The hymn, however, puts Jesus in the place of God, and does so on the basis of the Name above every name. If possession of this name justifies identifying Jesus with God, the Name in Philippians must then be a name that is exclusively associated with God. The most logical candidate is the Divine Name, and that is the conclusion of most scholars.

The passage in Isaiah contains the Divine Name in the Hebrew of vv. 21, 24, and 25,⁵ but it is not central to the passage. God identifies himself as YHWH, but the predicted confession is that this God, YHWH, is truly the only God. Philippians takes this up and uses the Name as the primary means of making the same statement about Jesus Christ. Possession of the Name serves the hymn writer as an effective means of asserting the highly exalted status to which Christ is raised after his submission to death.⁶

A similar choice is made in Hebrews 1, even though the name in question may be different. In seeking a way to express the superiority of Christ over against angels, v. 4 concludes by measuring his superiority on an onomanological basis. Christ's name is

⁴ Peerbolte, "Name Above all Names," 203-4.

⁵ The LXX does not contain the phrase in Isa 45:21 or 24. It translates it by κύριος in v. 25.

⁶ Peerbolte understands the bestowal of the name to identify Jesus Christ with God and to function as a divine vindication in heaven. In this way he understands it to serve the same function (vindication of Christ's suffering) that would later be served by the resurrection ("Name Above all Names," 205-6).

“more excellent” than that of the angels, and he ought to be recognized as superior to them to the same degree. This is no small exaltation in Hebrews. Verses 1-4 describe him as the reflection of God’s glory, the “express image” of God’s being, the sustainer of all things, and seated at the right hand of majesty. The most common way to read ὄνομα in v. 4 is to understand the name to be “Son” on the basis of v. 5 “For to which of the angels did God ever say, “You are my Son; today I have begotten you”? Or again, “I will be his Father, and he will be my Son”?”⁷ Sonship had already been introduced in v. 2, and these scholars typically take the ubiquity of the Son references to strengthen the conclusion that Son is intended as the name. That same extensive use of the word Son can also be taken as an argument that it cannot be the name that is inherited since the one inheriting has been called Son since the outset of the passage. Charles Gieschen understands it to be a reference to the Divine Name, and Luke Timothy Johnson favors understanding the name as “precisely his designation as ‘Lord’ (*kyrios*).”⁸ This interpretation is defensible. The statement that the name is inherited implies that it is something given to him by the Father, which was also possessed by the Father, and the Divine Name fits that description better than the designation “Son.” I prefer Johnson’s interpretation of the text, however

⁷ Among others, “Son” is favored by George Wesley Buchanan, *To the Hebrews: A New Translation* (Anchor Bible 36; Garden City: Doubleday, 1972), 9; Harold W. Attridge, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989), 47-48; Craig R. Koester, *To the Hebrews: A New Translation* (Anchor Bible 36; New York: Doubleday, 2001), 181-2.

⁸ Gieschen, “Ante-Nicene,” 142-43. Luke Timothy Johnson, *Hebrews: A Commentary* (OTL; Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2006), 73-74. Gieschen places more emphasis on the description of the name as greater than the angels. He also associates Hebrews use of word language (both ῥῆμα and λόγος) with Divine Name traditions, and supports his interpretation of 1:4 with references from 1:2 and 4:12-13.

Bénétreau's admonition to leave the identification in mystery is even more appropriate here than in Phil 2:9.⁹

More important for this discussion, however, is that whatever specific name Hebrews understands the Son to have inherited, it considers the name that he bears to be an important way of defining his exalted status. Even if Hebrews understands the ὄνομα of Jesus Christ differently than the Philippian hymn, both employ onomanology for the same purpose: as the best available indicator of the Son's supremely exalted status.¹⁰

II. Worship

The New Testament does not speak directly of worship offered to the Name. It does, however, offer a way of associating the Name with worship. The hymn in Philippians has some evidence of this, as the Son is being treated with dignity on account of the Name he is given. John 12:28 contains one of the few New Testament references to the glorification of the Name. Jesus prays: “ ‘Father, glorify your Name.’ Then a voice came from heaven, ‘I have glorified it, and I will glorify it again.’ ” In this prayer, Jesus connects his crucifixion to the glorification of the Father's Name, declaring that glorification to be the purpose for which he came into the world. The Father's response, anticipates Jesus own declaration regarding the Name in chapter 17 that he had made the Father's Name known, and would make it known again. Brown points out the connection

⁹ Bénétreau, “Le Nom Mystérieux,” 316.

¹⁰ Harold Attridge makes a similar observation. “Hebrews's specification of the ‘name’ is certainly different from that of the traditional hymn in Philippians, but both texts are rooted in the same early Christian tradition with its complex Jewish heritage” (*Hebrews*, 48).

between 12:28 and the glorification of the Name in ch. 17, where that glorification is a major purpose of Christ's incarnation. Glorifying the Father's Name there is equivalent to glorifying the Father himself.¹¹

Perhaps the most direct association between the Name and worship is found in Hebrews 13:15, where Hebrews pits praise of God against ritual sacrifice as variant and rival forms of worship. Hebrews' assumption that the believer's praise is superior to the sacrificial system is an expression of a scriptural theme found repeatedly in the prophets, and also one that is common in contemporary Greco-Roman culture.¹² It is interesting that Hebrews describes this praise as the confession (ομολογέω) of God's Name rather than the Son's, in spite of the earlier confessions of Christ.¹³ That this praise is offered to the Father's Name is apparent both from the fact that it is offered through Jesus and from

¹¹ Brown, John 1.475-77. Brown also stresses that revelation of the name to men is a significant aspect of that glorification. Gieschen takes this equation a step further in finding evidence in John 12:28 that the Son is in fact "the embodiment of the Divine Name," connecting this verse with the statements in ch. 17 that Jesus has manifested the name. Gieschen also suggests that the incarnation is thus similar to the Deuteronomic conception of the *Shem* as God's presence upon earth in the temple (*Ante-Nicene*, 135). The Deuteronomic *Shem* Theology, however, usually describes a relatively passive presence, not the kind of presence and activity John describes in the incarnational manifestation of the name.

¹² Luke Timothy Johnson points out the connection to both Jewish and Greco-Roman piety (*Hebrews: A Commentary* [Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2006], 349).

¹³ Heb 3:1, 4:14. Koester, *Hebrews*, 572. Nearly all commentators recognize the use of ομολογέω here as *confess* rather than as *praise*, a majority that Paul Ellingworth acknowledges in expressing his dissenting view that it ought to be taken as *praise* (*The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Greek text* [NICTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993], 721). Lane provides the exegetical argument for understanding the nuance as *praise*, but that interpretation continues to be the minority (*Hebrews* [WBC 47; Dallas: Word, 1991], 2.524, 550- 51).

Hebrews' normal preference for applying ὄνομα to the Father.¹⁴ The Son's role as the one through whom the believer's confession reaches the Father as praise provides a theological link to Clement of Rome, who will put Christ into a similar intermediary position. Hebrews does not relate the confession of God's Name here to salvation, as is commonly the case in the NT: in general, in Hebrews Christian behavior toward the Name is only indirectly connected with salvation. In both 2:12 and 6:10 salvation is part of the context, but 2:12 relates the declaration of the Name to praise, and in 6:10 love for the Name is showed by ministering to the saints as an act said to accompany salvation. In short, Christians relate to the Name in the context of their salvation, but not as a means to salvation. Other New Testament material, however, makes a much stronger association between the Name and the believer's salvation.

III. Soteriology

The Name is most often associated with salvation in Acts and in the Johannine literature. The most direct statement of Acts' Name oriented soteriology is found in Peter's declaration at Acts 4:12: "There is salvation in no one else, for there is no other name under heaven given among mortals by which we must be saved." Peter is before the Sanhedrin, defending his actions in healing a lame man "in the Name of Jesus." The first thing to recognize is the logic by which Peter introduces salvation in this context at all. Throughout the pericope, "name" language has been central to the discussion: the

¹⁴ The variant reading in K (διὰ τοῦτο οὗν) makes the case even more clearly that the Father is intended as the one whose name is confessed since it removes the Son from the verse. Although it is not the original reading, it provides support for understanding the name as the Father's.

Sanhedrin ask by what name Peter and John heal and teach (4:7), Peter explains that they act by the Name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth (4:10), and finally the Sanhedrin forbid them to speak or teach in that Name (4:17-18). Peter's declaration at 4:12 is the concluding statement of his defense, and it moves directly from explaining the source of the man's healing to basing that healing in a statement about salvation. In order for this to make sense, Peter must intend healing to represent a particular instance of the complete restoration of salvation.¹⁵ Not only is healing available through the name of a man the Sanhedrin had rejected, it is exclusively available through that name.

Healing is among the most frequent uses of name language in the book of Acts. The testimony in ch. 4 refers to the healing story of ch. 3, in which the man is commanded to stand up "in the Name of Jesus Christ" in v. 6. When explaining to the crowd in v. 10 what had happened, Peter does not say that Jesus healed the man, but he attributes that healing to "his Name itself," and says that it was made possible by faith in that Name. In chs. 16 and 19, the power of the Name is used for exorcism, also a form of healing, albeit on a more explicitly spiritual level. These verses support the notion that Acts first of all conceives of salvation and healing as related acts, and second that the Name of Jesus Christ is involved in both of them.¹⁶

¹⁵ C. K. Barrett relates the sense of σωτηρία to healing (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* [ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994-98], 230-33). Richard Pervo refers to the name's efficacy in healing as "a synecdoche, as we should say, of that name as the sole basis of salvation" (*Acts of the Apostles* [Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2009], 117).

¹⁶ Fitzmyer mentions salvation's dual meaning, and suggests that both physical and spiritual may be in view in Acts 4:9 (*Acts of the Apostles* [AB; New Haven: Yale, 2008], 300).

A further point about Acts 4:12 is contained in the two phrases Peter uses to define the Name. It is a name “under heaven,” and it is “given among men.” Both of these points suggest that the activity of the Name is understood, and explicitly described, as exercised in the present world and already given to living people. Barrett suggests that “under heaven” simply means “anywhere,” and is not meant theologically.¹⁷ Being paired with “given among men,” however, does suggest that a specifically earthly connotation is intended.¹⁸ The best way to translate τὸ δεδομένον ἐν ἀνθρώποις is debated,¹⁹ but however it is rendered, the implication is that there is a present, local revelation of the Name, and that that Name is effective for immediate deliverance in that present, local context, not only for an eschatologically conceived salvation. Thus, the primary intention of both phrases is to declare the exclusivity of the Name in soteriology, but to do so by stressing the earthly, human context of the Name’s power.

Because the Name must be known before it can save, Acts emphasizes the proclamation of the Name. Although Peter and John are questioned about the healing,

¹⁷ Barrett, *Acts*, 232.

¹⁸ Gieschen reads this as evidence of an inter-Jewish debate concerning the name. He concludes that under heaven is specifically concerned with refuting a perspective that forbids the pronunciation of the name on earth. He offers *Asc. Isa.* 9.5 and 10.7 as evidence of this perspective among Christians. To this, I would add *Apoc. Ab.* 10:3-8; *Joseph and Aseneth* 15:12x; and *Pr. Jac.* as further evidence of the widespread nature of this idea in the first and second centuries C.E. Further discussion in ch. 2 above.

¹⁹ There are translational difficulties with this phrase: τὸ δεδομένον ἐν ἀνθρώποις. Barrett thinks (following BDR § 412.4) the articular participle serves as a relative clause. The choice of ἐν ἀνθρώποις rather than simply ἀνθρώποις is also difficult. ἐν suggests the translation “among,” rather than the more natural and expected “to” or “for” which would have been suggested by the dative without preposition (*Acts*, 232-33). In an interpretation that emphasizes the spatial aspect further, Joseph Fitzmyer translates it as “given to human beings” in light of the apparent understanding in the variant readings of MS D and the Latin manuscripts, which omit ἐν (*Acts*, 302).

they are ultimately ordered not to speak or to teach in Jesus' Name. When they are brought back before the Sanhedrin in ch. 5, it is for continuing to proclaim the Name in violation of this order. As the focus of Acts shifts to Paul, he is described as being chosen to proclaim the Name to the Gentiles in ch. 9:15 and again in vv. 27-28.

In the three remaining verses that give the Name a role in salvation, two directly connect salvation to the act of calling upon the Name: Acts 2:21 and 22:16. It is not entirely clear in either verse whether the author intends the Name to be that of the Father or of the Son. Acts 2:21 is a citation of Joel 3:5 (LXX),²⁰ where κύριος renders *yhwh*. In the context in Acts, however, Peter is drawing the connection between this prophetic passage and the work of Jesus of Nazareth in order to identify him with YHWH,²¹ and so the "Name of the LORD" would appear to be identical in this instance with the name of the Son.²² In 22:16 Paul is recounting his conversion and call experience, and refers to calling upon "his name" as part of his salvation. The consensus appears to be that "his" refers to Jesus, even though Pervo admits that grammatically the antecedent ought to be "God" from v.14.²³ The variant reading of a few manuscripts should also be understood as referring to Jesus Christ. In place of "his Name," these manuscripts read "the Name of the Lord," assimilating to the typical formula for calling upon the Name.²⁴ Acts displays a pattern of applying κύριος to Jesus. Furthermore, in the immediate context Paul has

²⁰ Joel 2:32 in NRSV, and most other English Bibles.

²¹ Fitzmyer, *Acts of the Apostles*, 253-254.

²² Gieschen describes this verse as establishing Acts' Name Theology.

²³ Pervo, *Acts of the Apostles*, 565.

²⁴ Mss H L S Ç (James Hardy Ropes, *The Text of Acts* [vol. 3 of *The Beginnings of Christianity: The Acts of the Apostles*; ed. F. J. Foakes Jackson, and Kirsopp Lake; London: Macmillan, 1926], 212).

addressed Jesus of Nazareth as Lord (22:9-10), and this is precisely the acknowledgement that Ananias requires of Paul in v.16.²⁵ Recognizing that both of these “call upon” verses refer to the Name of the Son allows for the conclusion that in Acts salvation requires that the believer offer worship to Jesus by calling on his Name in a way that places him on the same level as the Old Testament YHWH, and transfers the theological convictions about YHWH onto Jesus Christ.²⁶

The remaining soteriological reference to the Name in Acts is at 10:43, where the salvation that comes “through the Name” is based on belief in Jesus of Nazareth, and it is to this association of Name with belief that I turn to now. The theme of belief is also recognized as a central part of the theology of the Gospel of John.²⁷ Not surprisingly, it is prominent whenever the Gospel speaks of the Name soteriologically. Three verses that

²⁵ Some of the language in Ananias’s statement raises questions about the nature of his own theology, or that of the source Luke used for this account. Jesus is referred to as “the Righteous One” rather than as Lord or Messiah, and God is “the God of our Fathers.” Both of these, combined with Paul’s description of him in v. 12 have led to the suggestion that in Acts 22 Ananias is portrayed as a Jew rather than as a Christian. Lake describes him as “an original Christian of the most primitive Jewish type,” and considers the more Hellenistic language of Acts 9 to be later (*Beginnings of Christianity*, V.190-191). If this is correct, and the speech in Acts 22 most accurately reflect Ananias’ own words, he may have not have intended “his name” to refer to Christ. Acts 22, however, is Paul’s retelling of the episode, and in that context Ananias’ statement must be read as following up on Paul’s account of the appearance in vv. 8-10. There it is Jesus who appears to and speaks to Paul, and who receives recognition as “Lord.”

²⁶ Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 203.

²⁷ C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel according to St. John* (2nd ed.; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978), 575, also 164. Brown calls it a major theme of the Book of Signs, *John*, 1.cxlili. Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of John* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003), 325-328. Urban von Wahlde presents different evaluations of the function of belief in each of the three editions of the Gospel that he detects, but in each of them, belief is important to John’s soteriology (*Gospel and Letters of John*, [3vols.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010], I.76-79, 82-83, 94-96, 97-98, 172-173, 337-338).

make a connection between the Name and salvation do so using forms of πιστεύω.²⁸ The first is John 1:12:

But as many as received him:
He gave to them the authority to become the children of God
to those *believing in his Name*.²⁹

The verse equates believing on his Name with receiving Christ.³⁰ The final phrase simply defines those who were given the power, the same ones who were signaled as the logical subject of the verse in the first phrase. Both of the verbs used to describe their actions, “receive” and “believe,” imply a conscious choice and so emphasize the idea that the believer has already taken possession of their association with Christ, and is aware of that possession.

On the other hand, failure to believe in the Name results in the judgment from which the Son entered the world in order to save it, according to John 3:17-18.

For God sent the Son into the world, not to condemn the world, but that the world might be saved through him
He who believes in him is not condemned;
he who does not believe is condemned already,
because he has not believed in the Name of the only Son of God.

²⁸ One other verse, John 2:23, refers to believing in his name, but has no other explicit reference to salvation. It appears to describe an inadequate belief. Keener points out that these three references, coming in the opening (1:12), the key revelatory episode with Nicodemus (3:18), and the conclusion of the Gospel (20:31) are deployed at particularly strategic points, “to stress the necessity of embracing God’s agent” (*Gospel of John*, 400).

²⁹ My translation. ὅσοι δὲ ἔλαβον αὐτόν,
ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τέκνα θεοῦ γενέσθαι,
τοῖς πιστεύουσιν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ

³⁰ Ramsey Michaels calls them “virtually synonymous” for the whole Gospel (*Gospel of John* [NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010], 68).

These verses follow the same pattern as in 1:12, making belief in the Name equivalent to belief in the Son. The addition of condemnation to the context makes it clear that the salvation under discussion is part of John's realized eschatology. The Son and his Name are present in the world, and their presence already serves to condemn those who refuse to believe and to deliver those who do believe.³¹

John 20:31, the last instance of this constellation of ideas, is different in that it rearranges the language and does not refer to "believing in his Name."³² The verse expresses the purpose for the composition of the Gospel:³³

but these are written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing you may have life in his Name. (John 20:31 RSV)

Here, what is believed is the Messianic identity and divine origin for Jesus that the Gospel has put forward.³⁴ The Name, while not mentioned as the subject of belief in John 20:31, is the source of the life that believers enjoy as a result of receiving Jesus as Messiah and as Son of God. John 3:18 equated believing in Jesus with believing in his Name, and 20:31 adds another way to relate belief, Jesus, Name, and salvation. By

³¹ Brown, *John*, 1.CXVI-CXXI, 147.

³² John F. McHugh calls it an "almost identical phrase, fractionally but adroitly altered" from what is found in the earlier occurrences (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on John 1-4* [London: T&T Clark, 2009], 46).

³³ Or the conclusion of the present section of the Gospel. Brown interprets it as the conclusion to the "Book of Glory" (*John*, 1056-1061). Barrett treats chapter 21 as an addendum, and 20:30-31 as the conclusion to the Gospel "as originally planned." (*John*, 575-576). Michaels represents what he calls the "distinctly minority opinion" that the verse was only intended as a conclusion to a series of post-resurrection appearances, and not to the overall Gospel or to one of the author's sources (*John*, 1020-22).

³⁴ Brown, *John*, 1059-1061, argues that "Son of God" should be taken as a profound confession. John has insisted throughout that the confession of Jesus as the Messiah was not alone sufficient, and that in addition to this Jesus had to be recognized as having come from the Father as His special representative in the world, that Jesus and the Father share a special present to one another, and that Jesus bears the Divine Name "I AM".

making Jesus (rather than his Name) the subject of belief, this concluding verse is closer to the expression “believing in him,” which is otherwise typical of the Gospel. The concepts are equivalent because the salvation that results from belief in either can be characterized as “life in his Name.” These three verses, strategically positioned at the introduction, conclusion, and one of the climactic soteriological passages,³⁵ merge salvific belief in Jesus as the Christ with Name Theology in order to indicate that Jesus Christ’s saving power is particularly connected to his possession of the Name.³⁶

When Christ refers to his own Name in the Gospel of John, he is ordinarily urging or authorizing his followers to entreat the Father in his Name.³⁷ These references do not give detail about the Name Christ possesses, but there is reason to conclude that John conceives of it as being related to, or the same as, the Name of the Father. For example, Christ refers to the Father’s Name in several places across the Gospel. The Son comes in the Father’s Name,³⁸ does work in the Father’s Name,³⁹ calls upon the Father to glorify

³⁵ Keener, *Gospel of John*, 400; similarly, McHugh calls 1:12 and 20:31 an “all-embracing *inclusio*” (*John 1-4*, 46).

³⁶ For John, belief in the name is what it means to receive or believe in Christ. The shorter phrase is more common in the gospel (Ernst Haenchen, *John: a commentary on the Gospel of John*, [2 vols.; Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984], 1.192). The use of name language at these three strategic points indicates that Christ’s saving power has a connection to his name. John does not have an independently active name. Christ acts through the Father’s name, which was given to him, and we are saved through his name, which is given to us. The same Johannine language is present in 1 John as well. Three times the epistle writer refers to his readers belief in the name of the Son (3:23 and twice in 5:13).

³⁷ e.g., at John 14:13-14, 15:16, 16:23-26. The lone exception is the pneumatological statement in John 14:26, “...the counselor, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name...”

³⁸ 5:43, 12:13

³⁹ 10:25

his Name⁴⁰ and manifests the Father's Name.⁴¹ These texts suggest that it is the Father's Name that is the authorization for the Son's mission in his descent to earth. Christ says in John 10:25 that the works he does in his Father's Name ought to be recognized as proof of that authorization. They demonstrate that indeed he is sent by the Father and does come "in his Name." However, this leaves open the question of how the Son came into possession of the Father's Name, and whether it should be identified as his own Name as well.

According to two references in John 17, the Son comes to possess the Name in the Fourth Gospel because the Father gives it to him. These are the only two references in the Gospel to the Father giving the Son a name,⁴² but they serve to explain the authority assumed in the command to "ask in my Name." The Son's Name bears this weight because it is the Father's Name, given to the Son.⁴³

⁴⁰ 12:28

⁴¹ 17:6, 26

⁴² There is also a textual variant at this point which would have the Father giving "them," (οὖς) the disciples, to the son in each verse. This textual variant is rejected by the editors, primarily on the grounds that the singular ὃ better explains the variants than does the plural οὖς. It is worth noting, however, that among the early supporters for reading the statement as referring to the disciples rather than the name are a version of the Diatessaron (i) (for v.11) the vulgate, several of the old Latin texts, as well as Athanasius (11) and Origen (12). A few older translation follow this rendering (KJV/NKJV, JB/NJB) as well as the NEB. Nearly all modern translations and commentators accept that the Father's name is given. Brown provides a discussion of the phrase, acknowledging it as the only instance where John says the Divine Name is given to Jesus (*John*, 2.759). Also, Barrett, *John*, 508. Both Brown and Barrett argue against Burney's suggestion that ὃ is a mistranslation of the Aramaic relative pronoun which would have been better rendered by οὖς (*The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel*, 102f. cited in Barrett, *John*, 508).

⁴³ Brown thinks that the name given in John 17:11 is the Divine Name (I AM), and that the fact that the verb is in the perfect implies that the name was already given, and continued to be possessed by the Son (*Gospel of John*, 759). Michaels disagrees with

Holy Father, keep them **in your Name, which you have given me**, that they may be one, even as we are one.

While I was with them, I kept them **in your Name, which you have given me...**
(John 17:11b-12a)

These two verses in ch. 17 also disclose the purposes for which the Name was given to the Son. One of those purposes is unity, as v.11 makes explicit: “that they may be one, even as we are one.” The other major purpose is salvation. In both of these verses the disciples are said to be kept (τηρέω) in the Name that the Father gave to the Son. Kratz understands τηρέω to have a sense of preservation until the appropriate time, and he believes that it is generally used in an eschatological sense.⁴⁴ Gieschen refers to this as the Name’s “protecting power.” He connects it also to earthly protection, associating it with the suffering for the Name mentioned earlier in the farewell discourse at 15:21.⁴⁵ Protection in these earthly circumstances seems secondary to the eschatological component, however. Jesus identifies what the disciples are kept from in v 12. He has kept the disciples from being “lost” (ἀπόλλυμι). John’s use of the term confirms that being “lost” also carries an eschatological sense, one of damnation. In the fourth Gospel, ἀπόλλυμι is consistently used as a term that is contrasted with life, or more often eternal life.⁴⁶ In the Gospel of John, and thus in 17:11-12, it is best to understand God keeping someone from being lost as a salvific reference. The Divine Name is used by Christ and

Brown, preferring to leave the name unspecified. His observation that the name delegates authority to the Son describes one of the ways that the name is active in the world.

⁴⁴ Reinhard Kratz, τηρέω *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament* 3.354-355.

⁴⁵ Gieschen, “Ante-Nicene,” 136-37.

⁴⁶ Life: John 10:10; 18:9 (disciples released and thus do not follow Jesus to his death.) Eternal life: John 3:16; 6:27; 6:39-40; 10:28; 12:25. The only exceptions are the gathering up of the bread fragments in John 6:12 and Caiaphas’ statement in John 11:50, which could certainly refer to temporal rather than eschatological destruction.

by the Father to both effect salvation from damnation and to preserve the disciples for that salvation.⁴⁷

Beyond this aspect of John's onomanological soteriology, two other verses in John 17 suggest that in addition to the Name having a role in the believer being saved and kept, the Name is revealed to the believer as well.⁴⁸ John 17 presents salvation as requiring confession of certain beliefs about the incarnation. John 17:3 equates eternal life with knowing the Father and knowing Jesus Christ whom the Father sent. The emphasis on the disciples or later believers knowing that Christ was sent by the Father continues in vv. 8, 21, and 25.⁴⁹ Christ identifies making this previously unavailable knowledge of the Father available as a significant part of his mission in ch. 17, and he describes this knowledge in terms of the Father's Name. According to John 17:6, the Son manifests (φανερώω) the Father's Name to the disciples. At the end of the prayer, in 17:26, he says that he has made that Name known, and will make it known (γνωρίζω in both cases).⁵⁰ The believer encounters the Name, and is thus able to receive, accept, and be kept by it, because it is revealed through the incarnation of the Son.

⁴⁷ Keener interprets "in your name" as both locative and instrumental. The believer is sheltered within the protection of the name, and that very fact is brought about by means of the name (*John*, 2.1057-58).

⁴⁸ Von Wahlde separates these two concepts, identifying giving to the disciples as an aspect of his proposed second edition, and the responsibility to keep that revelation as an aspect of the third (*John*, 2.733). His study is helpful in pointing out that the demands of keeping God's word in John's Gospel cannot come without the revelation (whether of the word or of the name), but it is not necessary to posit a stage during which only the revelation was taught.

⁴⁹ 17:18 also refers to the Son as sent by the Father, but simply as a fact without reference to belief.

⁵⁰ The commentators appear to agree with the judgment of Rudolph Bultmann (*Das Evangelium des Johannes* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968], 380, 547) that

Since believing in the Name is part of what the disciples preach to future believers in order to bring them to salvation, the Name which was disclosed to them must continue to be disclosed to others in evangelistic ventures. The concealment and revelation of the Name that I have just addressed is very important to a complete understanding of how John uses Name Theology as well as to how that Gospel relates to other New Testament texts. I will investigate the concealment of the Name in the next section, but there are several conclusions that can be summarized here regarding the soteriology associated with the Name in the Gospel of John. In the gospel, the Name that Jesus bears is in fact the Father's own Name. That Name conveys authority to Jesus, and he bears it in order to bring about salvation by the authority of the Name. The believer must know and recognize the saving authority invested in Jesus by the Name in order for it to be effective.

Besides these in John and Acts, there are a few other isolated passages that merit investigation. I have already mentioned John 15:21 and the trials that Jesus predicts the disciples will suffer in that passage. The theme of suffering for the Name appears in numerous places in the New Testament. There does not seem to be a technical vocabulary involved. The suffering can be defined by a wide range of verbs.⁵¹ The relationship

the terms are used synonymously. Brown is representative: "This line is little more than a rephrasing of 6a" (*John*, 773).

⁵¹ In John 15:18-21, ταῦτα πάντα ποιήσουσιν refers back to μισεῖ in vv. 18-19, and διώξουσιν in v. 20. Mark 13:13 and Matt 10:22 also use forms of μισέω (μισούμενοι). Others include παθεῖν at Acts 9:16, ὀνειδίζεσθε at 1 Pet 4:14 (αἰσχυνέσθω as a parallel at 4:16). In Acts, Peter and John suffer dishonor (ἀτιμάζω 5:41).

between that suffering and the Name employs four different prepositions.⁵² The diversity of terminology makes the concept more difficult to make specific conclusions about, but certain commonalities emerge from the collection of references. First, there is an expectation that Christian faith will in some measure require suffering. This suffering will be due to the Name that Christ bears, and that the believer also bears through him. It is more difficult to say in each case what that name is understood to be. The Name in John should be understood in keeping with most of the other references in the Gospel as the Divine Name.⁵³ The same is probably true in Acts, which regularly associates ὄνομα with κύριος. This must be the case at Acts 9:16, where Ananias understands it to be “the Lord Jesus” who is speaking. If the same theological perspective can be assumed in the Gospel of Luke, then perhaps κύριος is intended there as well: the tendency is not yet apparent in Luke’s Gospel, however. First Peter comes to a different conclusion, although the basic formula of believers receiving ill treatment as a result of the Name is still the same. Comparing 1 Pt 4:14 with 4:16 leads to the conclusion that the “Name of Christ” for which believers are reproached is in fact *Christ* since 4:16 indicates that *Christian* is the name under which one suffers. The identification of the name in the parallel examples at Mk 13:13 and Mt 10:22 is also difficult to determine. Nothing about either passage gives any strong indication of what name Jesus means; the thrust of the statement is that believers will be hated because they will be associated with him. It could be interpreted

⁵² Acts uses the phrase ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος in each instance. Mark, Matthew and John each use διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου. Luke 21:12 uses ἕνεκα and 1 Pt 4:14 uses ἐν.

⁵³ Brown calls it a play on the Johannine theme that Jesus bears the Father’s name (*John*, 2.687, 696-97).

as a reference to the Divine Name, but comparison with Mt 12:21 suggests that Matthew sometimes speaks of the Name of Christ without reference to the Divine Name.

Matthew 12:21 concludes a four verse long quotation from Isaiah 42. Verse 21 seems to follow the tradition that is also represented in the LXX of Isa 42:4 in reading “In his name the Gentiles will hope” against the MT, which has “the coastlands wait for his law.” Matthew applies this text, originally about the Servant, to Christ. Most scholars have concluded that ὄνομα represents a corruption of νόμος.⁵⁴ The rest of the quotation from Isaiah, however, follows the Hebrew text more closely than the LXX, and Gundry has made a case for seeing the LXX and Matthew as separate witnesses to a lost Hebrew variant that referred to the Name rather than to the law. His conclusion is based in part on the fact that there is no witness for “law” prior to the Theodotianic recension.⁵⁵ The association of ἐλπίζω or ἐλπίζω with ὄν is not unusual in the LXX, although this is the only NT occurrence. Septuagint examples are found in Isaiah and the Psalms. They are, like this one, focused on soteriology.⁵⁶ Isaiah 42, however, differs from the others in several important ways. First, it is the gentile nations who receive salvation in Isa 42:4. Second, in this reference it is not the LORD in whose Name those nations hope, but his servant, identified in LXX-Isaiah as Israel.⁵⁷ By applying the passage to Jesus, Matthew identifies

⁵⁴ See for example Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 8-20* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), 191.

⁵⁵ Robert H. Gundry, *Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel* (Leiden: Brill, 1967), 115.

⁵⁶ Isa 26:8, Ps 32:21 both refer to placing hope in the Lord's name. Pss 9:11 and 90:14 connect hope in the Lord to the knowledge of his name.

⁵⁷ LXX reads: “Jacob is my servant... Israel is my chosen.” The Peshitta follows the same wording as the MT. Gundry conjectures that the identification with Israel was an

him with the servant of Isaiah's servant song. As John Grindel points out, Matthew has a propensity for associating Jesus with ὄνομα,⁵⁸ but in this instance it is not clear that the Divine Name is intended. Since Matthew does not make use of any of the other passages in which salvation involves hope in the Lord's Name, it seems unlikely that this is what he intends here. Rather, Matthew understands the hope that the believer has to be in the Name of Christ himself.

Several other scriptural uses describe the Christian as possessing the Name rather than focusing on the Name's role in effecting salvation. This is prominent in certain passages from Revelation, where the Name is a distinguishing mark allowing believers to proclaim their association with God. The church at Philippi is in fact praised for maintaining this identification by not denying the Name. These uses have other characteristics that distinguish them more by assuming some degree of concealment of the Name itself, and I will come to them in my discussion of the concealed or hidden nature of the Name's presence in the world.

IV. Concealment / Relation to the World

In certain texts, the Name appears to have an active presence in the world. This presence is related to, but extends beyond, the issues of salvation that were addressed in

interpretive addition to the Greek on the basis of parallel passages at Isa 41:8, 9 and 44:2, where the collective references are present (*Use of the Old Testament*, 111-12).

⁵⁸ John Grindel "Matthew 12:18-21," *CBQ* 29 (1967): 110-115, 112. Grindel points to five verses, three of which are unique to Matthew (7:22, 18:20, 23:39, 24:5, 28:19). Most of these involve an agent acting "in the name" of another.

the previous section. Among the ways this activity can be manifested are petitionary prayer, agency and authorization, and the identification of believers.

In six verses in the Gospel of John, Jesus refers to asking in his Name, or to having a request answered in his Name.⁵⁹ The basic promise of all these verses is essentially the same: the disciples are told to make requests to Christ or to the Father in Jesus' Name, and are told that it will be done as they have asked. Scholars have not understood this to indicate that the Name is deployed by the disciples in a theurgical fashion; most scholars have simply discounted the notion. Haenchen is inclined to read the synoptic parallels as presenting the Name as an instrument of power, but finds that John's theology does not allow for this interpretation.⁶⁰ By this he appears to relate Jesus' possession of the Name to his role representing the Father in the world: "According to John, the Father can appear to us only in the earthly Jesus."⁶¹ This conclusion is sound. John does not conceive of the Name as an instrument of power that the disciples can wield at will, it is rather the means by which they have the authority to present their

⁵⁹ John 14:13, 14; 15:16; 16:23, 24, 26.

⁶⁰ Haenchen, *John*, 2.126, 132. Von Wahlde, however, relates the asking to questions about the identity of Jesus, and that Jesus' assurance is that they will no longer need to ask about this, but can ask for other things after the Resurrection (*Gospel and Letters*, 2.712-13). Much of his exegesis is difficult to maintain without also accepting his redactional reconstruction, but the connection he mentions between asking for things in the name and the implications regarding the identity of Jesus are nonetheless worth noting.

⁶¹ Haenchen, *John*, 1.96-97. Haenchen does not make the connection to the kind of *Shem* Theology often discerned in the Deuteronomic History, but the importance he places on Christ's representation of the Father through his possession of the name would seem to indicate a similarity. If John were adapting such a Deuteronomic *Shem* Theology, however, he does so by adding a great deal to the role of the name, since the Deuteronomic *Shem* remains a passive representation of an active God, whereas in the Gospel God acts through the name, as is more characteristic of Old Testament Name Theology outside the Deuteronomic material, especially in Pss or Isa.

requests. Nonetheless, this still makes a significant statement about John's view of the Name as an intermediary between God and the believer. First of all, the Son's Name is a powerful means of entreaty for believers in the world. Second, in order to function in that way it is clear that the Name must be revealed to believers in the world.

That revelation is described in John 17. Brown has observed that "this chapter stresses what the Father has *given* to Jesus."⁶² In particular, I would emphasize the authority to give eternal life to humanity in v. 2, words (ῥῆμα) in v. 8, glory in vv. 22 and 24, love in vv. 24, 26, and at the center of the chapter the Father's Name in vv. 11 and 12. Christ also says of each of these things that he has given them to the disciples. He says this of the words, glory and love at the same time that he mentioned being given them by the Father. The granting of the Name to the disciples is separated in the text from the granting of the Name to Christ, but it nonetheless fits the pattern of the chapter in which Christ comes into the world and gives the believers those things that he received from the Father. The two statements in 17:6 and 26 open and conclude the prayer by placing emphasis on the part of the Son's mission that relates to the Name. The Name is not kept secret, at least not from the disciples and believers.

The setting for the revelation of the Name is also clear in Chapter 17. The disciples to whom the Name has been revealed are acknowledged as not being "of the world" in v. 16 despite the fact that v. 15 has just said that they remain "in the world." The Son's work is said to have included glorifying the Father "on earth" in v. 4. In

⁶² Brown, *John*, 2.741. Brown's list is similar to mine, although he adds "men" from vv. 2, 6, 9, 24. I believe that the people the Father gives to the Son are a special case in this chapter, in that they eventually are the recipients of the other gifts the Son has received.

between this reference and the manifestation of the Name in v. 6 is the description of heavenly and protological glory in v. 5: “the glory which I had with you before the world was.” This point and counterpoint between earthly and heavenly serves to emphasize the earthly setting of the Name’s revelation. Christ also says that he “kept them in” the Father’s Name while he was with them, which also refers to presence in the world. He goes on in v. 13 to refer to the things that he wants to leave behind in the world since he is returning to the Father. One of those is the Father’s Name. These references serve to indicate a consistent conviction that the Name is among the things that are active on earth, among the disciples and other believers, not something that is reserved for heaven.

Another typical Greek use for ὄνομα is as an expression of the authorization for an agent. John uses this standard language of agency to describe Jesus coming “in the Name” of the Father.⁶³ Jesus claims this for himself (John 5:43), and it is proclaimed of him by the crowd as he enters Jerusalem (John 12:13). In a related text at John 10:25 Jesus does not mention coming in the Father’s Name, but instead refers to doing works in the Father’s Name. Like his claim to have come in the Father’s Name, Jesus offers the works as evidence of his authorization from the Father. These references must be read in light of John 17’s discussion of the Son having been given the Name of the Father, and giving it in turn to his disciples.⁶⁴ John describes the Son as having the authority to enter

⁶³ Keener, *Gospel of John*, 300-317, 660; von Wahlde, *Gospel and Letters*, II.265-268.

⁶⁴ Michaels rejects the idea of identifying the name that is given with specificity, in part on the grounds that readers would not “have understood such a subtle allusion.” Instead he suggests that by the name, the Gospel intends that Jesus has been delegated the authority to act on the Father’s behalf, and that these acts will manifest the Father (*John*, 868). I do not think the allusion is as subtle as Michaels does; afterall, this is one of four references to the Father’s name in ch. 17 (vv. 6, 11, 12, 26). His conclusion that this

the world, and to work in it, as a function of his possession of the Father's Name. The disciples, and later believers, receive that Name from him. In its power they are also authorized as agents to represent God and do similar work in the world. For John, the Name is not hidden in the present world, but is revealed and is an active source of power for initiating and preserving salvation.

There are several texts in the Apocalypse where the Name appears to be concealed in such a way that knowledge of the Name is restricted. In this way it differs slightly from the Gospel of John. The first reference is found in Revelation 2:17, in the conclusion of the letter to the church at Pergamum. There were some in Pergamum who had followed false teachers, and the faithful were called to resist them. Those who "conquered," presumably by overcoming the false teachers and excluding them from influence, were promised: "I will give some of the hidden manna, and I will give him a white stone, with a new name written on the stone which no one knows except him who receives it."

Several features of Rev 2:17 are repeated in 3:12, where the Name is clearly the Name of Christ and is associated with, perhaps identified with, the Divine Name.

He who **conquers**, I will make him a pillar in the temple of my God; never shall he go out of it, and I **will write on him** the Name of my God, and the Name of the city of my God, the new Jerusalem which comes down from my God out of heaven, and **my own new Name**.

refers to the Son's authority to act and to reveal the Father, however, does describe the way the name operates in this context.

Some scholars insist on a differentiation between the Name in 2:17, which they understand as the believer's new name, and that in 3:12, which is Christ's.⁶⁵ However, the parallels between the passages are striking, leading others to conclude that 2:17 also refers to Christ's possession of the Divine Name.⁶⁶ Both names are new, are inscribed upon someone or something, and are used for the purpose of identifying conquerors as those who are to receive divine blessings and protection. In both of these chapters, the Name is veiled in some degree of secrecy, but it is not withheld entirely, and comparison with two further examples suggests that it is given in an earthly setting, as it is in the Gospel of John.

In Rev 14:1 a Name is given to believers, as it was given to the conquerors in 2:17 and 3:12, and it is once again inscribed.

And I looked, and behold, the Lamb was standing on Mount Zion, and with him a hundred and forty-four thousand having his Name and his Father's Name inscribed upon their foreheads.

In the two earlier verses, however, there is some degree of distancing the believer from the actual writing. In 2:17, the Name is written on a stone, and in 3:12 where the Name is written on the believer, it occurs within a metaphor of the believer as a pillar in the temple. In 14:1, there is no such distancing. The Name is written upon foreheads of the believers themselves, and it is clearly given in an earthly rather than heavenly

⁶⁵ For example: Colin J. Hemer, *The letters to the seven churches of Asia in their local setting* (Sheffield, UK: JSOT Press, 1986), 102-103; Ben Witherington III, *Revelation* (NCBC; Cambridge: University Press, 2003), 103, 107. In this case, Christ's name in Rev 19:12 is also distinguished from the "new name" in 2:17.

⁶⁶ David Aune, *Revelation 1-5* (Dallas: Word, 1997), 190; Gregory Beale, *The Book of Revelation* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 253, 257. Gieschen, "Ante-Nicene," 131-34.

context.⁶⁷ Although chapter 14 is placed in an eschatological setting, it is describing events “on earth” and so need not be seen as a contrast with the Gospel’s insistence that the Name is given now.⁶⁸ It is true that Revelation 22:4 later depicts the believers as inscribed with God’s Name in a heavenly context, but this does not mean that they receive the Name there. The rest of the book of Revelation indicates that the Name is given to believers in their earthly lives, and ch. 22 simply shows them continuing in possession of that Name.

The revelation of the Name is not as unreservedly absolute as in the Gospel of John, however. In the Gospel, Christ’s mission is to reveal the Name in a public fashion so that its power could operate on the people to whom it is revealed. In Rev 19:12 Christ has a Name which no one knows except he himself. Unless one accepts Charles’ theory that v. 12 is an interpolation, vv. 13 and 16 can be taken to contradict this assertion of secrecy since they appear to identify the Name, and to do so in two different ways.⁶⁹

⁶⁷ Beale describes it as a way of speaking of God’s protecting presence with his people. (*Book of Revelation*, 733). Beale also points out a connection between the full designation *Mount Zion* (as opposed to merely *Zion*) and salvation related to the name of God (*Book of Revelation*, 731). Of the references he gives that do refer to ὄνομα (or *shem* in the MT) rather than to the tetragrammaton, Joel 3:5 [2:32 ET] and Ps 48:10-11 would be the most interesting. In Mic 4:5-8 and Ps 74:2-7 would be of greater interest were the concepts not so far separated. With so few examples, I believe it is better to follow up Beale observation by describing the references as the intersection of two soteriological themes (ὄνομα/*shem* and Mount Zion) rather than as a single theme that Rev picks up.

⁶⁸ Jarl Fossum finds roots in this verse for the practice of baptismal sealing with a mark that in the east represented the tetragrammaton name of God rather than *Χριστός* or a cross (*Name of God*, 101). Gieschen makes a more extended argument that this must be the case (“Ante-Nicene,” 133-34). Both follow Jean Danielou, *The Theology of Jewish Christianity* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1964) 154-57.

⁶⁹ On the grounds that this phrase interrupts the description, is contradicted by the identification of the name as “the Word of God” in the following verse, and that omitting it restores parallel structure to verses 12-13, an earlier generation of critical scholars

Rev 19:12c and he has a name inscribed that **no one knows but himself**.

Rev 19:13b ... and his name is called **The Word of God**.

Rev 19:16 On his robe and on his thigh he has a name inscribed, **King of kings and Lord of lords**. (NRSV)

There is a similar potential contradiction in *Asc. Isa.* 9.5, which I will discuss in chapter 6, but both of these texts are going about discussing the Name of Christ in similarly indirect ways. Those who see a contradiction understand *Rev 19:13* to identify the Name as “the Word of God,” and *19:16* to identify it as “King of Kings and Lord of Lords.” However, if either is an attempt to make known the unknown Name, then the other cannot be also.⁷⁰ Rather than choosing one or the other, it works better to say that neither attempts to identify the Name explicitly.⁷¹ *Ascension of Isaiah* does much the same thing in making the statement that his Name cannot be heard, immediately after saying that he will be called Jesus.⁷² *Κέκληται* in *Rev 19:13b* simply indicates that he will be called the

consider it to be an addition to the original. Charles, *Revelation* 2.132, (Following the analysis of Julius Wellhausen, *Analyse der Offenbarung Johannis* [Berlin: Weidmann, 1907], 30.) Aune, however, points out that the expression fits well with the style of the author as well as with the “high Christology of the final edition of Revelation,” and suggests the author may have inserted it later himself (*Revelation 17-22*, 1055). Charles’s theory appears to have fallen out of fashion in recent decades. Thomas Slater argues against it in this passage on textual grounds (*Christ and Community. A Socio-Historical Study of the Christology of Revelation*, [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999] 214-15).

⁷⁰ Beale avoids the contradiction by saying that both terms describe the character of Christ. His exegesis relies on the idea that *ὄνομα* is limited to the idea of *character*, and so linking several different terms to that character is not contradictory (*Book of Revelation*, 955). Limiting *ὄνομα* to character, however, falls short of Revelation’s use of the term, and so his explanation is not sufficient.

⁷¹ Mattias Hoffmann comes to a similar conclusion (*The Destroyer and the Lamb* [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005], 182-83).

⁷² *Asc. Isa.* 9:5

Word of God, that is, it is one of the designations for the one whose Name remains undisclosed. Verse 16 functions in the same way.

This need not be read to contradict the belief that this Name is in some way revealed to the believers, or to require reading those names to be different from the undisclosed Name. Thomas Slater has discussed the importance of the Name's secrecy in Revelation, and has suggested that it functions in a way that is similar to the Messianic Secret in Mark. Christian readers are able to understand that Christ is not recognized by the world because his Name (Slater says names) remains hidden and unrevealed to them. For Slater, this allows the earliest readers to make sense of the world in which they live while still holding fast to what they have been taught.⁷³ The Name is revealed, but that revelation is limited to believers.⁷⁴ As Beale writes, "Nothing in the Apocalypse suggests that Christ cannot reveal his confidential Name to whom he wills."⁷⁵

The concealment (and subsequent revelation) of the Name is only particularly significant in the Apocalypse of John and, in a different way, in the Gospel of John. Although the basic view of the Name's concealment is similar in these two books, they have different emphases. The Apocalypse emphasizes the concealment itself, whereas the Gospel presupposes concealment and emphasizes the revelation.

⁷³ Slater, *Christ and Community*, 215-16.

⁷⁴ Gieschen claims "the enlightened reader of Revelation is expected to know this secret name that only Christ knows" ("Ante-Nicene," 132).

⁷⁵ Beale, *Revelation*, 257.

Conclusions

The New Testament picks up in varying degrees many of the themes that were important in the Old Testament and in the other Jewish material. The book of Acts takes up the widest range of themes, and thus defies categorization, but the uses found in other books allow for them to be identified with particular aspects of Name Theology. The hymn in Philippians and the two references in Hebrews emphasize the Name's use in establishing an association between Jesus and the Father.

The Johannine literature, the book of Matthew, and many of the examples from Acts are largely soteriological in application. That is to say that in each of them the believer's salvation is intertwined with the way that believer interacts with the Name. The specifics of that interaction vary from book to book however. Matthew and Acts take the position that salvation involves or requires that the believer "call upon" the Name, but they do not expand upon this basic statement. That thought is more developed in John. In order to call upon, the believer must first know and comprehend the Name. Thus part of the mission of the incarnation is the revelation and proclamation of the Name so that the world might have the opportunity to avail itself of salvation. The book of Revelation takes the somewhat different position of acknowledging that believers possess the Name, but outside of the circle of believers shrouding the Name in secrecy. Possession of the Name is treated as a token of salvation for the believer.

Chapter Four

Name Theology in Rome: *First Clement*

Introduction

The epistle generally called *1 Clement* is a letter sent by the church in Rome to the troubled church in Corinth concerning the divisions there. Scholars traditionally dated it to the closing years of the first century (95-96 C.E.) by identifying the trials Clement refers to as the Domitianic persecution as well as the dates assigned to Clement in the later bishop lists for Rome. The certainty of the date has been challenged recently by some scholars.¹ The letter is signed as sent by the Roman church as a whole rather than by a single individual. The letter's earliest attribution is to Clement, who may have played a prominent role in its composition and

¹ Laurence Welborn demonstrates the difficulty of using any particular persecution to date the letter, and argues for a wide range between A.D. 80 and 140 ("The Preface to 1 Clement: The Rhetorical Situation and the Traditional Date," in *Encounters with Hellenism: Studies on the First Letter of Clement* [ed. Cilliers Breytenbach and Laurence L. Welborn; Leiden: Brill, 2004], 197-216; for his dating, 201). J. B. Lightfoot presents the case for the traditional interpretation in his edition, *The Apostolic Fathers 1.1: S. Clement of Rome* (London: Macmillan, 1890), 352. He gives numerous other factors, internal as well as external in establishing the date (*Apostolic Fathers 1.1* 346-358). Horacio E. Lona settles on the last decade of the first century, even while acknowledging the inconclusive nature of the reference to a persecution (*Der erste Clemensbrief Kommentar zu den Apostolischen Vätern 2* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1998], 77). Kurt Erlemann urges that scholars abandon the date 95-96 as too precise. He argues that it is overly reliant on two weak assumptions: a persecution under Domitian and the accuracy of what are in fact anachronistic bishop lists ("Die Datierung des ersten Klemenbriefes—Anfragen an eine Communis Opinio," *NTS* 44 [1998]: 591-607). Odd Magne Bakke provides a history of scholarship, coming down cautiously on Lightfoot's side ("*Concord and Peace*": *A Rhetorical Analysis of the First Letter of Clement with an Emphasis on the Language of Unity and Sedition* [WUNT2; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001], 8-11). I accept Erlemann's and Bakke's cautions regarding the dating of the epistle.

transmission.² Even accepting the cautions about the anachronism of the bishops lists, and the difficulties identifying any particular persecution with the trials Clement mentions, the letter can still confidently be dated to the very last years of the first or early years of the second century.

From the document, it appears that some members of the Corinthian church successfully challenged the authority of the elders. Clement writes in order to convince the parties to reestablish unity under the deposed rightful leaders. If the rebellious teachers repent and submit, they can be included in this unity; but if not, they should be cast out of the church. Clement's goal of persuading these factions to unify determines both the rhetorical structure of the letter and how Name Theology is incorporated into it.³

In *1 Clement* we encounter one of the earliest Christian adaptations of Name Theology outside the New Testament. It occurs in a Christian context but is not, for Clement,

² *1 Clem.* 65.2. Only the Coptic lacks Clement's name, the rest attribute the letter to Clement. The editions consider the subscription to be a later addition (Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers* 1.117, 122, 131) or call the Coptic correct (Michael W. Holmes, *Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations Third Edition*, [Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007], 131). Annie Jaubert includes it in the text, but does not translate it or give it much weight in her discussion of authorship (*Clément de Rome: Épître aux Corinthiens* [Sources Chrétiennes 167; Paris: Cerf, 1971], 15-23, 204-05). Quotations from *1 Clem* will follow Jaubert's text, and translations are my own unless otherwise indicated.

³ Odd Magne Bakke, "The rhetorical composition of the First Letter of Clement," *Studia patristica* 36 (2001), 155-62. Bakke makes the case that Clement's letter ought to be read as deliberative rhetoric, and that analyzing it in that way allows the structure of the epistle to become more apparent. Clement's means of convincing the Corinthians to make peace is one of the most studied aspects of Clement's epistle. Examples include Barbara Bowe, *A Church in Crisis: Ecclesiology and Paraenesis in Clement of Rome* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1988); H.E. Lona, "Rhetorik und Botschaft in 1 Clem 49," *ZNW* 86 (1995): 94-103; Odd Magne Bakke, "Concord and Peace": *A Rhetorical Analysis of the First Letter of Clement with an Emphasis on the Language of Unity and Sedition* (WUNT2; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001). Bowe opposes the reading that she finds in earlier scholars for whom the deposed leadership is the central concern, and emphasizes that the restoration of those leaders is secondary to the real goal of ending the schism (*Church in Crisis*, 16-22).

Christological.⁴ Instead the Name belongs to the Father under a variety of titles. By examining how Clement uses Name Theology and which of its aspects he chooses to emphasize, this chapter will show the ways Jewish Name Theology was attractive to Christians at Rome who felt no need to alter it in a specifically Christological way. I will show that Clement understands the Name as holy and divine, and as being closely involved in salvation. Furthermore, that salvation is connected to the cosmogenic properties of the Name.

Clement himself introduces Name Theology to the discussion, presumably because he thinks it serves his purpose in writing to the Corinthians. No particular passage or other issue in the debate explicitly brings the Name into the discussion. Clement's concern is to resolve the division in the church at Corinth, not to lay out a systematic theology of the Name. He urges the Corinthians to enjoy unity under the authority of their proper leaders, and as such, we must recognize that Clement deploys Name Theology only when it pertains to that pastoral concern.

Before going into a more detailed analysis of the content of Clement's Name Theology, it is important to understand the logic by which Name Theology contributes to the goal of resolving the schism. Clement believes that the divisions at Corinth constitute an assault upon the Name of God. He implies this in numerous places and states it clearly in ch. 47: the divisions cause "blasphemies to be inflicted on the Name of the Lord." The blasphemy alone would make

⁴ Discussion of Clement's Christology can be found in Harold Bumpus, *The Christological Awareness of Clement of Rome and Its Sources*, (Cambridge, MA: University Press of Cambridge, 1972); M. Mees, "Das Christusbild des ersten Klemensbriefes," *ETL* 66 (1990): 297-318; Philippe Henne, *La christologie chez Clément de Rome et dans le Pasteur d'Hermas*, (Fribourg: Editions Universitaires Fribourg Suisse, 1992); Lona, "Exkurs 6: Die Christologie des 1 Clem.," *Clemensbrief*, 398-407; Christoph Marksches, "Jesus Christ as a Man Before God: Two Interpretive Models for Isaiah 53 in the Patristic Literature and their Development," *The Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 in Jewish and Christian Sources* (ed. Peter Stuhlmacher and Bernd Janowski; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 234-41.

the divisions undesirable to the Corinthians, but Clement appears to use this only as the first step in a logical process that makes the situation more serious. By his logic, restoring unity becomes a soteriological issue.⁵ The Name enters the discussion because it plays a significant role in salvation. It is both an initiator and sustainer of the Christian in the same way that it is the initiator and sustainer of the existence and unity of the church and of the universe. Christian, church, and cosmos depend on the same kind of creative activity by the Name. Fostering divisions within the church is effectively despising the work of the Name in maintaining the unity of the church. It therefore also despises the work of the Name in sustaining one's own salvation. Clement employs the Name in his argument because it appeals to the existential issue of salvation.

I. Salvation

In this section I will examine Clement's Name Theology as a soteriologically oriented theology. Clement's logic depends on the assumption that, as blasphemy, the Corinthians' actions put their salvation at risk. Only if the Corinthians accept this point is Clement's argument persuasive. *I will first describe that risk.* Having seen this, we will consider *the aspect of salvation that Clement most often attributes to the Name - preservation.* That preservation is secured through the believer's knowledge, so I will examine the Light-Darkness language that Clement uses to describe the Name's salvific role as a soteriology of knowledge. I will then show that *Clement assumes that knowledge to have to do with the elevated status of the Name*, a divine status he describes with the terms Glory, Majesty, and Holiness. That elevated status is

⁵ Bakke includes this among the significant appeals Clement makes to the Corinthians (*Concord and Peace*, 48-51, 320).

confirmed by Clement's description of worship being offered to the Name by the faithful, that is, by those people who have entered into proper knowledge regarding the Name. Proper recognition of the Name's status will also then be shown to lead to obedience, and it is with this point that Clement relates his *Name Theology* to his immediate objective of *securing obedience and submission to the duly appointed elders in Corinth*. Finally I will consider *Clement's cosmogenic understanding of the Name* and suggest that this key explains the nature of the saving work that the Name does and provides the logical connection between the unity of the church and the salvation of the believers. That connection is why he holds that an assault upon one can be construed as a threat to both.

1. *Salvation at Risk*

One of Clement's tasks in the epistle is to convince the Corinthians of the gravity of their situation so that they would be persuaded to find a resolution to it.⁶ Clement describes the risk the Corinthians face in 51-54, and again, more explicitly, in 57. In the first he makes several comparisons between the Corinthian situation and the Pentateuchal wilderness narratives. The wilderness narratives provide Clement with a parallel in the account of Korah's opposition to Moses' divinely ordained leadership. Clement highlights the rebellion of Korah in order to emphasize God's punishment of those who attempt to displace his chosen servants. According to Numbers 16:33, which Clement quotes loosely, Korah and his fellow rebels are swallowed up by

⁶ Bakke demonstrates the *1 Clem.* 1:1 is designed to introduce the idea that the division in Corinth threatened the church there in a wide range of ways – social as well as theological. By introducing this theme in the first verse, Bakke says, Clement puts his entire argument in the context of averting a problem of the utmost importance (“Rhetorical Composition,” 156-158).

the earth and go “down to Hades alive” (51.4).⁷ Clement himself adds to this description the feature from Psalm 48 that “death will be their shepherd.”⁸

In case the implied warning had been missed by his Corinthian readers, Clement makes the conclusions he is drawing explicit in 57. Clement urges the rebellious Corinthians to repent, suggesting that if they continue they will be “excluded from [Christ’s] hope.”⁹ He uses a quotation of Prov 1:23-33 to illustrate the possibility, and the dangers, of exclusion, which are there described as desolation, destruction, distress and anguish. Exclusion from hope amounts to damnation, and damnation is the “danger” Clement refers to a few lines later in 59.1:

But should any disobey what has been said by him through us, let them know that they will bind themselves with no small transgression and danger.

as well as in an earlier passage, 47.7.¹⁰

you cause blasphemies to be inflicted on the Name of the Lord because of your foolishness, and danger to be created for yourselves as well.

Salvation is conceived of as the preservation of the believer from that risk of damnation.

Proverbs 1:33 (LXX) attributes that salvation to “hope.” In the short passage from ch. 57.7 –

⁷ Numbers 16:33 LXX “And they went down and all that they had, alive into Hades”

⁸ Psalm 49 in MT and standard English translations.

⁹ I Clement 57.2

¹⁰ Commentators appear to be agreed that the danger is the danger of damnation. J. B. Lightfoot calls it the danger of incurring God’s wrath (*The Apostolic Fathers* 1.2, 145). Rudolph Knopf says that it is “nicht eine irdische Gefahr” (*Die Lehre der zwölf Apostel: die zwei Clemensbriefe* [Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck) 1920], 124). Robert M. Grant and H. H. Graham go further, and say that this danger is brought on by blasphemy (*The Apostolic Fathers: First Second Clement* [Apostolic Fathers II; New York: Nelson, 1965], 79). For Lona, the danger is being turned away from the salvation that is the will of God (*Erste Clemensbrief*, 512).

58.1, Clement first quotes Proverbs' reference to hope. When he repeats it as part of his exhortation a few lines later in 58, Clement makes slight alterations to the scriptural language.¹¹

...they [evil ones] will be killed, and an examination will destroy the impious. But the *one hearing me* will abide, trusting in hope, and will rest, free from fear of all evil."

Let us, then, obey his most holy and glorious Name, escaping the threats that have been foretold through Wisdom to the disobedient, so that *we* may abide, trusting in his most holy and majestic Name.

The most significant textual alteration Clement makes in his initial quotation of Prov 1:33 at 57.7 is the addition of the word *πεποιθώς*, which appears in no LXX manuscripts.¹² Without this addition, the text reads that the hearers abide in hope; Clement's version allows him to indicate where they place their trust. He repeats *πείθω* in 58.1 (*πεποιθότες*), and substitutes the Name in place of *hope* as its object. In so doing, he associates the Name with the eschatological preservation of the Christian from the kind of death that the unrighteous suffer.¹³ He applies this

¹¹ Donald Hagner makes a few references to the long quotation from Prov 1 (*Use* 22, 27, 48, 80, 85), noting that "agreement with the LXX is striking" (*The Use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome* [Leiden: Brill, 1973], 48). He makes no reference to the alteration Clement makes when referring to the Prov material in 58.1. The commentators are, on the whole, more concerned with Clement's addition of *πεποιθώς*. They ignore the change between 57 and 58 of the object of that trust. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers 1.2*, 168. Lindemann, *Clemensbriefe*, 161.

¹² Both *1 Clem.* 57.5 and 58.2 use *κατασκηνώω* and *πείθω* to express the security the believer enjoys. As mentioned above in note 11, Prov 1:33, which Clement is quoting, does not contain *πεποιθώς*: "ὁ δὲ ἐμοῦ ἀκούων κατασκηνώσει ἐπ' ἐλπίδι καὶ ἡσυχάσει ἀφόβως ἀπὸ παντὸς κακοῦ." Clement's reading and alteration were possibly influenced by Sir 4.15. This verse is similar to the passage from Prov 1 in that both are warnings by Wisdom to those who fail to listen. In Sirach, however, both *κατασκηνώω* and *πείθω* are used. Jaubert appears to suggest this as well (*Épître*, 192 note b), although the note is misplaced.

¹³ Bakke is right to understand Clement's application to mean that obedience and submission to the elders, is required to avoid precisely the threats Wisdom issues in Proverbs. His assertion that "his most holy and glorious name" is simply a circumlocution for God, however, avoids the question of Clement considers this circumlocution more apt to the circumstance than any other, including the more directly parallel "Wisdom" (*Concord and Peace*, 271). For similar comments, see Lindemann, *Clemensbriefe*, 161.

salvation to the Christian by making a change in the subject of the verb κατασκηνόω, and in doing this, Clement identifies the faithful Christian (“we”) with Proverbs’ “the one who hears.”¹⁴ This salvation involves eschatological, future hope in that the reward is given in the future tense. The Christian “will be enrolled and included into the number of those saved through Jesus Christ.”¹⁵

Salvation is not exclusively the spiritual preservation from eschatological damnation, however.¹⁶ Righteous people like Daniel and his three friends are each preserved from the persecution heaped upon them by the unrighteous because of their worship of the Name. Clement describes God as champion and protector against earthly dangers as well as spiritual, eschatological damnation.¹⁷ Even that temporal protection ultimately has an eschatological view. Clement is well aware of Christians suffering death at the hands of the unrighteous, and refers to those who are killed, along with those persecuted, imprisoned, and stoned. Those are exalted with glory and honor, so whether or not the believer survives the persecution, he is nonetheless being preserved by God. Clement associates that preservation with the believers relationship to the Name.

¹⁴ There is a further semantic link between these two expressions, in that ἀκούω (*hearing*), forms the semantic as well as the etymological foundation for ὑπακούω, which Clement will use to describe the *obedience* Christians give to the Name.

¹⁵ 58.2, italics mine.

¹⁶ Bultmann criticized Clement for loss of “eschatological tension” (*Theology of the New Testament*, 2.187-89). Heikki Räisänen described it as “de-eschatologization,” and “giving up imminent expectation” but praises it as having been a necessary response at the end of the first century (“Righteousness by Works,” 220-22). Bultmann and Räisänen overstate Clement’s shift away from an eschatological perspective, but Räisänen is right that Clement’s soteriology is not an exclusively eschatological expectation.

¹⁷ In *1 Clem.* 45.7, defender is ὑπέρμαχος and protector is ὑπέρασπιστής. Both words are applied to God in the LXX, ὑπέρασπιστής especially in the Psalms. Neither appears in the NT.

(ὑπέρμαχος: Wis 10:20, 16:17; 2 Macc 8:36, 14:34. ὑπέρασπιστής: 2 Kgdms 22:3,31; Pss 17:3,31, 26:1, 27:7,8; 30:3,5, 32:20, 36:39, 39:18, 58:12, 70:3, 83:10, 113:17,18,19, 143:2.)

2. *Knowledge – Association with the Name*

Unlike Revelation, or other works like *Odes of Solomon* and *Ascension of Isaiah* which speak of taking on the Name, Clement describes the relationship between the believer and the Name in terms of knowledge (γνῶσις and ἐπίγνωσις). The believer's salvation is dependent upon that believer having particular knowledge of the Name. We will see, however, that coming to that proper knowledge of the Name is not simply a human achievement of intellect. The Name actively grants knowledge to the believer as well as serving as the proper subject of that knowledge.

Salvation is a process of moving from ignorance to knowledge. In two places in the epistle, Clement describes that salvific process using the language of darkness and light to represent ignorance and knowledge. The first is in 36.2, where Clement uses this pair of opposites to introduce his description (also found in Heb 1) of Jesus Christ as having inherited an excellent Name, and that as part of the result “through him our foolish and darkened mind shoots up into the light; through him the Master willed that we should taste immortal knowledge.” The second time Clement uses the contrast between darkness and light is in 59.2. Clement describes the elect as those who are “called from darkness to light, from ignorance to the knowledge of the glory of his Name.”¹⁸ Light-Darkness language is well established as soteriological terminology. Isaiah 50:10 describes salvation in these terms, and relates it to trust in the Name just as Clement does. “Who among you is the one who fears the Lord? Let him hear the voice of his servant. Those who walk in darkness – they have no light; trust in the Name of the Lord, and lean upon

¹⁸ I will return to this parallel of δόξα with φῶς in my section on *Glory, Holiness and Majesty*.

God.” Gospel traditions portray Christ using similar language to describe humanity’s standing with God, especially in the Gospel of John. In John, Jesus refers to himself as the light (John 8:12), and urges his hearers to avoid the darkness and become “children of light” (12:35-36). Those hearers are also credited with bringing light in Matthew’s version of the Sermon on the Mount (5:14-16). The Two Ways theology in Barnabas 18-20 associates light with the angels of God and darkness with the angels of Satan, and both it and John connect the possibility of life in the light with knowledge given by God. Similar Two Ways theology is also found at Qumran, where the Community Rule (1QS) and the War Scroll (1QM) are examples. The community there understood itself to be the “children of light” who were in conflict with the “children of darkness.” Pauline theology contains essentially the same ideas, understanding light to be the knowledge that characterizes the believer.¹⁹ In particular, Ephesians 5:6-20 describes conversion as a transition from darkness to understanding and from being deceived to being wise and understanding. 2 Corinthians 4:6 also describes believers as having had light and knowledge given to them, allowing them to be saved. Indeed, Holmes has suggested that Clement may be adapting 2 Cor 4:6 in *1 Clem* 36.2.²⁰

¹⁹2 Cor 4:4-6; 2 Tim 1:10; Eph 5:8. On 2 Cor 4:4-6, see Margaret Thrall, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Second Epistle to the Corinthians* 1.308-12, 315-18. Thrall identifies the light with the Gospel, and in particular with Paul’s epiphany experience, in which “God shone in Paul’s heart, to effect the enlightenment produced by (or, consisting in) the knowledge of his glory in Christ” (318).

²⁰ Michael W. Holmes, *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*. (3rd ed.; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 93. The more common reference is to 2 Cor 3:18 (Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers* 1:2, 111; Lona, *Clemensbrief*, 393). Some of the imagery is shared with 3:18 (“in a glass”), but the description from 2 Cor 4:6 of the of light shining “in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God” has key points of contact with what Clement says in 36, and the entire passage, especially 2 Cor 4:6 must be kept in view.

Before returning to the question of the content of this salvific knowledge, I will consider some other characteristics of Clement's light-darkness soteriology. In both passages, the prior state of the believer is that of ignorance. In 36 the unsaved mind is described as "foolish and darkened." In 59, the connection to ignorance is clear from the parallel use of "from darkness" and "from ignorance." Salvation, then, is a change in the believer from that ignorant state to a new state of knowledge and light. Clement connects that new state of knowledge and light to life in 36.2:

Through whom we gaze into the heights of heaven
 through whom we reflect upon His faultless and most lofty face
 through whom the eyes of our hearts were opened
 through whom our foolish and darkened mind shoots up into the light
 through whom the Master willed that we should taste immortal knowledge:
 Who, being the radiance of his majesty, is as much superior to angels as the Name
 he has inherited is more excellent.

The knowledge is "immortal" (ἀθανάτου) knowledge; it gives life by enabling the believer to avoid death. The previously darkened mind "grows up" (ἀναθάλλει) into the light. The verb ἀναθάλλω has a horticultural background, describing the growth and blooming of plants. Clement's choice of the image of a plant's shoot emerging from the darkness of the soil contributes to the theme of vitality that is present in his description of saving knowledge.²¹ Clement uses less suggestive language in ch. 59 than in ch. 36, but the context in 59 sets up a strong contrast between the death and destruction that ought to be expected by those who resist God's will and the hope of salvation for those called into the knowledge of the glory of his Name.

²¹ Lona stresses the vitality of ἀναθάλλω in 36.2, and also connects this passage to 59 as well (*Clemensbrief*, 394-95).⁰

The change from darkness to light is brought about by Jesus Christ according to both passages. Christ's agency is emphasized in ch. 36 by the long series of "through whom" (διὰ τούτου)²² statements. When Clement describes salvation as the believer's mind "grow[ing] up into the light," he does not indicate an independent act by the believer, but rather that it happens διὰ τούτου. Rudolph Knopf finds traces of a liturgical source behind the passage, accounting for both the series of "through him" declarations and the incorporation of light language.²³ More recently arguments have been made to suggest New Testament sources for both.²⁴ This material in 36 certainly appears to have been borrowed, but whether it is borrowed from liturgical practice or directly from the New Testament is less important than the fact that Clement borrows it because he finds that it supports his argument. One particular element that makes the material attractive to Clement is the role Jesus Christ plays in drawing the Christian out of darkness²⁵ and into the light. Hebrews 1 provides the text from which Clement argues for the superiority of the Son, who is the agent of the salvation Clement is describing. Interestingly, this is the only place in the epistle where Clement uses the Name in a way that must be applied to the Son, and even here, only in the quotation also preserved in Heb 1. In spite of the fact that Hebrews associates a Name with Christ, which Clement does not do elsewhere, this passage provides him with support

²² Donald Hagner addresses the source of the διὰ τούτου statements, and argues that Zuntz's solution in finding them in a variant of Hebrews 1:3 is unlikely, but that they have other more likely sources within Hebrews (*Use*, 183-184). Günther Zuntz, *The Text of the Epistles: A Disquisition Upon the Corpus Paulinum: The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 1946* (London: Oxford University Press, 1953), 43.

²³ Knopf, *Die zwei Clemensbriefe*, 106-107.

²⁴ Grant and Graham deny that this usage must come from a liturgical source (*First and Second Clement*, 63-64).

²⁵ Grant and Graham connect "foolish and darkened mind" to Romans 1:21, pointing out the more direct reference to Romans 1 in Clement's previous chapter (*First and Second Clement*, 63).

for describing Jesus as the means by which God has “spoken,” and in that context, Jesus’ exaltation is proven by his inheritance of a Name. His language is similar in chapter 59, where God (the creator: δημιουργός) calls (ἐκάλεισεν) the believer to the enlightening, saving knowledge of the Name, through (διὰ) Jesus Christ. Thus, knowledge of the Name appears to be the essential element of salvation, and Jesus Christ himself is only an agent through whom that knowledge is received.²⁶

Clement makes use of these images of light, darkness and knowledge in a few other places in the epistle. These uses are consistent with the understanding of Christ and a means to salvific knowledge as suggested above. In Chapter 16 Clement quotes the LXX of the servant song in Isaiah 53. Light is there mentioned as part of the *exaltation* of the Servant (whom Clement understands to be Christ): “And the Lord desires...to show him light and to form him with understanding.”²⁷ Just as in the horticultural metaphor of ch. 36, darkness (σκότους) characterizes the state of humanity before God’s intervention in 38.3.

Let us then take into account, brethren, of what matter we were formed, who and what came into the world; *out of what grave and darkness* the one who formed and created us *brought us into his world*; prepared his benefits before we were born.

²⁶ Aloys Grillmeier describes Clement’s soteriology as established by the Father through the Son and Spirit (based on 42.1-3). Clement’s theology is essentially an Old Testament theology. The emphasis on Christ gives Clement a NT “flavor,” but Christ remains of second importance in salvation. The Son is pre-existent, but is exalted and then united with the Father. (*Christ in Christian Tradition: Volume One From the Apostolic Age to Chalcedon* [Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1975] 86).

²⁷ Understanding translates σύνεσις, not γνῶσις. The expression appears to render *yd* (knowledge) in Hebrew.

Grant and Graham read this passage as a description of the state of humanity before the original creation,²⁸ however it seems more likely that Clement is pulling the two themes of creation and salvation together here, as we will see that he does again in ch. 59.²⁹ It is the creator who saves. The state from which the creator saves is a dark grave. The opposite state, which is “his world” into which the believer is brought, is implied to be characterized by light and life.

One further point to consider about Clement’s use of the light-darkness contrast is the visual nature of the metaphor. Nearly all of the images given for salvation in 36 are visual – we look steadily, we see, our eyes are opened, and we enter light. Only the last, that we “taste immortal knowledge” makes the transition away from visual language. The quotation from Isaiah in 16 also assumes that the requisite knowledge is a dependent upon light. Knowledge that is gained visually can only be gained in the presence of light is, even if the vision and light are metaphorical.

We have seen that Clement regards knowledge concerning the Name as an important part of describing the salvation of believers. Salvation requires the acknowledgement of the elevated position of the Name, which agrees with Clement’s general presentation of the high position of the Name. The change that takes place when the believer makes that acknowledgement is described as leaving behind a state of darkness and entering a state of light. It is very important to note that although the believer is called upon to know, that knowledge is given by Christ –

²⁸ Grant and Graham, *First and Second Clement*, 66-67. Knopf took the position that Clement described birth and life in this passage, and that the “grave” refers to the preexistence of souls in a “Mother Earth” underworld (*Zwei Clemensbriefe*, 111). Andreas Lindemann rejects Knopf’s mystical character, but retains the interpretation that Clement refers to birth and to general blessings in life (*Die Clemensbriefe* [Die Apostolischen Väter 1; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1992], 117-118).

²⁹ Lona, *Der erste Clemensbrief*, 420.

because it is through him the believer tastes the saving knowledge.³⁰ With these points it becomes clear that in its soteriology, Clement's Name Theology intersects with Christology, but it is not directly Christological. Both Name and Christ play a role in Clement's soteriology, but those roles are distinct. Salvation comes through Christ, because Christ calls; however, he calls to knowledge of the Name, for the knowledge of the Name saves. The next section considers the particular knowledge of the Name to which Christ calls for the purpose of salvation.

3. *Content of Knowledge – High Onomanology*

Glory, Holiness, and Majesty

Chapters 58-59 provide a convenient starting point for the discussion of the particular knowledge that saves because in earlier passages that knowledge is suggested, but it is not explicit. In 58-59, Clement makes clear what Christians must know and accept concerning the elevation of the Name. In *1 Clem.* 59:2 believers are not merely called to know the Name, but specifically to “the knowledge of the glory of his Name.” The exaltation assumed in this expression is also present a few lines earlier at 58:1 where salvation is described as “trusting (πεποιθότες) in his most holy and majestic Name.” Both of these passages connect the salvation of the believer to the Name's exalted status, and so I turn now to the terms Clement employs to designate that status: glory, holiness and majesty.

In Jewish and Christian contexts, the term δόξα, like its Hebrew counterpart *kabod*, is routinely used of God. When applied to God, it has connotations of divine presence, authority,

³⁰ Lona describes the role of Jesus Christ, the servant, as “Vermittler im Heilswerk” (*Erste Clemensbrief*, 591).

and of eschatological hope.³¹ Both δόξα and its cognates ἔνδοξος (glorious) and δοξάζω (glorify) often refer to that divine presence as a manifestation of light.³² These uses of δόξα are an adaptation of the Greek word to the particular theological semantic range of *kabod* in the translation of the LXX.³³ Mettinger emphasizes the theme of Presence in his description of *kabod* theology.³⁴ His interest is in showing an exilic trajectory in which glory becomes *the* mode of Divine Presence for a certain group within Israel. Brueggemann's more general description of Glory Theology³⁵ is more helpful, since even in Mettinger's proposed scheme the elements of *kabod* theology are reabsorbed into broader Jewish thought after the exile.³⁶ Brueggemann finds "governing presence" to be the controlling idea behind God's Glory, and identifies three ways that the glory functions: (1) ministering assurance and sustenance for his people, (2) a display of power and authority towards the nations, and (3) the all encompassing nature of God's right to rule.³⁷ The first two are particularly oriented around God's active salvation of his people by showing his posture towards his people and towards those who threaten his people. This context for thinking of God's glory explains how Clement talks about the glory of the Name in 59 and in 43 as part of God's saving activity.

³¹ Carey Newman, "Glory, Glorify," *NIDB* II:576-580.

³² Gerhard Kittel, "δόξα." *TDNT* 2:253-54.

³³ Gerhard Kittel, "δόξα." *TDNT* 2:242-251; Fossum, "Glory," *DDD* 348.

³⁴ Tryggve N. D. Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth: Studies in the Shem and Kabod theologies* (Coiniectanea Biblica 18; Uppsala: CWK Gleerup, 1982), 80-115.

³⁵ Brueggemann, *Theology of the Old Testament*, 283-287, 670-675. Although Brueggemann agrees with the outlines of Mettinger's proposal that Glory and Name theologies functioned as rivals during the crisis of the Babylonian and Persian exile, outside of that period it is possible for elements of Name and Glory theology to appear together.

³⁶ Mettinger, *Dethronement*, 132-134.

³⁷ Brueggemann, *Theology of the Old Testament*, 286-287.

In 58-59 Clement describes salvation as a safe state into which one moves due to the glory of the Name. That safety comes from acknowledging the exalted status of the Name by placing trust in it for safety. I have already discussed the importance of light imagery in Clement's description of salvation in this passage. The traditional association of δόξα with manifestations of light does not play a major role in Clement's work, but placing δόξα in parallel with φῶς strengthens the association between glory and salvation at 58:2.

The idea of the Glory of God's Name operates in a slightly different way in a second passage where Clement refers to it. In ch. 43, God's Name is understood to possess glory, and that glory can be denigrated by the actions of his people. Clement explains Moses' actions in Num 17, when Aaron is confirmed by the budding of his staff, as an attempt to protect the glory of God by preventing division among God's people.

For when of jealousy arose and the tribes contended (στασιαζουσῶν) over the priesthood: which of them should be adorned with that glorious Name (τῷ ἐνδόξῳ ὀνόματι). (43:2)³⁸

What do you think, beloved? Did Moses not know beforehand what would happen? Certainly he already knew. But, in order that no disorder (ἀκαταστασία) would come to be in Israel, he did this so that the Name of the true and only God might be glorified (δοξασθῆναι). (43:6)

Clement's explanation of the Numbers narrative is designed to reinforce his message to the Corinthians that they (like the Israelites) ought to follow their leaders without grumbling or

³⁸ Some scholars think that ἐνδοξον ὄνομα refers merely to the rank of the bishop's office, not the name of God (Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers I.2* 130; Knopf, *Zwei Clemensbriefe*, 117; Lindemann, *Die Clemensbriefe*, 129), but it seems clear that Clement refers to the "adornment" of the High Priest's headgear with the Divine Name. Horacio Lona argues that these scholars explanations are insufficient, and that ἐνδοξον ὄνομα must be interpreted as the Name of God (*Erste Clemensbrief*, 451).

disorder.³⁹ However, the biblical account contains no reference to the Name, nor does it mention glory as part of God's motivation for confirming Aaron and his sons as priests.⁴⁰ I can find no Jewish or Christian source that combines these ideas in the way that Clement does. Clement introduces the glorification of the Name to the account.⁴¹ The move fits well with his rhetorical objective of making the situation in Corinth seem urgent. His decision to frame the disorder of Israel (and by extension of the Corinthian church) as an offence against the glory of the Name of God indicates that he hoped that the Corinthians would be sufficiently shamed by such an offence that they would humble themselves and modify their behavior. He does, a few sections later, work out the consequences if they were to continue in division, and I will return to that after considering a final example of the Name's association with salvation.

In a third place where Clement speaks of salvific knowledge, the glory of the Name is again part of that salvific knowledge. Unlike the direct statement in 59.2, in Chapter 36 Clement does not clearly identify the knowledge to which believers are raised as having to do with the Name's superiority. Nonetheless, the context in 36, and comparison with the passage from 59

³⁹ Joseph Mueller has argued that this passage fits within an early Christian ecclesiological method that founds church order on a halakhic and aggadic interpretation of the Hebrew Bible that is presented as Apostolic, and shares exegetical techniques with Judaism ("First Clement in the Church Order Tradition" (paper presented to the Jewish Roots of Christian Mysticism Project, Milwaukee, Wisc., 12 Feb 2013).

⁴⁰ "Glory" is mentioned twice in Numbers 16:19 and 42 as part of the episode which leads in to the selection process described in Numbers 17. It is possible that Clement assumes the motivation from these references.

⁴¹ Grant and Graham suggest that Clement may have been following an unspecified rabbinic tradition for details of his account. They also point to similarities with Philo (*De Vita Mosi* 2, 174-180) and Josephus (*Jewish Antiquities* 4,63-66). Philo's objective in *VM* is the exaltation of Moses, and in his retelling God's motivation is simply the vindication of Moses as a righteous leader. Josephus does record a tradition that the people reacted with admiration for God's wisdom, however he makes no reference to glorification as an aspect of God's motivation, and says nothing of the divine Name in this context. Whatever Clement may have taken from either of these sources, he did not find the glorification of the Name in them.

indicate that Clement must have the same content in mind. Besides the obvious structural parallel – that both passages concern the transfer from ignorance to knowledge, characterized as darkness and light – in both passages Jesus Christ is the agent through whom the Christian makes that transition. Further, the description of salvation as a change from knowledge to ignorance comes in Chapter 36 as part of a series of descriptions of Christ’s mediating role in salvation. Clement adapts a liturgical tradition also found in Hebrews 1:3-4⁴² to explain that the ground upon which Christ provides this mediation is the Name. “For he⁴³, being the radiance of his *majesty*, is as much *superior* to angels as the Name he has inherited is more excellent.” Christ’s superiority is measured by the superiority of the Name, and it is this superiority that is the basis for salvation. Clement abbreviates the longer version found in Heb 1:3, using the term “majesty” (μεγαλωσύνης) to include the rest of the content of that verse: “Who being the radiance of his glory and the exact representation of his nature, and upholds all things by the word of His power. When He had made purification of sins, He sat down at the right hand of the majesty on high.”⁴⁴ Clement elides *glory* in these instances, but it is significant that he has chosen a collection of verses that concern the glory. He is surely aware of the repetition of glory references in his choices, and that context ought to be seen as impacting [how] his use of those texts. If Clement’s

⁴² Gerd Theissen, *Untersuchung zum Hebräerbrief* (SNT 2; Gütersloh: Mohn, 1969), 33-38 suggests that the two passages independently reflect a liturgical tradition. Lona gives a similar analysis of the traditional and liturgical character of the phrases Clement takes up (*Erste Clemensbrief*, 391-397). Lane rejects this interpretation (following the argument in Cockerill (JBL 97 [1978] 437-40) and says that Clement’s *radiance of the divine majesty* “simply compresses into a pregnant statement the substance of Heb 1:3” (*Hebrews*, 14).

⁴³ “for he” translates the Greek relative pronoun ὃς. BDAG (ὃς, 727) lists the expression of a cause as one of the uses for the pronoun.

⁴⁴ Although I think Cockerill and Lane go too far in asserting that *1 Clem* is directly dependent on Heb here, Lane’s description of the use of μεγαλωσύνης as compression (see n. 42 above) seems more in keeping with Clement’s usage of “glory.”

“immortal knowledge” is read as a reference to the knowledge of the glory of the Name, the logic of the sentence becomes clear. The Christian comes to knowledge of the glory of the Name through Christ because Christ is, in fact, the radiance of divine majesty. Jesus Christ’s superiority is measured in terms of the superiority of the Name he is given, so once the Christian understands Christ’s superiority, that Christian has also come to understand the Name’s superiority. As in the section on Salvation, the elevated status or superiority of the Name is precisely the knowledge required of a Christian.⁴⁵ The “immortal knowledge” that relates to salvation in ch. 36 ought, therefore, to be read in parallel with the “knowledge of the glory of his Name.”

In contrast, those who remain in ignorance about the glory of the Name of God are expected to deny its glory, its holiness, and its divinity. For that denial, Clement anticipates consequences corresponding to the salvation of those who believe and acknowledge the glory of the Name. These people are described in ch. 45 as those who “did not realize that the Most High is the champion and protector of those who with a pure conscience worship his excellent Name.” That failure to recognize is equivalent to the ignorant darkness in which humanity finds itself before being called to the light. Clement’s point in 45 is to connect the division fostered by the schismatics and their persecution of the Corinthian elders with the actions of those who persecuted Daniel and the three youths.⁴⁶

The unbelieving persecutors, along with the Koraites rebels against Moses who are added in ch. 51, remain the foil in chs. 58 and 59. Those who disobey, either against Wisdom in ch. 58

⁴⁵ In this respect, Clement differs slightly from the suggested parallel to 2 Corinthians 4:6 where the glory that is known through Christ is called the glory of God (the Father).

⁴⁶ Bakke, *Concord and Peace*, 262.

or Clement in ch. 59, are associated with the pagans who persecute God's people. In 47 Clement had rebuked the Corinthians for committing offences that inflicted blasphemies on the Name of the Lord in spite of the fact that they had already been advised against division by Paul. In 58 and 59, Clement's rebuke is more significant, in that he excludes them from the group of the elect that will be preserved by God.⁴⁷ Those Corinthians who continue to act in ways that demean the glory of the Name of God act as though they remained in ignorance rather than knowledge – in darkness rather than in the light. Clement sees no reason for them to expect to “abide, trusting in his most holy and majestic Name,”⁴⁸ avoiding the destruction described in the extended quotation from Proverbs 1. If salvation lies in recognizing and acknowledging the divine glory of the Name, the denial of that glory yields damnation.

Clement calls the Name “holy” three times in two passages, each time with a different Greek word related to LXX translations of *qodesh*.⁴⁹ At 58.1, Clement uses πανάγιω when urging the believers to obey the most holy Name.⁵⁰ In the same sentence he uses ὁσιώτατον (in the superlative) to say that believers trust in his most holy Name for safety. Finally, in ch. 64, Clement uses ἅγιον to say that those believers call upon God's holy Name. Clement's use of these three terms to raise the points of obedience to, trust in, and calling upon the Name brings

⁴⁷ Bakke identifies this passage as a significant part of the conclusion of the *probatio*, which corresponds to the goal of the Corinthians expressed in *1 Clem.* 2.4 as being “that the number of his elect might be saved” (*Concord and Peace*, 49). Bakke goes on to suggest that this point is the most persuasive part of Clement's argument, explaining its placement at the end of the probation as indicating this importance in terms of Cicero's *Rhet. Her.* 3.10.18 (272).

⁴⁸ 1 Clement 59.1

⁴⁹ ἅγιος is regularly used to translate *qodesh*; ὅσιος is used for *miqdash*, which is derived from the same root. Πανάγιος does not appear in translation of Hebrew, but only in 4 Macc 7:4 and 14:7. In both those cases it refers to the holiness of individuals facing martyrdom.

⁵⁰ Lindemann points out that πανάγιος is only otherwise used by Clement (at 35.3) as a description of God (*Die Clemensbriefe*, 161). Lightfoot speculates that Clement's is the first use of the term (*Apostolic Fathers*, 1.2.108).

together the three points that form the nucleus of Clement's Name Theology. I will address *call* language and obedience in coming sections, but in these two passages Clement describes a salvation in which the believer trusts in the Name for salvation through proper recognition of the Name's position (the worshipful act of calling upon) and its authority (obedience).

Through the use of ὅσιος, Clement may also be including a reference to the place of Name Theology in the epistle's rhetoric. Ὅσιος is unexpected since it stands in direct parallel to πανάγιος in the preceding line.

Let us, then, obey his *most holy* and glorious Name...
so that we may abide, trusting in his *most holy* and majestic Name

It may be that he has chosen ὅσιος because of its usage in the LXX, where ὅσιος is nearly a technical term⁵¹ for the faithful covenant congregation. Clement frequently uses it of the congregation in a similar way, and uses it once (in adverbial form) of the elders who have been mistreated. Clement applies the negative, ἀνόσιος, to the schism and schismatics.⁵² Clement calls this again to the minds of the schismatics by connecting obedience to the salvation that comes specifically through the ὅσιος Name.⁵³

In his interest in the holiness of the Name, Clement draws again on the language and concerns of the Name Theology in Leviticus and Ezekiel, where the vast majority of the OT

⁵¹ H. Balz, "ὅσιος," *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*, Eerdmans, 1991, 536-537. The term is rare in the NT, but according to Balz, where it occurs it has lost its technical association with formal worship.

⁵² *1 Clem* 1.1, and by extension at 45.4.

⁵³ Bakke describes the centrality of ὅσιος/ ἀνόσιος in Clement's argument, which appears throughout the letter. Bakke contrasts Clement's 13 uses of its forms with the entire nt, where it appears only 10 times. He includes it among the "political terms" that Clement employs to support his argument against discord, which he "regarded ... as inconsistent with the Corinthians' status as the people of God, and thus a transgression of his laws" (*Concord and Peace*, 106-107).

references to the “holy Name” are found. The same concern for holiness is exhibited in a wide range of later Jewish texts. Clement’s deployment of this notion, however, is most like what is found at Qumran and in *4 Ezra* where not only is there an interest in the holiness of the Name, but there is an assumption that God will take action to protect his Name.

The passage at 58.1 is the only instance where Clement applies the term majesty (μεγαλωσύνη) directly to the Name. Although he does not build on the “majesty of the Name,” the fact that he is willing to attribute majesty to the Name at all confirms the high onomanology that he holds. In the New Testament and other early Christian literature μεγαλωσύνη is only used of God,⁵⁴ and Philippe Henne has argued that the word “so completely refers to the divine transcendence that it suffices to say *God*.”⁵⁵ The divine connotations of majesty are applied consistently in *1 Clement*. Clement normally attributes majesty to God, once to Jesus Christ (20.1) and here at 58.1 to the Name.

Majesty is connected with God’s saving mercy⁵⁶ and with his creative activity.⁵⁷ I argued earlier that Clement uses μεγαλωσύνη in ch. 36.1 to replace “glory” and the rest of the content preserved in Heb 1:3.⁵⁸ Along with glory, divinity, salvation and exaltation, an important component in the deployment in Heb 1 is the cosmological preservation suggested by the

⁵⁴ “μεγαλωσύνη,” BDAG 623.

⁵⁵ Henne, *La Christologie*, 56. Andreas Lindemann describes it (in application to Christ) as a “powerful symbol of the preexistent Christ.” *Die Clemensbriefe*, 61.

⁵⁶ *1 Clem.* 37.2 and especially in 58.1.

⁵⁷ Based on *1 Clem.* 27.4 “By his majestic word he established the universe, and by a word he can destroy it.” Also in *1 Clem.* 20.12. Ruling Authority is referred to in 16.2. Three further examples (61:3, 64:1, 65:2) appear in a prayer formula that ascribes majesty (along with other praise) to the Father through the agency of Jesus Christ.

⁵⁸ Henne regards this as a direct replacement of δόξα with μεγαλωσύνη, but interprets it as a shift from Hebrews interest in exaltation to Clement’s interest in salvific activity (*La Christologie*, 56-57).

statement that the Son who has been given the Name is “upholding all things by the word of his power.” In ch. 3 I made the argument that this associates the Son’s creative activity with the Name he is given. If Clement incorporates this into his understanding, it is only implied at 36. However, it is expressed explicitly in 58 where salvation and creation are joined as central elements of Clement’s onomanology.

Worship Directed to the Name

One of the ways Clement indicates the divine status of the Name is by treating it as an appropriate object of worship. Chapter 45 refers directly to Christians worshipping or serving the Name. In this instance Clement uses *λατρεούντων*, indicating that the people “who with a clear conscience worship his most excellent Name” are protected by God. Clement does not use *λατρεύω* elsewhere, but its background in the LXX and the NT indicate a cultic context for the kind of service intended. The word can be used simply to indicate service, but the predominant meaning in Jewish or Christian use is that it indicates religious service, whether rendered to YHWH or condemned for being rendered to other gods.⁵⁹ When it is applied to YHWH, it is most often found in the context of cultic service in the temple. NT usage is less limited in location, but preserves the religious dimension. There, it is never used of secular service; the object of *λατρεύω* is always being treated as divine by the worshipper. Clement’s use of *λατρεύω* is similar,⁶⁰ and indicates a willingness to direct to the Name a kind of cultic service that is only rightly directed to God.

⁵⁹ Kittel, *λατρεύω*, *TDNT* 4:58-60.

⁶⁰ Lona, *Erste Clemensbrief*, 488.

Other than this reference to λατρεύω Clement does not use any of the other Greek terms that are typically used to designate worship.⁶¹ Worship is service, and Clement is more inclined to speak of the believer's duty to God as service. He emphasizes the importance of that service being properly rendered. In Clement's examples in ch. 45, the righteous in the book of Daniel are contrasted with those who reject YHWH and follow other gods instead. They do not fear God or devote themselves to the religion of the Most High. The faithful, who succeed where the wicked fail, serve (δουλεύω) God, and "render service to" his Name. By using λατρεύω here, Clement makes the Name the recipient of service that according to Jewish and Christian usage was normally rendered to God alone. The fact that Clement condones the worship of the Name implies the elevated status he accords it. That conception further confirms the high view of the Name that I observed in his association of the Name with God's glory.

Call Upon the Name

Although Clement does not use other terms for worship (either of God or of the Name) he does describe actions that should be understood to constitute worship. In particular, Clement employs the scriptural language of "calling upon" the Name of the Lord. In chapter 64, Clement prays for "every soul that has called upon (ἐπικεκλημένη) his magnificent and holy Name." Ἐπικαλέω appears in the middle voice, which many scholars regard as the LXX usage for worship and petition.⁶² The context in fact indicates petition; Clement is making a request of the Father in

⁶¹ Both σέβω and προσκυνέω are absent. Clement refers twice to "religion", in 45.7 and 62.1 – both are forms of θρησκεία.

⁶² Lightfoot prefers to interpret the verse as identifying the subject with the Name and translates "called after his Name." He acknowledges, however, that "with this meaning the common constructions in biblical Greek would be ἐφ' ἧν(or ἐφ' ἧ ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ (e.g.

this paragraph. Clement asks for “faith, fear, peace patience, steadfastness, self control, purity and sobriety” for those who have “called upon [the] Name” These acts of petition are a part of worship in the Old Testament, where calling upon the Name was frequently associated with ritual worship. In Genesis “calling on the Name of the Lord” is nearly a technical term, and is often connected with the construction and use of altars.⁶³ It is also used in both the Psalms and in Isaiah, and in those it is more frequently associated with direct pleas to God. The psalmists call on the Name of the Lord for aid (most often) in battle,⁶⁴ and Isaiah fears the future destruction of the nation because they have neglected to call upon the Name.⁶⁵ These two examples are less explicitly cultic, but nonetheless refer to people who are (or ought to be) worshipfully serving God.

Clement petitions God for a long list of specifics in 58, but ultimately his request is for salvation. This is apparent from the fact that Clement assumes that those gifts will allow those who do call on him to please “his Name ... both now and forever.” It is more explicit in the statement at 45 that God is the defender and protector of those who call upon his Name. Clement does not say that the Name itself protects or saves. What he says is that God’s protection is given

Acts xv. 17, James ii. 7, and freq. in the LXX), or ἐπικέκληται τῷ ὀνόματί μου (Is. xliii. 7).” (*Apostolic Fathers*, 1.2.186). Grant and Graham follow the same interpretation, translating it as “called by his exalted and holy name.” They suggest that “the name is presumably “Christ.” Nonetheless, they acknowledge a special sense of the word “name” that refers to “God’s person or presence or purpose,” which they say occurs in this passage as well as in chs. 43.6, 45.7, 47.7, 58.1, 59.2, 59.3, and 60.4 (*The Apostolic Fathers*, 99). Absent the constructions that Lightfoot acknowledges to be typical for the meaning he gives the phrase, it is better to interpret it in line with the worship related meaning that is typical for Clement’s construction. Lindemann simply calls it a common expression (“*geläufige Wendung*,” *Clemensbriefe*, 179), but the LXX and NT references he cites (Ps 98:6, Joel 3.5, 1 Cor 1.2) support my interpretation.

⁶³ Gen 12:8, 13:4, 21:33, and 26:25

⁶⁴ Pss 97 (not in LXX), 98 [ET 99], 102 [ET 103], 104 [ET 105], and 105 [ET 106]. Ps 29 [ET 30] is similar, but has to do with restoration of health, not directly associated with battle.

⁶⁵ Isa. 63:19, 64:6, 65:1, 65:15 (LXX).

as a consequence of the worshipful act of calling on the Name. In this sense, Clement's Name Theology is not like that of Isaiah (in which the Name is more directly active), but instead is like the Name Theology of Genesis, or some of the Psalms. This connects Clement's posture towards the Name to his view of salvation as it comes through the Name. The Hebrew tradition that Clement follows calls upon the Name for precisely the kind of deliverance Clement anticipates. *I Enoch* 45:3, Judith 16:2, and a psalm from Qumran preserve similar perspectives.⁶⁶ The saved are those who call upon the Name, who worship the Name, and who obey the Name—in short, those who honor the Name by recognizing its high position. Clement's language of worship is consonant with his attribution of holiness to the Name as described above.

Blasphemy of the Name

One final point further confirms the elevated status Clement ascribes to the Name. The disorders taking place within the Corinthian church cause "blasphemies to be inflicted on the Name of the Lord" (47.7). In classical and secular Greek, blasphemy need not indicate divine status in its victim, however in the LXX and in early Christian usage blasphemy is not used outside of a religious context, and is an offense that is ultimately committed against God. Blasphemy asserts that something belonging to the realm of the holy belongs to the realm of the mundane, and in so doing insults the divine by denying God's status, or his power.⁶⁷ When Clement applies this language to the Name, he grants it an elevated status that ought not to be diminished. Clement attributes the word holy itself to the Name in 58-59 three times, and again

⁶⁶ See above: *Call upon the Name* in ch. 2.

⁶⁷ Hermann Beyer, "βλασφημέω κτλ," *TDNT* 1:621-625.

in 64. In his concern for the holiness of the Name, Clement takes up a theme that is characteristic of the Priestly literature of the OT.⁶⁸

In Rom 2:24, Paul looks to the LXX of Isa 52:5 as the model for his ideas concerning blasphemy against the Name. The LXX has a different nuance from the MT about the cause of this blasphemy. Whereas the Hebrew simply mentions the blasphemy against the Name among foreign rulers and makes no statement about how this is caused, the LXX lays the blame at the feet of Israel by means of a *δια* phrase.

Seeing that my people are taken away for nothing? Their rulers wail, says the LORD, and continually all the day my Name is despised. (RSV)

Because my people were taken for nothing, you marvel and howl. This is what the Lord says, Because of you, my Name is continually blasphemed among the nations. (NETS)

Paul certainly follows this LXX interpretation when he uses it in Romans 2:24.⁶⁹ Like the LXX, he insists that the behavior of the believing community is the cause of the blaspheming among the nations.

It is impossible, and perhaps pointless, to say whether Clement has LXX-Isaiah or Romans in mind when he writes *1 Clem.* 47.⁷⁰ He does, however, develop his own statement beyond what is found in either of the two scriptural passages, stresses the believer's role in the blasphemies.

Clement writes “ὥστε καὶ βλασφημίας ἐπιφέρεισθαι τῷ ὀνόματι κυρίου διὰ τὴν ὑμετέραν ἀφροσύνην,” adding ἐπιφέρεισθαι to change the verbal action of the sentence from blaspheming in scripture to inflicting blasphemies. Philo uses ἐπιφέρω in a similar way at *Contempl.* 72,

⁶⁸ Beyer finds similar references to: disputing of God's saving power (4 Kgdms 19.4,6, 22) desecrating of his name by the Gentiles who capture and enslave his people (Is. 52.5) violation of this glory (Ez 35.12) (2 Macc 15.24), “βλασφημέω,” *TDNT* 1:622.

⁶⁹ Sanday & Headlam, *Romans*, 67; Cranfield, *Romans*, 1.171.

⁷⁰ Hagner refuses to commit to either (*Use*, 219). Cf. Lona, who believes that Clement and Paul both work from Isa (*Erste Clemensbrief*, 511-13).

speaking of the free men who serve at the banquets of the Therapeutae. They wear the loose clothing of free men “in order that no likeness of slavish appearance be implied (ἐπιφέρεσθαι).”⁷¹

The Therapeutae take an active role in avoiding the appearance of servitude. Clement means that the divided church is taking a similarly active role in inflicting blasphemies on the Name of God, even if the “others who differ from us” actually speak them.⁷²

4. *Obedience*

The previous two sections have shown that Clement understands salvation to depend upon knowledge with a certain content regarding the Name. Clement’s requirement of knowledge concerning the Name does not allow the believer to stop at the simple acquisition of information about the Name, even information concerning the holiness and glory of the Name. True, saving knowledge of the Name leads directly and inevitably to obedience to that Name.⁷³ The connections between knowledge, obedience and salvation are laid out by Clement in 58-59, and again in 60. He makes a direct statement placing a condition on the Christian’s right to “dwell safely, trusting in the Name” in 58.1, and that condition is that they must “obey his most holy and glorious Name.” In the larger structure of 58-59.2 (the introduction to the prayer that

⁷¹ My translation.

⁷² Lightfoot believes that the subject of the middle voice ἐπιφέρεσθαι is the Corinthians, and so translates the expression “so that you heap blasphemies” (*Apostolic Fathers* 1.2 145). Bowe appears to interpret Clement as saying the same as Paul, in that she describes blasphemy as simply the consequence of their division (*Church in Crisis*, 141); similarly: Lindemann, *Clemensbriefe*, 139. Lona stresses the church’s responsibility for the blasphemy (*Erste Clemensbriefe*, 512).

⁷³ Räisänen makes a similar point, connecting Clement’s position here to Jewish soteriology: “Both Clement and normal Judaism present obedience as the human *response* to the goodness which God has shown to humanity” (“Righteousness by Works,” 217).

continues from 59.3 to the end of 61) Clement also connects this obedience to the saving knowledge to which the church is called.

- A [58.1] Let us, then, obey his most holy and glorious Name,
- B escaping the threats that have been foretold through Wisdom to the disobedient,
- C so that we may abide, trusting in his most holy and majestic Name.
[58.2] Receive our advice and there will be nothing for you to regret. For God lives, and the Lord Jesus Christ lives, and the Holy Spirit (who are the faith and the hope of the elect), that the one who in humility, with earnest gentleness, without regret keeps the ordinances and commandments given by God *will* be enrolled and included into the number of those saved through Jesus Christ, through whom be glory to him [God] forever and ever. Amen.
- B' [59.1] But should any disobey what has been said by him through us, let them know that they will bind themselves with no small transgression and danger.
- A' 59.2 But we will be innocent of this sin, and will ask an earnest prayer and make supplication, that the Creator of everything might keep unbroken the total number of his elect in the whole world, through his beloved servant Jesus Christ, through whom he called us from darkness to light, from ignorance to the knowledge of the glory of his Name,

As the diagram above illustrates, Clement moves quickly from a call to obedience (A) to a description of the condemnation of the disobedient (B). After an extended thanksgiving for the hope of salvation (C), Clement returns to a reassertion of the danger involved in disobedience (B'). I contend that the final point (A') gives a fuller account of the obedience to the Name mentioned at the beginning. That obedience is the reason that believers are “innocent of this sin” and is possible because God preserves the elect and “called [them] from darkness to light, from ignorance to the knowledge of the glory of his Name.”

Without directly mentioning knowledge, Clement connects the order in the church with obedience to the Name in 60.4: “Give us concord and peace ... when we give obedience to your almighty and most excellent Name...” *First Clement* 60.4 is part of a prayer that runs from 59.3 to 61.3. The obedience mentioned in 60.4 is the same obedience introduced in ch. 58-59.2, the

passage quoted above. Clement's language in the two verses is similar enough that in several manuscripts ἔνδοξος has been mistakenly substituted for πανάρετος.⁷⁴ Clement gathers several terms around the Name in this passage. The Name is glorious, almighty, most excellent, holy, and majestic. The recognition of that elevated status should motivate one to obedience. Knowledge about the Name that fails to move one to obedience is deficient in its recognition of that Name's glory, and provides no grounds for the expectation of salvation.

Submission is closely related to obedience. In his long quotation of Prov 1, Clement alternates between ὑπακούω (obey) and ὑποτάσσω (submit), even substituting one for the other at one point.⁷⁵ More important for understanding Clement's argument, however, is the similarity with which he treats submissive obedience to the church's elders and submissive obedience to the Name. Bakke finds that the concepts of obedience and submission are closely related to Clement's goal of concord in the Corinthian church.⁷⁶ Chapter 57 is a warning to the schismatics that they ought to end the division in Corinth by submitting themselves to the

⁷⁴ πανάρετος appears in Codex Hierosolymitanus, ἔνδοξος is suggested by the Latin, Syriac and perhaps Coptic. SC, 198. The easily explained substitution of ἔνδοξος, and relative rarity of πανάρετος make the case for πανάρετος' originality compelling. I am not here arguing for ἔνδοξος as the preferred reading. I am suggesting that if ἔνδοξος is a substitution, the scribal tendency to make this substitution demonstrates the connection among the terms Clement uses to describe the exalted status of the Name.

⁷⁵ Delling and Kittel each make the point that obedience requires a certain degree of submission in their respective articles on ὑποτάσσω and ὑπακούω. Gerhard Delling, ὑποτάσσω, TDNT 8:41. Gerhard Kittel, ὑπακούω, TDNT 1:223.

⁷⁶ Bakke, *Concord and Peace*, 119-22. Bakke analyses ὑποτάσσω as one of the standard political terms that Clement employs in his argument. He finds background in Dio Chrysostom *Or.* 36 for the idea that submission to authorities is a required part of concord within an organization. Clement appeals to this commonly accepted cultural norm by associating the church leadership with the same role as the governing leaders to whom the Corinthians already submit (*1 Clem.* 1:3). Bowe understands the leaders of 1:3 to be church leaders, but this difference would not substantially alter the analysis of the rhetoric; Clement would still be urging the Corinthians to conform within the church to the same minimum standard of interaction that cultural norms would require (*Church in Crisis*, 97-98).

authority of the elders against whom they had revolted. Twice in ch. 57 Clement urges submission (vv. 1 and 2), telling the schismatics that they would be better off to accept a lower standing in the church⁷⁷ than to be excluded from salvation. This risk of exclusion from salvation is the danger of damnation that to which he refers in 59.1, recalling his similar warning in 47.7.

When Clement supports his assertion in 57.1-2 that rebellion against church leaders will put salvation at risk, he does so with a biblical passage that he explicitly connects to the Name, not to church leaders. Proverbs 1:23-33⁷⁸ is about obeying Wisdom, the speaker: “Because I [Wisdom] called and you did not obey (ὕπακούω), and you ... ignored my advice and disobeyed (ἀπειθέω) my correction.” Clement interprets this to demand obedience and submission to the Name, which he treats as a solution to the problem of disunity and rebellion in Corinth.⁷⁹ The obedience to the Name that Clement demands involves submission to the will of God. Clement assumes that submission to the will of God requires submission to the elders.⁸⁰ In this way Clement’s decision to introduce the idea that Christians must obey the Name can be shown to be

⁷⁷ Clement may choose μικρούς to describe the position they should accept because submission involves being placed lower than that to which one is subordinate.

⁷⁸ LXX Prov. 1:23-33 does not contain the word ὑποτάσσω. By making this transfer from the biblical ὑπακούω to his own ὑποτάσσω, Clement treats the terms as closely related, even if not identical.

⁷⁹

⁸⁰ On the basis of his position that Salvation requires obedience, Clement has been described by some as holding a “works salvation” position. Räisänen (“Righteousness by Works”) works through Clement’s logic in an attempt to show that this is contextually expressed, and that his soteriology is not in fact more works oriented than Paul’s. I agree with the way Räisänen connects salvation with obedience to God and to the church leaders. His suggestion, however, that Clement demands obedience to himself or to the Roman church reads too much into what Clement says in places like 15, 57, and 59.1 (“Righteousness by Works,” 222). In all three, the obedience is still due to God (and in 59.1 to his Name). The ecclesiological application that Clement makes is to the legitimate Corinthian leadership.

part of his rhetorical strategy to secure submission to the Corinthian elders. Those who obey the Name will not be in rebellion against the elders.⁸¹

II. Cosmogony

The previous section has shown how Clement employs the Name as a part of his rhetorical strategy; however, it leaves unexplained what role the Name plays in salvation that makes it particularly useful for Clement's argument. Why does Clement introduce the Name into an argument that hinges on the relationship between salvation and the unity of the church under its rightful elders? In the prayer that begins in *1 Clem.* 59.3, Clement gives an indication of how the Name operates in salvation. After an apparent omission in the text, the prayer begins, "to hope upon your Name, the primal source of all creation."⁸² God as creator is central in the prayer that stretches from ch. 59 to ch. 61, and Lona finds the two paired "schöpfungstheologisches Bekenntnis" to head the two main sections of the prayer.⁸³ Prior to the reference to "the primal source of creation," Clement addresses his requests to "the Creator of everything" (59.2). Creation continues is mentioned again at the beginning of the second section (60.1), where Clement first praises God for having "created the earth," and then calls him "wise in creating and

⁸¹ It is possible that Clement is influenced by Exod 23:20-21. In both, disobedience (ἀπειθέω) is condemned, obedience is commanded (εἰσάκουε in Exod; ὑπακούσωμεν in *1 Clem*) and the consequences are dire. In both cases, the Name is significant for the obedience. In Exod the angel must not be disobeyed because God's "name is in him," and in *1 Clem* 59, it is the name itself which must be obeyed.

⁸² Lindemann (*Clemensbriefe*, 165-68) gives a structural analysis of the prayer and explains the logic whereby the prayer is understood to begin in 59.3 after a lost opening phrase. Lindenmann also disagrees with the assumption that Clement's prayer is taken from an early Roman liturgy, as he finds supposed by Rudolph Knopf (Lindemann, *Clemensbriefe*, 165), and is also suggested by Kleist (*Epistles*, 116).

⁸³ Lona, *Erste Clemensbrief*, 586-592.

intelligent in establishing what has come into being.” The constant association of salvation by the Name with creative activity, and in particular the creative activity of the Name, suggests a connection between these two divine acts in which the saving activity of the Name is best understood as a creative work.

In praying “ἐλπίζειν ἀρχεγόνον πάσης κτίσεως ὄνομά σου” Clement bases the hope of salvation on the Name’s position as “the primal source of all creation.” ἐλπίζειν ... ὄνομά σου, must be taken as a soteriological expression for two reasons. First, it is surrounded in 59.3 by a cluster of examples of the light/knowledge terminology that we examined in the discussion of Clement’s view of the Name’s role in salvation. Because of the Name, believers might have their eyes opened and know God. Second, Clement consistently uses ἐλπίζω and ἐλπίς as soteriological terms. I have already discussed the passage in 57.2-57.7 where exclusion from Christ’s hope amounts to damnation and trusting in hope yields life free from evil. Besides these two examples, hope is tied to redemption through the blood of the Lord (12.7), God’s mercy (22.). The resurrection is referred to as “this hope” in 27. ἐλπίζειν ... ὄνομά σου introduces nothing new, and simply confirms the salvific activity Clement has attributed to the Name.

The concept that is newly introduced in ch. 59 is the identification of the Name as the ἀρχεγόνον πάσης κτίσεως. In this passage, the originating aspect of creative power is emphasized by Clement’s use of the term ἀρχεγόνον, which refers to the origin or source.⁸⁴ By

⁸⁴ Lightfoot gives the argument for ἀρχεγόνον against ἀρχέγονον, which would give greater emphasis to time (*Apostolic Fathers* 1.2.172). Lindemann concurs (*Clemensbriefe*, 168-169). Both interpret this as giving an emphasis to the Name as *source* or *origin* rather than a primary focus on time. See also BDAG, 137; Lampe gives greater emphasis to the time element (*PGL* 233). Lona describes the philosophical background of ἀρχεγόνοϛ. He finds it to refer to the origin of creation, not simply chronological priority, and suggests that Philo raises the Greek term to theological usage (*Erste Clemensbrief*, 592).

connecting the Christian's hope to that originating power, Clement is describing salvation also as an exercise of the same divine creative power. Salvation, then, is a form of re-creation, a new gift of life from the same original source of life. That gift of new creation is given to those who are entrusted with the knowledge of the glory of his Name, as *1 Clem.* 59.2 makes clear.

Divine creativity is also the basis for the preservation of the church. Clement calls upon God, as creator of everything, to “keep unbroken the total number of his elect,” that is, the church. In this way, Clement's theology brings creative power to bear upon the preservation of the church. Clement singles out God's creative power in his plea for the preservation of the church because God not only initiates creation, but gives it order and establishes it permanently within that order. The terms Clement uses to describe cosmogonic activity conform to his concern for the preservation of an ordered creation. The “creator of everything” in 59.2 is the δημιουργός, which refers to the design and order of creation rather than the sheer bringing into existence suggested by κτίζω. When κτίζω is used in 60.1, the world which is created is the οἰκουμένη. The οἰκουμένη is the inhabited world, or the world that is under the control of a powerful government. It does not ordinarily refer to the world in an absolute sense to include wild uninhabitable regions, the seas, or the underworld.⁸⁵ Both δημιουργός and οἰκουμένη emphasize the ordering, arrangement, and maintenance of creation rather than mere existence. The other creation reference in this prayer is not directly connected to the Name, but reflects the same view of creation. God is praised for being “wise in creating intelligent in establishing what has come into being.”

⁸⁵ οἰκουμένη, BDAG, 699-700. *1 Clem.* 60.1 is listed here as an “extraordinary use” in that Clement intends the word to refer to more than the Roman world, but still intends it only to reach as far as living beings, including transcendent beings.

According to Clement's expression in 59.2, the church is not preserved directly, but is preserved by the salvation of the individual believers. This is apparent from Clement's description of the church as "the total number of his elect."⁸⁶ That salvation is again connected to the Name in 60.4, where Clement asks that God grant his blessings "when we give obedience to your almighty and most excellent Name."⁸⁷

Creation involves both initiation and preservation. Clement associates the Name with both of these two aspects of creative activity, and thus credits it with the power that renews life in salvation and also that preserves life, both in the believer and in the church. Clement's Name Theology is a theology of a creative Name that saves those who obey, and excludes those who do not. Numerous Jewish texts of the Second Temple period used the idea that the Name plays a role in both the initiation and the preservation of creation, although the idea is not present in the Hebrew Bible or in the New Testament. *First Enoch* 69 contains the most extended description of creation as dependent upon the Name, and it contains several other points of connection with *1 Clement*. First of all, the Name's creative role appears to involve both the establishment and the preservation of heaven and earth (*1 En.* 69:16-23). Second, the proper response to the Name's cosmological work is praise (*1 En.* 69:24), and finally the Name is the basis for the Son of Man's authority to judge (*1 En.* 69:26-29,⁸⁸ also 48:7-10).

⁸⁶ A similar expression appeared at *1 Clem.* 2:4. Together the two reinforce the centrality in the epistle of the idea that God's will would be accomplished, and the importance of conforming to that will.

⁸⁷ I have already pointed out the connection that Clement reinforces here between salvation and obedience to the name. Also, he makes a connection to Old Testament language of "calling upon" the Name in placing obedience here in parallel to the "ancestors" calling upon the Lord.

⁸⁸ This is based on the perspective represented in the final form of the text rather than the probable original arrangement in which these verses are separated from ch. 69. For more explanation, see my section on Cosmology in Ch. 2.

The connection between both aspects of creation and the salvation of individual believers is important for Clement's attempt to end the division in Corinth. By associating salvation with the Name's power to originate the world and to sustain the church, Clement is able to close the circle of his logic and present the argument that these three are inseparable. Since salvation is dependent upon the creativity of the Name, salvation is ultimately bound up with the unity of the church. The practical conclusion for the schismatics at Corinth is that their own salvation depends on the very power that they oppose in dividing the church. If they persist in putting the unity of the church at risk, they also put their salvation at risk.

Conclusions

At this point, I can draw several conclusions regarding the nature of Clement's onomanology. Clement employs the Name in the epistle because of the salvific role that it plays. In Clement's appropriation of this theology, he primarily speaks of the salvation provided by the Name as a protective, preserving salvation. His emphasis is on the finality of salvation in its eschatological aspect, but he does not appear to believe that this conflicts with using examples of more immediate protection and preservation in earthly circumstances. In doing this, he reflects the usage found in the Psalms, and especially in the book of Isaiah. Isaiah seems to be particularly relevant as a point of comparison because of the dual emphasis in that book on temporal/immediate salvation alongside eternal preservation. In contrast, the Psalms most often speak of the Name in the context of immediate salvation in battle or similar circumstances. Isaiah also combines Clement's – on knowing the Name as a requisite feature of salvation with the choice of light imagery for that knowledge. The imagery is common, and can be found in many Jewish texts, ranging from Gospel narratives, Pauline epistles, and material from Qumran. The cluster of ideas and language in Isaiah 50:10 – trusting, hope, light-darkness – suggests that this

could also be part of the conceptual background for Clement's understanding of the salvation provided by the Name. Although the language is common, and so Clement need not have had any one of these precedents in mind as he wrote, his application is most like that in Ephesians, 2 Corinthians, and the Gospel of John.

Isaiah and the Psalms are also present as minor parallels in the description of the specific knowledge that is required of a Christian. Both of them provide background for Clement's use of calling on the Name of the Lord. The Psalms are also one of the places Clement had precedent for his references to the holiness of the Name. Since the Psalms are one of his favorite sources, it seems safe to suggest that reading them influenced some of this usage. However, for holiness and for most of the high onomatology that we find in Clement, a stronger precedent is found in Leviticus and Ezekiel. Clement's concern for the glory of the Name, the holiness of the Name, and the need to prevent blasphemy of the Name are each best reflected in this literature from a priestly trajectory. Ezekiel seems particularly close in the expectation that God will act for the sake of his Name, and that this expectation should form a persuasive argument for God's people to change their behavior.

Other aspects of Clement's thought have only weak biblical precedent, if any at all. The idea of obedience is perhaps assumed in Ezekiel's argument, but the language of obedience and submission is actually only connected to the Name in a few references from Deuteronomy and Jeremiah. Worship directed to the Name and the cosmogonic role for the Name have only very weak parallels that should not be understood as backgrounds for these ideas. There is precedent in other Second Temple Jewish literature, however, for these concepts. The Similitudes of *I Enoch* in particular provide examples of each of these ideas, along with soteriology. To an extent, these ideas are clustered in *I Enoch* in a way that is similar to Clement. The relationship

between salvation and offering worship to the Name is used in the same way in both: salvation is available to those who recognize the proper place of the Name and offer it worship, damnation to those who refuse. The *Similitudes* also provide a parallel to Clement's use of cosmogenic language of the Name. Thus, neither the association of the Name with salvation nor the ascription of creative power to the Name is new in Clement. However, the fact that Clement relates them by making salvation an outworking of the same power as creation is unusual. *First Enoch* contains both, but the closest that text comes to making one dependent upon the other is in juxtaposing salvation with the judgment by the creative Name. The creative power of the Name is to be feared in *1 Enoch*, not called upon as in *1 Clement*.

All the elements of Clement's Name Theology are present in the earlier Jewish material, especially in Isaiah and in *1 Enoch*. Although Clement's Name Theology develops traditions that are also represented in these two places, *1 Clement* differs from the *Similitudes* in two ways that suggest he has developed his Name Theology independently of that text. First is the fact that his own understanding of the cosmological role of the Name is far more soteriologically oriented than the *Similitudes*. The second distinction goes back to a feature of Clement's Name Theology which is nearly unique among Christians: it is not Christological. In this sense, the *Similitudes* have developed the underlying tradition more than Clement, since they apply the Name to messianic Son of Man figure. This Christological question will be an important feature in the discussion of the development of Name Theology in *Shepherd of Hermas* in the next chapter.

Chapter Five

Name Theology in the *Shepherd of Hermas*

Introduction

Shepherd of Hermas was very popular in the early centuries of the Christian church in spite of issues with its expression of Christology that have led some modern scholars to discount it.¹ Christology is not the chief concern of *Shepherd*; however, as much of its content has to do with questions of sin and repentance within the church.²

Hermas's personal concern for repentance is illustrated in *Vision 1*, where the *Visions* are

¹ In particular, the perceived inconsistency between *Sim. 5* and *Sim. 9* is often the central point of difficulty. Adolph von Harnack evaluates *Sim. 5* as "Adoption Christology" (*History of Dogma* [trans. Neil Buchanan; 7 vols., 1896-1905; repr., New York: Dover, 1960] I.191), and much of the commentary since follows suit. For a survey of the influence of Harnack's analysis, in an article that challenges the "adoptionist" reading of *Sim. 5*, see Bogdan Bucur, "The Son of God and the Angelomorphic Holy Spirit: A Rereading of the Shepherd's Christology," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 98 (2007) 120-142, here 135n53. My primary edition for this chapter will be the critical edition produced by Martin Leutzsch, *Papiasfragmente – Hirt des Hermas* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftlichen Buchgesellschaft, 1998). In addition I will consult the older editions of Robert Joly, *Hermas: Le Pasteur* (SC 53; Paris: Cerf, 1958) and Molly Whittaker, *Der Hirt des Hermas* (GCS; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1956).

² Joseph M.-F. Marique, *The Apostolic Fathers* (FOC 1; New York: Fathers of the Church Inc., 1947), 225: "The *Shepherd* is basically an exhortation to penance in apocalyptic form." Graydon Snyder, *The Shepherd of Hermas* (Apostolic Fathers 6; Camden, NJ: Nelson, 1969), 69: "Repentance is the primary concern of the author..." Norbert Brox, *Der Hirt des Hermas* (KAV; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991), 476-485. Carolyn Osiek, *Shepherd of Hermas* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999), 28-30 provides a summary of Hermas's concern with metanoia, including footnotes summarizing the scholarly positions. Michael W. Holmes, *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007), 443; Lage Pernveden, *The Concept of the Church in the Shepherd of Hermas* (Lund: Gleerup, 1966); and Edith McEwan Humphrey, *The Ladies and the Cities: Transformation and Apocalyptic Identity in Joseph and Aseneth, 4 Ezra, the Apocalypse and The Shepherd of Hermas* (JSP Supp 18; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1995) are exceptions to this consensus.

inaugurated with a revelation of his sinful lust and his repentance from that sin. The text is not limited to issues of personal morality. Some baptized members of the church have bowed to undefined external pressures and showed themselves to be “ashamed of the Name” rather than suffer death—the sometime consequence of bearing the Name.³

Hermas refers to these pressures as tribulation, persecution, suffering, and martyrdom, and scholars have attempted to identify the precise conditions of persecution that underlie these experiences. There is no consensus as to the best explanation, and some scholars have retreated to the more general position that Hermas’s description is broad enough to include many degrees of pressure.⁴ Whatever the cause of their failure, Hermas sought to answer the question of whether repentance and forgiveness were possible for any who had sinned after baptism, and if so, for whom. His answer is partly expressed in terms of God’s ὄνομα.

Scholarship has been similarly unsettled on the questions of dating and authorship. An older school of criticism divided the document, based on conflicting

³ Hermas says this at *Sim.* 6.2.3.

⁴ Most often the persecutions under Domitian (95-96) or under Trajan (113-115) are identified as the historical background for Hermas. Brox highlights the difficulty of assigning a specific date, categorizing scholars by the specific persecutions they favor, and concluding that Hermas’s references are too vague to identify specific events, although the persecution he speaks of is real, not theoretical (*Der Hirt*, 474). John Christian Wilson argues for the Neronian persecution (*Five Problems in the Interpretation of the Shepherd of Hermas* [Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen, 1996], 21-32). Osiek concludes that “with so many uncertainties it seems safe to conclude only that some kind of oppression or difficulty for Christians occupies the author’s concern but offers nothing definitive for placing the book historically” (*Rich and Poor in the Shepherd of Hermas* [CBQMS 15; Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association, 1983], 13). By the time of her commentary, she suggests that the Neronian persecution is in mind, but only as historical evidence giving credibility to the idea that such persecutions were possible, not as immediate historical context (*Shepherd of Hermas*, 20).

internal evidence, into as many as seven different compositions; however, recently there has been a return to various forms of “single authorship,” usually dated to sometime during the first half of the second century.⁵ A single author, however, need not imply that it is a single composition. Carolyn Osiek endorses “Brox’s proposal of a single author in several redactional stages,” concluding that “a theory of sequential composition in the order in which the parts are now arranged is the simplest solution.”⁶ My own work concurs with this description and suggests that at least *Sim. 9* must have been composed at a later stage than the preceding material.⁷ Its use of Name Theology is different in a way that displays development in the author’s use of this theological language. The proposal of sequential composition over an extended period also has the advantage of allowing the document’s compositional history to span the range that is suggested by different aspects of the internal and external evidence.⁸

In the section that follows I will be considering only the onomanology that Hermas expresses before *Sim. 9*. In this material, I will show that Hermas employs an onomanology that operates along the same lines as that of Clement. The Name of God is

⁵ Carolyn Osiek provides a helpful summary of the debate in her introductory section on “Literary Unity,” *Shepherd of Hermas*, 8-10.

⁶ Osiek, *Shepherd*, 10. Citing Brox, *Der Hirt*, 26-28.

⁷ I am not making a statement about the compositional history of the material from *Vis. 1* through *Sim. 8*. I am inclined to agree with Brox and with Osiek that it is written by a single author, but composed gradually over the course of several decades, but my conclusions do not depend on any particular reconstruction of the earlier stages of composition. Nothing appears to change in Hermas’s onomanology until the interval between the completion of *Sim. 8* and the beginning of *Sim. 9*. *Sim. 10* is typically included with *Sim. 9* in accounts of compositional stages. I see no conflict with that assumption, however since it does not contain references to Name Theology of any kind, it does not enter into this work.

⁸ Osiek provides a brief summary of the evidence for dates ranging from the early second century to the middle of the century (*Shepherd*, 18-20).

to be revered, is active in salvation, and that salvation is connected with the Name's ecclesiological, cosmogenic role. What is more, prior to *Sim.* 9 Hermas never ascribes the Name to the Son of God, but always to God or the Lord—sometimes in direct contrast to the Son. I will not attempt to suggest that Hermas learned his onomanology from Clement, either personally or literarily. Indeed, there are differences that will be apparent suggesting that he could not have. Instead, it is my objective to show that Hermas represents a second, independent example of a Name Theology in early second century Rome that is founded upon the same understandings and assumptions about the Name.

Part One Vision 1 – Similitude 8

I. Association with the Name

Hermas, like Clement, understands the Name to have to do with Salvation. His terminology, however, is different. Hermas normally speaks of the believer possessing the Name rather than knowing the Name. Nonetheless, he shares with Clement the assumption that the nature of the believer's association with the Name determines his salvation. The Name is absolutely indispensable for salvation. In *Vis.* 4.2.4 the lady, who is the personification of the church, explains to him that he “could not be saved by anything except by the great and glorious Name.” Hermas defines the association between the Name and the believer as bearing the Name (βαστάζω or φορέω)⁹ and being called by the Name (καλέω).

⁹ Hermas is inconsistent in his use of βαστάζω and φορέω for “bearing the name.” In discussing the one place that Hermas seems to make a consistent distinction (*Sim.* 9.14),

For purposes of this discussion, it is useful to distinguish between three points along a spectrum describing the attitudes with which one might be judged to bear the Name: with shame, with gladness, or with gladness even in suffering.¹⁰ The most extreme expression of willingness to bear the Name gladly is found in those who suffer for the Name. In keeping with Hermas's soteriology, these people are also those who have a guaranteed salvation, and can be incorporated into the kingdom of God without the further refinement that the others require. They furthermore occupy a place of honor within that kingdom, a place to which Hermas cannot yet aspire.¹¹

Hermas emphasizes the importance of the attitude with which one bears the Name in the contrast between those who have been ashamed of the Name and those who bore

Brox calls his other uses mixed up: "An anderer Stelle bringt Hermas diese gewählte Diktion zwar völlig durcheinander" (*Der Hirt*, 428).

¹⁰ In the course of the text, Hermas describes much finer divisions within the church than my three part distinction. Lage Pernveden produces a full listing of ways in which the baptized relate to the kingdom of heaven based on their repentance in his section on metanoia. He presents three different lists (of 3, 10, and 15 items) of people and their lots, but when focusing on the assigned lots, these can be reduced to three categories: those who are included, those who can be included if they repent (minor variations in detail are most pronounced within this category), and those who are excluded from the kingdom. Pernveden acknowledges the overlap in his frequent use of phrases like "The same lot as the previous ones" in his lists (*Concept of the Church*, 223-38, the lists run from 233-37). These three categories correspond to my own groups who are ashamed to bear the name (and are excluded), those who bear the name gladly (and can be included if they repent), and those who bear the name gladly even in suffering (and are already included). Brox's discussion also assumes the distinction between three groups along these lines. He refers first to the ideal Christians, and then contrasts the two groups that are ashamed and those who are glad to bear the name (*Der Hirt des Hermas*, 369-370).

¹¹ This is emphasized in *Vis.* 3, where Hermas is directed away from sitting on the church's right side because it is reserved for those who have already suffered for the name. Brox's excursus on suffering and martyrdom gathers together the various references to martyrdom and argues that they are significant for Hermas in how they relate to repentance (*Der Hirt*, 473-76).

the Name gladly.¹² The question of attitude also affects the distinction Hermas makes between ashamed Christians who will repent, and those who have wholly turned away from God and cannot even be given the opportunity to repent. *Similitude* 6 represents both groups as happy, well fed sheep. Those who had completely turned away were frolicking about carelessly in the meadow, no longer sensitive to their spiritual condition. In contrast, the sheep who might still repent appeared to be subdued in their enjoyment of their luxury, perhaps aware that all was not right.¹³ They had not yet fallen into “double-mindedness” (διψυχία) concerning the Name, an attitude that Hermas strongly condemns,¹⁴ and so they still had the possibility of salvation. When the message of repentance came to them, they repented immediately.

Hermas returns to the distinction between bearing the Name gladly and bearing it with shame in *Sim.* 8. He describes thirteen different categories of people in *Sim.* 8, all of whom were called, and had believed, and bore the Name. These groups are being considered for entry into the kingdom of God, based upon their lives as symbolized by the vitality of the willow branches they are given. Those who turn their backs upon God are said to have been ashamed of the Name of the Lord.¹⁵ By contrast, others are praised (if mildly) for having borne the Name gladly.¹⁶ Both the ashamed and the glad are

¹² *Sim.* 8.6.4 (ashamed) and 8.10.3 (gladly)

¹³ *Sim.* 8.6.2.

¹⁴ See *Mand.* 9 for Hermas’s only direct discussion of the problem of διψυχία. For more on διψυχία in Hermas, see Brox’s excursus “Der Zweifel (διψυχία),” in *Der Hirt*, 551-554, and Osiek, *Shepherd of Hermas*, 30-31.

¹⁵ Osiek observes that shame has to do with anxieties about the social consequences of identification with Christ (*Shepherd of Hermas*, 237).

¹⁶ Although they had fallen into sin, all would repent after hearing the shepherd’s word.

included among “all who are called by the Name of the Lord” in the eighth *Similitude*,¹⁷ even though not all of these would ultimately be saved (symbolized by entry into the tower or the walls). In Hermas’s soteriology possessing the Name is absolutely essential to salvation, even if it is not sufficient in itself. This perspective will become explicit in *Sim.* 9, but it is already apparent prior to that section that the faithfulness with which one bears the Name finally governs whether or not the Name saves. Hermas places greater emphasis on the quality of the association, but his basic assumption is like Clement’s: you must be associated with the Name in order to be saved.

II. High Onomanology

Many scholars have interpreted Hermas’s allowance for Christians to repent even after baptism as central to his message.¹⁸ This is true, as far as it goes, but it does not go far enough. Hermas attempts to explain the reason why repentance is only possible once and cannot be done repeatedly. After having accepted the opportunity to repent and the forgiveness involved, continuing to sin amounts to an affront to the grace of God. Rejection of sin is only part of what Hermas seeks in repentance. More fundamentally, he

¹⁷ *Sim.* 8.1.1.

¹⁸ See note 2. There is also a conflict within Herm. between the position that repentance is offered once to the baptized, and that only new converts have the opportunity of repentance (see *Mand.* 4.3). One solution to this has been to suggest that parts of Herm. are intended for catechumens, and teach that there is no sin after baptism, whereas other parts are intended for those already baptized, and those teach that there is still one opportunity for repentance, but no sin after that. Snyder summarizes the possibilities, but concludes that it is not necessary to divide the catechumen from the baptized in Hermas’s audience (*The Shepherd of Hermas*, 69-71).

requires the believer to unreservedly accept their association with God.¹⁹ Avoidance of sin is a behavioral consequence of that acceptance, and that acceptance can be described in terms of the believer's relation to the Name.

In *Sim.* 8.6.2 the Shepherd explains to Hermas that false repentance blasphemes (βλασφημέω²⁰) the Name,²¹ and so the Lord gives repentance only to those whose hearts are pure and he withholds it from those who would repent hypocritically in order to avoid such blasphemy. The same idea is also found in *Sim.* 6.2.3. Some well fed happy sheep have “blasphemed against the Lord's Name” by turning away from God completely. They are bound for death, and have no opportunity for repentance. Hermas makes a case for allowing believers to repent (once), but these two passages illustrate how and why he

¹⁹ Although Snyder and Osiek disagree on the audience for Hermas's message of repentance, they both appear to agree that Hermas's message is a calling to a change of life (Snyder, *Shepherd*, 71). Osiek writes: “The change envisioned is not a ritual or repetitive action, but a fundamental personal change. Though it may have to be repeated, the underlying conviction is that it is permanent.” What has to be repeated is the turn away from acts of sin, what she understands to be permanent is the “profound change of heart” that Hermas will refer to as bearing the name gladly (*Shepherd of Hermas*, 29-30).

²⁰ βεβηλόω is a minority reading, appearing in A. The majority reading is βλασφημέω.

²¹ Leutzsch, Whittaker and Joly prefer the reading τὸν νόμον on the basis of the Michigan Papyrus and the Latin translations. Supporting τὸ ὄνομα against that reading are Athous, and the Ethiopic and the Sahidic translations. Brox prefers “name” and argues that βλασφημέω is always directed against the Lord, for whom he reads the name as a stand-in (*Der Hirt*, 368-369). Osiek follows Whittaker's choice of “the law,” saying that the law is also important in *Sim.* 8 (*Shepherd*, 206). Although “law” is more difficult to explain, I agree with Brox's assessment that it is not possible in this context, and add that a search of *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* for combinations of βλασφημέω and νομος returned no examples of the law as the object of blasphemy prior to Hermas. The first example of law being blasphemed is placed by Eusebius into the mouth of the Emperor Constantine, *Vita Constantini* III.21.2.4 (“those who are always ready to speak ill of the divine law” τὸν θεῖον βλασφημεῖν νόμον). Snyder translates “name,” but does not comment on his decision to depart from the editions of Whittaker and Joly (*Shepherd of Hermas*, 122).

cuts off further repentance.²² The ability and desire to repent is given by God, and it is given selectively. Much like Clement, Hermas describes the repeated refusal to acknowledge association with God as a rejection of God's grace, and finally as blasphemy. This blasphemy is committed against the Name of God – since receiving the Name of God is the association that the sinning Christian has denied. The end result of the blasphemy is condemnation.

The fact that this blasphemy is perpetrated against the Name illustrates the elevated way in which Hermas speaks about the Name. His concern for the Name is influenced by the perspective of the Priestly material in the Hebrew Bible. Both are concerned to guard against profaning or blaspheming the Name because of the Name's close association with God. Hermas allows that repentance is given selectively by God as a means of protecting the Name of God against blasphemy; it is not given to those who would abuse the opportunity to repent by continuing to fall into sin. They have turned completely away, and subsequent insincere repentance would further blaspheme or profane the Name of the Lord. In order to prevent blasphemy, these people cannot be given the ability to repent. This assumption—that the Name should be strongly guarded

²² Brox emphasizes that falling away is the blasphemy, and that repentance is disallowed as a protective measure (*Der Hirt*, 336-337). Partially against this, Osiek places emphasis on the human agency in the final destruction, “it is not God who excludes them, but their own persistence in evil and refusal to be converted” (*Shepherd*, 206-207). Osiek is correct that their persistence leads to their exclusion, she fails to take into account the importance attached to protecting the name (or simply God, as in Brox) against blasphemy, and so minimizes God's active role in preventing repentance. Pernveden takes a position similar to Osiek's: “What excludes salvation for Hermas's part is man's hardness of heart,” and also diminishes God's active responsibility for that hardening: “Man's disinclination is an obstacle for God's act of salvation ...” (*The Church in the Shepherd of Hermas*, 242).

against blasphemy—is similar to the logic in Clement. There, the consequences of blaspheming the Name were considered so grave that Clement assumed the schismatics would be motivated to end the division once they realized that the division constituted blasphemy.

The opposite of blaspheming the Name is attributing to it the glory it in fact possesses by being a “glorious” (ἐνδοξος) Name—one that is filled with glory. Hermas describes this acknowledgement as “glorifying the Name,” using the verb δοξάζω, and his use agrees with Clement’s regarding the Name’s glory:²³ recognition and acknowledgement of that glory is the Christian’s duty, and it plays a role in the necessary repentance of believers. Hermas’s own experience of repentance provides the first example of this perspective in the second *Vision*. His sins had been revealed to him by God in the first *Vision*, and upon remembering the event one year later, in *Vis.* 2.1.2 Hermas reacts by stopping “to glorify (δοξάζειν) his Name, because he had considered me worthy and had made known to me my former sins.” Later, in the fourth *Vision*, Hermas asks for the completion of the revelation that he had earlier been given, and points to the glorification of the Lord’s “great and glorious (ἐνδοξον) Name” as the ultimate outcome if God grants his request. In both this case and the one from *Vis.* 1, Hermas assumes a connection between the glory of the Name and the revelation that is made to him. The assumption in *Vis.* 4.1.3, in fact, is that the objective of proclaiming the

²³ See my section XXX in ch. 4 on *Glory, Holiness, and Majesty* for a discussion of the nature of δόξα, as well as its relationship to ἐνδοξος and δοξάζω. As in Clement, Hermas sometimes uses δοξάζω to mean *praise* without any suggestion of a connection with God’s δόξα, but the term is also able to indicate an acknowledgement of God’s δόξα (Kittel, “δόξα.” *TDNT* 2:253-54), and that is the way it is used in the passages discussed here.

Name's glory will motivate God to act in a certain way. Again on this point, Hermas is in agreement with the Name Theology that I identified in Clement, who interprets the wilderness narratives in much the same way—the Lord acts to preserve and magnify his own glory.

I asked the Lord to **complete the revelations** and visions that he had showed me through his holy church,

in order that he might strengthen me and **grant repentance** to his servants who had stumbled,

so that his great and glorious (ἐνδοξον) **Name might be glorified**(δοξασθῇ), because he considered me worthy to show his wonders to me.

Hermas believes that these visionary revelations have a strengthening effect upon the one who receives them, allowing them to repent. He himself had been led to repent of his sin as soon as it was revealed to him in *Vis.* 1. Hermas makes the logical (and causal) sequence that he envisions from revelation to repentance and to glorification of the Name clear in the quotation above. The revelations and visions he has received, and will pass on to the church, ought to lead directly to their repentance and cessation of sin. It was for this repentance and the continued possibility of salvation that Hermas was thankful and glorified the Name.

Hermas connects the glorification of the Name to revelation²⁴ because he understands that revelation will lead to repentance, which is a necessary intermediate

²⁴ Brox recognizes this sequence in describing Hermas's ultimate argument for revelation as being for the glorification of God through his self-proclamation, however he does not work out the logical connection that causes Hermas to place repentance between the revelation and the glorification, viewing instead the strengthening of Hermas, the repentance of the sinners, and the glorification to be three individual consequences of the

step.²⁵ The repentance of the sinning Christians glorifies the Name just as the alternative, continued sin, profanes and blasphemes the Name by denying the efficacy of its work. Hermas's emphasis on glorifying the Name corresponds to the desire to protect the Name against blasphemy. Like preventing blasphemy, glorifying the Name is an objective that is expected to motivate Christians. Together the counterpoints of blasphemy and glorification support the conclusion that *Shepherd of Hermas* displays a high view of the Name.²⁶

III. Cosmology

Hermas uses the creative activity of the Name in a similar way as Clement,²⁷ especially in the emphasis both place on the role of the Name in the establishment and preservation of the church. The "Lady" describes the church as a tower on a foundation of water in *Vis.* 3.3.5: "Why, then, is the tower built upon waters? Hear: Because your life was saved and will be saved through water. But the tower has been founded (τεθεμελίωται) by the word (τῷ ῥήματι) of the almighty and glorious Name, and is sustained by the unseen power of the master." There is a strong connection between the

requested revelation which are not causally related to one another, describing them instead as each directly resultant from the requested revelation (*Der Hirt*, 166).

²⁵ In *Vis.* 3.4 the Lady displays a similar perspective on revelation. She tells Hermas that the visions have been revealed to Hermas so that "the name of God might be glorified" and so that the "double-minded" will know the truth – that if they are sincere there is the possibility of repentance from the sins they have fallen into.

²⁶ The additional term, "great" (μέγας), is often associated with glory, and emphasizes the elevated view of the name, however it does not add any additional content to that view. It is used in *Herm.* to describe several subjects in addition to God (the calling of believers, *Mand.* 4.3; the things Hermas is told by the Shepherd, *Sim.* 5.5, 9.2, 9.14, 9.18).

Nonetheless, Hermas most commonly uses it to describe something associated with God.

²⁷ Although the logic is only fully visible in *Sim.* 9, and so will be treated in that place.

establishment of the church as pictured here and the establishment of the world in *Vis.* 1.3.4, where God (rather than the Name) is said to have “founded (θεμελιώσας) the world upon the waters,” also through the word (ῥήματι).²⁸ Koester suggests that this watery foundation is originally a cosmological image that Hermas modifies into an ecclesiological one when he uses it in *Vis.* 3.²⁹ By taking up cosmological language for his description of the church, Hermas stresses that the church is maintained and

²⁸ The translations given for both *Vis.* 1.3.4 and *Vis.* 3.3.5 are my own..

²⁹ Helmut Koester, *Introduction to the New Testament* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1995), 258-259. Brox, however, argues that the cosmological content of the image is no longer present in *Vis.* 3. He describes the internal consistency of the water image in *Herm.* as weak, and concludes that the soteriological content is the important part. The connection between baptism and salvation symbolizes the Christian’s freedom from past sins, and a definitive guarantee of future salvation (*Der Hirt*, 91, 126-127). Henne believes that the waters in the two passages represent the same symbol, but that a distinction between plural (foundational waters) and singular (baptismal water) is strictly maintained. He finds it to be without scriptural precedent, but to be an example of Hermas’s tendency not only to allow symbols to carry more than a single meaning, but also his tendency to shift from cosmological referents early in *Herm.* to soteriological referents in later uses (“La Polysémie allégorique dans le Pasteur d’Hermas,” *Ephemerides theologiae lovanienses* 65.1 (1989) 131-35, here 131). I agree with Henne’s assessment that the subtle distinctions provide nuance to a single cosmological image rather than indicate two separate and unrelated images, and accept Osiek’s language—that both the church and the world share this terminology, and that as such, the terminology is “polyvalent” (*Shepherd of Hermas*, 68-69). Pernveden, for whom the church is the central theme of *Herm.*, finds the connection between creation and the church to be important in interpreting these passages. For him purpose of creation is the church, and so the cosmological need not be lost in the ecclesiological use of the image. The waters of *Vis.* 3 are an adaptation of the Jewish concept of the life giving waters of paradise which flow under the mountain of paradise. That the waters are plural may be a reference to the four rivers of Paradise that flow out of the temple. Pernveden follows the logic laid out by J. Jeremias (*Golgotha*, [ΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ vol 1; Leipzig: Pfeiffer, 1926), and uses it also to connect *Vis.* 3 to the similar image in *Sim.* 9, which I will treat in my section on that Similitude (*Church in the Shepherd*, 284-291).

established by divine creative power.³⁰ In *Vis.* 3 that creative power is exercised by the Name, just as in *1 Clement* the creative power of preserving both church and creation are attributed to the Name. When Hermas applies the water imagery to baptism, he makes the water singular in order to emphasize the singularity of entrance into that church.³¹

IV. Non-Christological Application

A final observation to make is that in the sections of *Shepherd of Hermas* we have so far treated (everything up to and including *Sim.* 8) Hermas never applies the Name to the Son. Some passages are ambiguous, those that simply refer to the “great and glorious Name” without assigning it, but most often the Name is designated as the Name of the Lord, or the Name of God. The “Lord” or “God” is not the Son in these passages, as is apparent from the juxtaposition of the terms in *Vis.* 2.2.8: “For the Lord swore by his Son that those who have denied their Lord have been dispossessed of their life.” Brox uses this passage to explain the expression “the Name of the Lord” as a reference to God, in distinction to the Son.³² In this way Hermas is consonant with Clement in understanding the Name to have to do with divinity, but in a way that is not christologically relevant.

³⁰ He had already signaled such a connection in *Vis.* 1 by including a statement about the church in the middle of a long description of God’s creative work: “with wisdom and with foresight [he] created the holy church.”

³¹ The theme of entrance will also be developed when cosmogony is revisited in *Sim.* 9.

³² Brox, *Der Hirt*, 115, 127. Osiek disagrees, concluding that in *Vis.* 2.2.8 “the two uses of κύριος (“Lord”) in the same sentence are different: the first time it refers to God, who swears the oath, the second time probably to Christ ...” She reports that Audet allows no examples of κύριος referring to the Son (*Shepherd of Hermas*, 56). I am inclined to agree with her assessment.

Conclusion

The Name Theology found in the *Shepherd of Hermas* up through *Sim.* 8 is very similar to what is found in *1 Clement*. I outlined Clement's onomanology as treating the Name as holy and glorious, and thus it should not be blasphemed. I also showed that the Name played a substantial role in Clement's soteriology, and that it contributed to that salvation by means of its cosmogenic activity. I have now shown that this description also serves as a good framework for Hermas's theology of the Name. Hermas also expresses a high onomanology in which the Name is protected against blasphemy, is worthy of praise, and can be described with glory terminology. Like Clement, Hermas thinks that the Name plays an indispensable role in salvation, and that its soteriological role is best described as cosmological. One final point is that up through *Sim.* 8 Hermas follows the same pattern as Clement by applying the Name exclusively to the Father and the Father's work.³³ This is not to say that Hermas is dependent upon Clement's work. Differences in the language they use, particularly in expressing the association between believer and the Name suggest that he comes to his onomanology without referring to Clement's work.³⁴ Instead, I suggest that both Roman writers were deriving their ideas about the Name from a similar set of ideas, primarily based in the Psalms and in Isaiah, in

³³ The term *Father* is not Hermas's normal term for God, but he does employ it in *Vis.* 3.9.10, and *Sim.* 5.6.3-4. (Also *Sim.* 9.12.2, which falls into the next section.)

³⁴ In particular, Hermas does not make use of Clement's "knowledge" language and imagery until a brief mention of it in *Sim.* 9, at which point I think the christocentric nature of his onomanology makes it sufficiently different from Clement's that influence cannot be argued there.

the Priestly literature of the Hebrew Bible, and in the *Similitudes* of *I Enoch*, as I laid out in chapter four for *I Clement*.

Part Two Similitude 9

Having identified a Name Theology in the previous section of this chapter that is largely similar to that of *I Clement*, I turn now to the onomalogy of the ninth *Similitude*. In *Sim. 9* there is a change in the references to the Name. Instead of the consistent application of the Name to “God” or to “the Lord,” in *Sim. 9* the Name is, with only two exceptions, always applied to the Son of God.³⁵ Stronger emphasis on Christ is in keeping with the general tone of the ninth *Similitude*, an emphasis that has been noted in previous scholarship. Osiek comments in her introduction to the passage that “Christological allusions will grow stronger,” and makes frequent reference to the increased attention to the Son in this *Similitude*. In his study of the Christology of *Shepherd of Hermas*, Henne uses two passages to organize his argument: one passage from *Sim. 5*, and extensive material from the *Sim. 9*.³⁶ The strong Christological dimension of the ninth *Similitude* is

³⁵ I have counted 24 references to the name in *Sim. 9*. Of those, 10 refer explicitly to the Son, 12 additional say “his name” or “this name” and contextually must be to the son. Only two references, at 9.18.5 and 9.28.6, refer to the name of “the Lord” and are probably not applied to the Son.

³⁶ Henne, *La Christologie chez Clément de Rome et Dans Le Pasteur D’Hermas*. Unfortunately in his brief discussion of ὄνομα in *Herm.*, Henne does not give attention to its uses prior to *Sim. 9*. As a result, his assessment of Hermas’s theology of the name is overly simplified and he describes it as an improvement upon Clement’s (*La Christologie*, 272-74).

part of the criteria Giet uses to attribute it to a later author.³⁷ If, however, the more recent scholarship is correct and the ninth *Similitude* is a later composition by the same author,³⁸ it raises the question of how the shift from “God” to “Son of God” affects the way Hermas expresses an onomanology that has become Christological.³⁹ In the final section of this chapter, I turn my attention to that question.

I. High Onomanology

In making this shift to a Christological focus, *Sim.* 9 continues the high onomanology of the earlier sections and retains most of the content that was found expressed there. In those earlier references, as well as in *1 Clement*, this attitude was displayed through the use of terms that mark the Name as the recipient of honor and praise that are appropriate for God.⁴⁰ *Similitude* 9 displays concern for those issues in ways that are similar to the rest of the book. I will now show that high onomanology by

³⁷ Stanislas Giet, *Hermas et les pasteurs, Les trois auteurs du “Pasteur” d’Hermas*, (Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1963), 274-276. Giet, however, unlike other reconstructions, separates *Sim.* 10 from *Sim.* 9.

³⁸ As is argued by most recent scholarship, see Osiek, “Literary Unity,” *The Shepherd of Hermas*, 8-10.

³⁹ Some scholars have referred to this language as “Name Christology” (Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition* [2nd ed; Atlanta: John Knox, 1975], 41), or “Christology of the Name” (Danielou, *Theology of Jewish Christianity*, 147-163. Danielou uses “christologie du Nom” in the original French edition [*Théologie du Judéo-Christianisme* (Tournai, Belgium: Desclée & Co., 1958), 201].). I prefer the terms Christological Name Theology or Christoloical onomanology because it highlights the connections between “Name Christology” and other Name Theology, and because it avoids confusion with study of the Names and titles borne by Christ.

⁴⁰ For Clement, these terms included glory (δόξα), majesty (μεγαλωσύνη), and holiness (ἁγιος, ὅσιος, and πανάγιος).

considering the Name as glorious, great and marvelous, incomprehensible, and finally the act of calling upon the Name.

1. *Glory terminology* (ἐνδοξος, δοξάζω)⁴¹

Some of the language used in *Vis.* 3 to describe the Name of God is carried over directly into *Sim.* 9. Terminology related to glory, for example, appears in both. The Name is called glorious (ἐνδοξος) twice in *Sim.* 9, in each of the two instances where the Name is that of the Lord (κύριος). In *Sim.* 9.18.5 the Name of the Lord is said to be “great and marvelous and glorious.”⁴² Because this reference to the Name of the Lord would be one of very few examples in *Sim.* 9 in which the Name is not explicitly assigned to Son, one might argue that the Lord here indicates the Son of God also. It is equally possible, however, that a distinction should be maintained between the Son and the Lord. In *Sim.* 9.12.6 and 9.13.5 at least, this distinction is clear. The Lord may only be entered through “his Son” in the first, and people “have believed in the Lord through his Son” in the second.⁴³ In *Sim.* 9.14 there is not such a convenient contrast, where we find reference to people who call upon the Name of the Lord, but it is also not necessary to see a shift here to identify the Lord with the Son.⁴⁴ The passage under consideration in 9.18 is the next place where the Lord is mentioned. It seems best to understand Hermas to

⁴¹ The noun δόξα is not mentioned directly; Herm. uses ἐνδοξος (glorious, or filled with the quality of glory) and δοξάζω (glorify).

⁴² *Sim.* 9.18.5 “μέγα καὶ θαυμαστὸν καὶ ἐνδοξον”

⁴³ Osiek points out that the unusual notion of a city with a single entrance “underscores the Christological statement” (*Shepherd of Hermas*, 234).

⁴⁴ Brox interprets κύριος as a reference to God in both locations, and furthermore observes that the title is rarely applied to Christ in Herm. (*Der Hirt des Hermas*, 419).

still be using “the Lord” to indicate someone separate from the Son, as he had in 9.12 and 9.13. Although for most uses, *Sim.* 9 speaks of the Name as it belongs to the Son, the author is able to retain the usage that characterized the earlier portions of the *Shepherd* and *1 Clement* and attribute the Name to the Father, even while having predominantly shifted the reference to the Son.

Returning to *Sim.* 9.18.5, this passage appears to be a variation of a similar statement at *Vis.* 4.1.3. Just as in *Vis.* 4, in *Sim.* 9 Hermas urges the Shepherd to answer his questions in order that the Name of the Lord would be glorified (δοξάσῃ).⁴⁵ In the Visions passage it is the “great and glorious” (μέγα καὶ ἑνδοξόν) Name that is glorified. “Marvelous” (θαυμαστὸν) is added in the *Similitude*, but otherwise, the phrases are the same. Both assume, as Clement had in *1 Clem.* 43, that the proper attribution of glory to the Name was an important objective. All three passages assume that the desire to glorify the Name would convince someone (the Shepherd, the Corinthians, or God himself) to act in a particular way.

In *Sim.* 9.28.3-4 glory seems even to be transferrable, in that believers themselves become glorious (ἑνδοξοί) in the sight of God if they suffer for the Name of the Son of God.⁴⁶ All who suffer for the Name are glorious, but attitude is again determinative because those who suffer willingly are more glorious (μᾶλλον ἑνδοξότεροί) than those who hesitate at first. The Shepherd encourages those who have been considered worthy

⁴⁵ Whenever I refer to the name being glorified or the glorification of the name, the Greek verb in use is δοξάζω.

⁴⁶ More than other passages in *Herm.*, these verses may retain some of the notion of glory as a visible manifestation of light. The fact that believers can assume it, and that it is perceived in God’s “sight,” supports this possibility. Nevertheless, this notion does not seem to be important in Hermas’s use of the set of terms.

of suffering to glorify God in gratitude for that honor. Hermas's thought here seems most similar to that in 1 Peter 4:12-16 where believers are called on to suffer in the Name of Christ, sharing in both his suffering and glory (δόξης).⁴⁷

2. *Great (μέγας) and Marvelous (θαυμαστός)*

Great and *marvelous*, which are added to *glorious* in *Sim.* 9.18.5, frequently appear together whether or not they are describing the Name. They appear to be connected to the exercise of divine power. In *Vis.* 4.1.3, although the Name is not called marvelous, the revelation Hermas asks for is a revelation of the "marvels" (θαυμάσιος). These marvels amount to the establishment and sustenance of the church. The cluster of *great*, *marvelous*, and *glory* appear together, again based upon creative power, at *Mand.* 12.4.2, although in that passage *glory* (δόξα) is described as great and as marvelous.⁴⁸

By applying these terms to the Name (both of the Lord and of the Son) in *Sim* 9.18.5, the author expresses a high view of the Name, one which is very similar to that in the earlier sections of the book. Leutzsch points to the similarity between this passage

⁴⁷ Brox, *Der Hirt*, 440 notes the connection. See also Romans 8:17, where however there is no reference to the name "...and fellow heirs with Christ, provided we suffer with him in order that we may also be glorified with him." 1 Pet 4 is the only NT example of suffering in or for the name of Christ. For further discussion on the commonness of the concept of Christian suffering being related to reward, including glorification, see Achtemeier, *1 Peter*, 303-309 (see also 314-315, where he interprets ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τούτῳ as "on this account").

⁴⁸ "Fool, incomprehending and double-minded, do you not perceive the glory of God, how great it is, and how mighty and marvelous, because he created the world for the sake of humanity, and subjected all his creation to humankind, and gave them authority to rule over everything under heaven?"

and the longer series at *Jub.* 36.7,⁴⁹ where the terms serve as part of a series of characteristics that reinforce the Name's authority to compel obedience. *Great* is also used in *Sim* 9.14, in a passage that introduces some additional concepts to Hermas's treatment of the Name of the Son of God.

3. *Uncontained or Incomprehensible (Ἀχώρητος)*

Ἀχώρητος, translated as "incomprehensible" by Lightfoot, is used to describe the Name in 9.14.5. Schoedel relates this term to the philosophical description of divinity as being uncontained but containing all things. He suggests that the term Ἀχώρητος was preferred by Christians over the related and more common term περιέχειν because Ἀχώρητος more strongly implied that God was not only spatially boundless, but also beyond the grasp of the mind.⁵⁰ The terminology can be traced to the pre-Socratics, but Philo is the first to use it specifically of God in order to emphasize God's transcendence.⁵¹ Around the middle of the second century, Christians begin to make more

⁴⁹ Leutzsch, *Hirt des Hermas*, 493.

⁵⁰ William R. Schoedel, "Enclosing, Not Enclosed: The Early Christian Doctrine of God," in *Early Christian Literature and the Classical Intellectual Tradition: In Honorem Robert M. Grant* (ed. William R. Schoedel and Robert L. Wilken; Paris: Éditions Beauchesne, 1979), 75-86, here 76-77. Spatial and conceptual boundlessness are closely associated in the philosophical tradition. The Christian shift does not introduce a new idea, but signals a shift in interest from the spatial to the conceptual.

⁵¹ The pre-Socratic notion was not of an unenclosed divinity, but of unenclosed original substance. Schoedel cites Thales describing topos as that which contains everything (Diogenes Laertius 1.35), and follows Wolfson's suggestion that Philo's use of this language to describe God as unknowable was new in philosophical discourse, and is best traced to Judaism ("Enclosing not Enclosed, 77). John Dillon appears to suggest that Philo receives the idea from the Alexandrian philosophical tradition since it appears in Albinus, who is not known to have used Philo (*The Middle Platonists* [Ithaca: Cornell, 1996], 155). Nonetheless, Philo remains our earliest example.

frequent use of ἀχώρητος as a characteristic of God.⁵² Hermas appears to be an early example of the Christian adoption of ἀχώρητος. Rather than simply applying the adjective to God, however, Hermas applies it to the Name. In so doing, he raises the Name above the realm of those things that can be grasped in human experience. As we will see, however, grasping this ungraspable Name forms an important part of Hermas's account of salvation.⁵³

4. *Call upon (ἐπικαλέω) the Name*

I have already mentioned *Sim.* 9.14.3 as an example of Hermas making reference to the Name of the Lord rather than the Name of the Son of God. Hermas thanks the Lord for his mercy “on all those who called upon (ἐπικαλουμένοις) his Name.” The idea of calling upon the Name does not appear elsewhere in *Shepherd*, but the use of ἐπικαλέω here is very similar to Clement's use several decades earlier. For Clement, to call upon the Name was a worshipful plea for salvation. That salvation was heavily eschatological, as even the temporal aspects have an eschatological focus.⁵⁴ In the context of *Sim.* 9.14,

⁵² Among those who know and use ἀχώρητος are Justin, *Dialogue with Trypho* 128.2.7; 127.2.7; Theophilus, *Ad Autolycus* 1.3.4; 1.5.9; 2.22.3; Athenagoras, *Legatio* 10.1.2; 20.4.14; and Irenaeus, *Adversus Haeresies* 1.1.1; 1.2.1; 1.2.5; 1.14.2; 1.15.5; 4.Frag.10.5 (4.20.5). Justin and Athenagoras simply acknowledge that God is incomprehensible, Theophilus goes on to discount the ultimate value of any description of God, saying that any name for God names only one aspect. Irenaeus uses it most often in reporting gnostic theology but affirms the idea himself at 1.15.5, describing God as “the all containing Father, unable to be contained (πάντα χωροῦντα Πατέρα, ἀχώρητον δὲ ὑπάρχοντα).”

⁵³ The related verb χωρέω, is used at *Sim.* 9.2.1 to describe the capacity for the rock (later identified as the name) to “hold” the whole world.

⁵⁴ Patricia Cox Miller describes the combination of temporal and eschatological perspectives that are active in Hermas's salvation. She describes this “third understanding of salvation” which lies between purely eschatological and purely temporal “as a

those who have received mercy are the sinning believers who repent and can thus be included in the church. The mercy that is extended to them is two-fold. The most obvious mercy is that they are allowed to enter the church at all, but the more immediate mercy is that the completion of the church is delayed to give them time to realize their sins and repent.⁵⁵ This aspect of salvation, however, still appears to be an act of the Lord rather than an act of the Son of God. In its account of the place of repentance in the process of salvation, *Sim.* 9 retains elements of the soteriology in the earlier sections, in particular the concepts of repentance present in the Parable of the Willow branches in *Sim.* 8. I turn in the next section to the particular nature of that salvation.

5. *Summary of High Onomanology*

In terms of what I have called his “high onomanology,” Hermas does not make a large shift between *Sim.* 8 and 9. This onomanology is applied mostly to the Son in *Sim.* 9; although, there are a few instances in which it continues to refer to the Lord. It appears, therefore, that Hermas understands the Name still to be the Name of the Father, now extended to the Son. A similar perspective was also present in the New Testament, most notably in John 17 where the Father gives his own Name to the Son. In spite of this Christological transfer of the Name, Hermas’s elevated view of the Name does not

conscious awareness of dwelling in an invisible “safe place” in the midst of everyday earthy reality” (“All the Words Were Frightful: Salvation by Dreams in the Shepherd of Hermas,” *VC* 42 [1988], 327-338, here 327).

⁵⁵ Brox argues that Hermas speaks of the delay primarily in individual terms rather than general terms (*Der Hirt*, 426), and so rejects Joly’s suggestion that the work stoppage refers to the delay of the Parousia (*Hermas le Pasteur*, 332). Osiek concurs with Brox, arguing that the delay is not a problem for Hermas, but rather the solution to a problem (*Shepherd of Hermas*, 236).

change. Many of the old terms can still be applied (glory, marvelous, great) and the new terms that are introduced (incomprehensible, call upon) do not conflict with, but rather reinforce the basic perspective present in the earlier work.

II. Salvation in Similitude 9

As we have already seen, for Hermas, salvation ultimately depends upon the manner in which each believer relates to the Name. In *Sim.* 9, Hermas returns to the symbol of the tower as an image of the church in order to illustrate this salvation. He had used a similar tower image in the third Vision.⁵⁶ In both, believers are represented as stones to be either included or excluded from the construction of the tower/church. Included if they are glad in their association with the Name; excluded if they are ashamed. In keeping with the change that has taken place between the eighth and ninth *Similitudes*, the Name here is the Name of the Son of God. The believer is connected to the church in two ways in *Sim.* 9, first by association with the Name of the Son of God (receiving it and bearing it) and second by entering into the kingdom of God through the Name.

⁵⁶ Osiek lays out the main differences, and describes the vision in *Sim.* 9 as a reworking of the same idea as in *Vis.* 3, and finds this to support the theory that *Sim.* 9 is a later work by the same author as the Vision material (*Shepherd of Hermas*, 220). Brox describes it as a duplicate, and argues that it is by the same author as *Vis* 3, which Hermas takes up again because of his fondness for the tower image, but also in order to embellish it with his new idea to found it upon the rock and door, rather than on the water (*Der Hirt des Hermas*, 375).

1. Association

a. Receive the Name: Believers are said to have received (λαμβάνω) the Name of the Son of God, and possessing it is an absolute prerequisite for entry into the Kingdom of God.⁵⁷ Hermas use of λαμβάνω to describe the believers' association with God appears to be new in *Sim.* 9. Believers receive the seal of baptism in *Sim.* 8. In light of *Sim.* 9, it is possible that he already conceives of the seal as equating to the Name, in which case the language is not entirely new. In either case, λαμβάνω aligns well with Hermas's more common terminology of bearing the Name.

b. Bear the Name: Once received, Hermas also says that the believer "bears" the Name of the Son of God (either βαστάζω or φορέω).⁵⁸ The idea was also central in *Sim.* 8, and most of my interpretation of that passage about bearing the Name with shame or with gladness carries over to this one. The chief difference is that the Name in *Sim.* 9 is the Name of the Son of God. The believer must bear the Name wholeheartedly and without shame. Shame in bearing the Name had been equated with blasphemy in *Sim.* 8.6.4, and constituted grounds for exclusion from the church. The same logic (although without the language of blasphemy) appears in *Sim.* 9. Only those who bear the Son's Name without shame are a part of the church according to *Sim.* 9.14.6, and those who are ashamed, while having still a chance to repent, are at risk of waiting too long and being

⁵⁷ "Receiving" the name is referred to in *Sim* 9.12.8; 9.13.2; 9.13.7; or "having" the name, as in *Sim* 9.18.2. *Sim.* 9.12.8 is the clearest expression of the indispensable place of the name in salvation "whoever does not receive his name will not enter into the kingdom of God."

⁵⁸ See footnote 9 in this chapter for comments on the interchangeability of these terms in Herm.

permanently excluded in *Sim.* 9.21.3. Bearing the Name implies a close association, and in *Sim.* 9 this association is fundamental to allowing one to be included in the final construction of the church where that association with the Son of God becomes permanent.

c. Bear the Virtues: Although no one can enter the kingdom of God without bearing the Name of the Son of God, according to a passage beginning in *Sim.* 9.13, bearing that Name is not by itself sufficient for Salvation. In addition to his Name, believers must also bear his power (δύναμιν μὴ φορῆς), which is the collection of “holy spirits” (ἅγια πνεύματά), or virtues (δυνάμεις), represented by twelve virgins.⁵⁹ Those virtues are the ones displayed by the believers who ultimately enter into the Kingdom of God. The Shepherd explains that the names of these virtues are in fact borne by the Son himself. “To bear their names” (τὰ ὀνόματα φορεῖν) along with His own demonstrates complete acceptance of the association with the Son implicit in bearing his Name. Hermas makes it clear that for those who only receive the Name of the Son of God (ὄνομα μόνον λάβης) without also bearing the Son’s power, bearing his Name is futile. That is, those who associate with the Son but do not display the virtues in their lives will “bear his Name in vain” (εἰς μάτην ἔσῃ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ φορῶν) and derive no benefit from their association with him.

The shift at *Sim.* 9 from the Name of God to the Name of the Son allows Hermas to apply the tower image in two ways that he could not, or could not emphasize, in its first deployment in *Vis.* 3. First he is able to incorporate the righteous from before the

⁵⁹ Faith, Self-Control, Power, Patience, Simplicity, Innocence, Purity, Cheerfulness, Truth, Understanding, Harmony, and Love (*Sim.* 9.15.2).

time of Christ into the Kingdom of God. They had already borne the virtues, but still could not enter without the Name of the Son. Once they received the seal of the Name,⁶⁰ pictured as them being raised through the water, they can be incorporated into the tower as completely and seamlessly as those who knew the Son in their lives.⁶¹ Second, and perhaps more important for Hermas, it allows the tower image to illustrate both the need for and the possibility of repentance for those who have already received the Name of the Son. Initial association with the Name of the Son does not guarantee inclusion in the kingdom. Since the Son of God was incarnate and manifested the virtues in his human life, the Shepherd can say that he bore the names of the virtues, and thus to bear his Name completely requires one to bear the names of the virtues as well.

2. Enter (εἰσερχομαι) Through the Name

In addition to the association with the Name of the Son of God implied by the two terms above, *Similitude* 9 describes entry into the church as being available only “through” (διὰ) the Name of the Son of God. “a person is not able to enter into the

⁶⁰ Hermas appears to use ὄνομα and σφραγίς almost interchangeably in this section. There seems to be an equation between “coming up through the water in order to be made alive” and receiving the seal of the Son of God-bearing the name of the Son of God. The apostles ‘died’ and took the name of the Son of God down with them to preach to the dead so that they could come to full knowledge of the name of the Son of God. This knowledge is required for a person to enter the church/tower. They fell asleep in righteousness, they just did not have the seal – the full knowledge of the name.

⁶¹ This is Hermas’s only reference to “knowledge” of the name here at *Sim.* 9.16. In spite of the fact that these righteous people bore the names (virtues) that were later borne by the Son himself, it was still necessary for them to know his name in order for them to bear it. To that end, the name was proclaimed to them so that they “came to know (ἐπιγινώσκω) the name of the Son of God,” they received it (in baptism), and then they could bear it and be included in the kingdom of God.

kingdom of God except through the Name of his son.”⁶² In this statement, Hermas adapts his onomanology to an aspect of the Christology that is prominent in *1 Clement*. There salvation was an act of the Name performed through the Son. Having identified the Name as the Name of the Son, Hermas places the Name of the Son into the role of the Son in this scheme, so that salvation is an act performed through the Name of the Son. This factors into the image of the tower, in that the Son of God is pictured as the door because those who enter the kingdom, enter through the Son. The shepherd relates this door to the incarnation by explaining its newness as having to do with the lateness of the incarnation in human history. The image of Christ as a door into the kingdom of God is very reminiscent of the parable of John 10, in which Jesus is the door to the sheepfold through which the sheep must enter to be safe.⁶³

III. Cosmology

The image of the door is combined with the image of a Rock⁶⁴ in *Sim.* 9.12, in that the tower is said to be built upon the rock and the door. Hermas draws attention to

⁶² *Sim.* 9.12.5 “εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἄλλως εἰσελθεῖν οὐ δύναται ἄνθρωπος εἰ μὴ διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ”

⁶³ The Greek words are different, however. Clement uses πύλη, John uses θύρα. Osiek notes the connection to John 10, but as she observes, there is probably not direct dependence upon the gospel text, but instead the influence of a widely circulating image of Christ as a door (*Shepherd of Hermas*, 233). Raymond Brown suggests that Hermas “weaves together the Johannine and Synoptic imagery,” referring to the similar statement at Matt 7:13 where Jesus refers to the narrow gate that leads to salvation. Matthew, like Hermas, uses the term πύλη, although the gate is not there identified with Christ (*Gospel According to John*, 1.394).

⁶⁴ Ben F. Meyer describes the Rock symbolism that is used in the Gospels (*The Aims of Jesus* [London: SCM, 1979], 185-197). Pernveden analyzes the same symbolism in *Herm.* and suggests that it serves the primary function of emphasizing pre-existence. He

this change from the tower, that in Vis. 3 was said to be built upon the water. In the answer to Hermas's question about the rock and door as foundation, the Shepherd connects the Name of the Son of God to the cosmogenic role of the Son. He had already made mention of creation in *Sim.* 9.12.2, where he explained the reason for the extreme age of the Rock. As a symbol of the Son of God, the rock is old because the Son was older than "his creation." The Shepherd goes on to say that the Son was the Father's counselor in creation. In 9.14.5-6 he extends the logic of his cosmology. The Name of the Son of God supports the entire cosmos, and it is therefore fitting that the church, made up of the people who bear that Name and were called by it would likewise be supported by it. As in *I Clement*, ecclesiology follows cosmology and the power that sustains the world is deployed also for the benefit of the church.

Interestingly, it is also at this point in the text that the fluidity between the Name of the Son of God and the Son himself is greatest. Brox observes that the two terms appear to function interchangeably in the passage.⁶⁵ If the beginning of the explanation of the vision in *Sim.* 9.12 is included in the discussion the point is made more clearly. In 9.12.1 it is the Son who is identified as the rock and the door. When Hermas and the Shepherd return to discussing the double image in 9.14, in particular why the church is built upon the rock and the door, the Shepherd begins with a statement about the Name of the Son of God, without justifying this transition. Furthermore, he goes on to use the

describes *Sim.* 9 as an advance upon *Sim.* 5, but finds it nonetheless to describe a Christology that is ecclesologically determined (*Concept of the Church*, 64-69). Henne comes to the same conclusion regarding the use of the rock to assert pre-existence (*La Christologie*, 245-46).

⁶⁵ Brox, *Der Hirt des Hermas*, 427.

“almighty and glorious Name” was not the foundation itself, but was instead the one responsible for placing the church upon its foundation.⁶⁹

What this means is that the church is not founded on baptism, it is founded on the Son of God. Pernveden argues that the addition of Christology to the ecclesiology in *Sim. 9* does not significantly redefine the ecclesiology, and that the Son of God is only introduced as “something of a teacher of wisdom, who reveals the divine truth.”⁷⁰ He is correct that salvation retains a strongly ethical character, but his analysis fails to recognize how much the incorporation of the Son of God affects Hermas’s understanding of inclusion in the church. In the *Vis. 3* version of the tower image, the church rested upon baptism, but this was a problem for Hermas’s commitment to the need for virtue and the call to repentance. In *Sim. 8*’s reference to the tower, Hermas has added the repentance of sinning Christians, but he has not yet made it integral to the tower itself. The tower appears in *Sim. 8* as if imported directly from *Vis. 3*, without further development. Those who repent are placed into a wall, but still excluded from the tower itself.⁷¹ He resolves this problem in *Sim. 9* with the conclusion that Christ bears those

⁶⁹ Pernveden takes a different perspective. Pernveden argues that the *Sim. 9* passage ought to be included with *Vis. 3* and 1, all understanding the water as the foundation. The Rock in *Sim. 9* is held to be the rock in the Holy of Holies and to be floating upon the world’s primordial waters (*Concept of the Church*, 284-86). Pernveden’s interpretation requires reading too much into the passage. It is better to acknowledge an actual shift in the way the image is described.

⁷⁰ Pernveden, *Concept of the Church*, 69.

⁷¹ Brox points out the relationships between *Vis. 3.6.3*, *Sim. 8.7*, and *Sim. 9.23*, each of which deal with believers who hold grudges against one another and are not at peace (*Der Hirt*, 371). The reference to the tower in *Sim. 9.23.3* is nearly identical to the earlier two in that it makes no mention of the possibility of restoration to the tower (or even a wall), but it is very brief, saying only that they “were cast away from the tower and rejected for its construction.” Nothing in *Sim. 9.23* requires that the rejection be

who bear his Name, and that bearing the Name of the Son of God means bearing it gladly, bearing it without shame, and walking in his commandments. This transition allows Hermas to bring the image of the church as a tower better into alignment with his understanding of repentance.

Hermas's concern regarding the repentance of Christians is two-fold, and seeks a position between two extremes. On the one hand, he argues against the rigorists that Christians who sin after baptism be allowed to repent. On the other hand, he attempts to convince Christians of their need to repent with sincerity and solemnity.⁷² I have already described the opportunity and need for repentance that is a feature of *Shepherd of Hermas*, and is prominent in *Sim.* 9. The simpler parallel in *Vis.* 3 differs in that stones placed in the tower of *Vis.* 3 appear to be permanently placed. Exclusion of stones – people – who are not acceptable takes place before their inclusion in the church. Those outside might still enter,⁷³ but the builders maintain strict entry requirements for those who do enter. Those judgements appear to be final in that no mention is made of stones initially judged acceptable later requiring removal. In contrast, stones that are correctly brought to and included in the structure of the tower in *Sim.* 9 can later be found to be unsuitable and then be removed. This distinction allows Hermas to emphasize that

permanent, or that it preclude their eventual reincorporation into the tower itself as described in *Sim.* 9.14.

⁷² Brox gives an extensive account of the prevalence of these two positions in the Roman church of the second century and how this plays into the development of Hermas's account of repentance (*Der Hirt*, 476-485).

⁷³ Osiek incorrectly writes of the first tower, "the rejected stones never are able to enter." (*Shepherd of Hermas*, 220). *Vis.* 3.5.5 indicates that they still can repent and be useful in building, as Osiek herself notes in her comments on that section (71-72).

repentance is not only for those still outside the church, but that those within the church are not secure, and might find themselves in need of repentance.⁷⁴

Conclusion

Hermas uses Name language to talk about Salvation and to talk about the church in cosmological terms. By associating the Name with the Son of God Hermas uses Name Theology to relate his soteriology and ecclesiology to one another. In all parts of *The Shepherd*, Hermas maintains the same basic outlines for speaking of the Name. In both, the Name is absolutely indispensable to salvation, and is borne by the believer. Hermas now makes this salvation conditional, however. In the earlier material he speaks of the attitude with which one bears the Name (shame, gladness, or willingness to suffer) as the determining factor. Shifting the Name to the Son of God in *Sim.* 9 gives him a way to expand on the way one bears the Name well. One must also bear the Names of those virtues that had been borne by the Son of God in his incarnation.

By shifting the Name to the Son of God in *Sim.* 9, Hermas is able to bring together this christocentric soteriology with his cosmological ecclesiology. The Name plays a role in the ecclesiological tower in both *Vis.* 3 as well as *Sim.* 9. In Vision 3, the Name places the church upon its watery foundation. The shift to “the Name of the Son of

⁷⁴ This shift of focus onto the repentance of sinning Christians has led numerous scholars (Zahn, Harnack, d’Alès, Völter, Dibelius, Vielhauer, Hoh, Giet, Joly: as cited by Brox) to describe the difference between the towers of *Vis.* 3 and *Sim.* 9 as between an “ideal” church in *Vis.* 3 and a more realistic sinful, earthly church pictured in *Sim.* 9. Brox’s suggestion (*Der Hirt*, 375-376) that *Sim.* 9 represents a return to a favored image (the tower) in order to embellish it with new details and a greater emphasis on the theme of repentance is more persuasive, especially in light of the fact that sinful believers are already present, if temporarily kept out of the tower, in *Vis.* 3.

God” in *Sim.* 9 leads Hermas to alter the image so that the Name itself becomes the foundation upon which the church stands. This shift combined with his view of the place of virtue in salvation, allows Hermas to bring the ecclesiological image into alignment with his teaching about repentance, making baptism only a part of the process.

As for repentance, Hermas does not change his actual view on repentance, but he alters the way he expresses his ecclesiology and his Christology so that they fit better with his understanding of repentance. Functionally, repentance keeps the same place and importance it had held before, but in *Sim.* 9 it is no longer expressed as merely ethical; it becomes Christological as well.

These conclusions have so far described how Hermas uses Name Theology differently upon applying it to the Son in *Sim.* 9; they leave open the question of what source Hermas may have had for making that transfer. As I showed in ch. 3, the New Testament frequently associates the Name with Christ, but the different documents do so in different ways. The most likely source for Hermas is the Gospel of John, specifically the theology of the Name in John 17. Scholarship has not arrived at a conclusive answer for the question of the reception of the Gospel of John in *Shepherd of Hermas*, or of the arrival of that Gospel in Rome. The *Shepherd of Hermas* is generally used to establish a *terminus post quem* for the Gospel of John’s presence in Rome. In these studies, the strongest and most numerous references are in *Sim.* 9. Among the recent publications on this question are the works of Charles E. Hill⁷⁵ and of Joseph Verheyden.⁷⁶ Verheyden

⁷⁵ Charles E. Hill, *The Johannine Corpus in the Early Church*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

gives an excellent survey of the history of scholarship on the question. Although he is skeptical about Hermas's use of John, most of the possible allusions and references he lists come from *Sim.* 9. Hill is inclined to believe that Hermas does know and use John, but acknowledges that the evidence is strongest for *Sim.* 9: "It appears likely, then, that the author did know the Fourth Gospel, at least by the time he wrote Similitude 9."⁷⁷

Hermas does not quote John 17 directly; however, the adjustments he makes in his Name Theology in *Sim.* 9 bring it in line with the Name Theology expressed in John. In John 17 Jesus makes it clear that he has been given the Father's Name—giving Hermas a warrant to apply the Name to the son. Furthermore, Jesus declares twice that he makes the Father's Name known to his disciples (17:6, 26). This allows Hermas to transfer the Name to the Son while maintaining his understanding that the Name is borne by believers. Hermas's Name Theology is soteriological, and this association with salvation is supported in John 17 as well: Jesus asks the Father to keep his disciples in the Name just as he has kept them in the Name (John 17:11-12). It is also possible to read John 17 as incorporating the ethical dimensions of the Christological Name Theology Hermas expresses in *Sim.* 9. Immediately after the statement that Jesus makes the Father's Name known in John 17:6, he says that they have kept his word. Jesus emphasizes the unity of the disciples in John 17:21, and again in v. 26, where he connects that unity in love to the manifestation of the Name: "I have made your Name known to

⁷⁶ Joseph Verheyden, "The *Shepherd of Hermas* and the Writings that later formed the New Testament," in *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*, edited by Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett, 293-329; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

⁷⁷ Hill, *Johannine Corpus*, 380.

them, and I will make it known, so that the love with which you have loved me may be in them, and I in them.” In *Hermas* that love is manifested more specifically in the guise of the twelve virtues that believers bear in addition to simple identification with the Name of the Son. My conclusion is that Hill is most likely correct; at some point between the composition of *Sim. 8* and of *Sim. 9*, the author of the *Shepherd of Hermas* encountered or for the first time incorporated his understanding of John 17’s Name Theology into his own scheme.

Chapter Six

Name Theology in Second Century Syria: *The Ascension of Isaiah and the Odes of Solomon*

Introduction

In this chapter I will turn to two texts that scholars have attributed to the area of Syria and Antioch. I will show that *Ascension of Isaiah* and *Odes of Solomon* share many convictions about the Name, but that they differ markedly on questions of how and whether that Name is available, or interacts in any way with the created world. The texts also make use of somewhat different Jewish traditions regarding the Name, and this difference can be related to their disagreement about the Name's role in the world.

Part One – Ascension of Isaiah

The *Ascension of Isaiah* is a Jewish Christian composition in the form of a heavenly ascent. In contrast to other texts that fall into this genre, it is less concerned about eschatology than it is about the actual description of Heaven and the description of “future” events like the life and death of the Lord. It was previously assumed to be a composite text,¹ but that theory has been largely abandoned in recent scholarship in favor of characterizing the whole as a Jewish-Christian composition that incorporates certain

¹ The *Martyrdom*, chapters 1-5, were considered to be a Jewish document, to which Christians had appended the *Vision*, chapters 6-11. Knibb's introduction in the *OTP* represents this position. (“Martyrdom and Ascension of Isaiah,” *OTP* 2.143)

older traditions about Isaiah in the early chapters.² The document has only been completely preserved in a Ge'ez (Ethiopic) translation, but is usually understood to have been translated from a Greek original, with perhaps some Hebrew portions underlying some of the early traditions.³

Issues about dating and provenance are bound up in the discussion of the polemical setting of its composition. *Ascension of Isaiah* takes a high view of prophetic heavenly ascent, and was in conflict with rivals who opposed that practice from a variety of positions. Ignatius is seen representing a parallel school in which the bishop assumes the prophetic role that *Ascension of Isaiah* gives to the prophets. The identification of this polemic leads to the conclusion that *Ascension of Isaiah* ought to be dated to the early decades of the second century, and to the vicinity of Syria.⁴ Robert G. Hall goes a step

² Already in 1981, around the time of the publication of the *OTP*, Charlesworth argued that no parts of the text could be taken as anti-Jewish, thus setting the stage for a Jewish-Christian identification ("Christian and Jewish Self-Definition in Light of the Christian Additions to the Apocryphal Writings," *Jewish and Christian Self Definition 2* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981], 45-46). This suggestion was made explicit by the Italian scholarship on *Asc. Isa.*, represented in a critical edition and commentary (Paolo Bettolo, et al, *Ascensio Isaiae: Textus*. CCSA 7. Paris: Brepols, 1995. Enrico Norelli, *Ascensio Isaiae: Commentarius* (CCSA 8; Paris: Brepols, 1995), as well as by Robert G. Hall ("Isaiah's Ascent to See the Beloved: An Ancient Jewish Source for the Ascension of Isaiah," *JBL* 113 [1994], 463-484), and Jonathan Knight, (*Disciples of the Beloved One: The Christology, Social Setting and Theological Context of the Ascension of Isaiah* [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996], 28-32). By 1997, Michael A. Knibb, author of the *OTP* 2 introduction, had come to agree with the scholarship represented by Hall, Knight and those Europeans who see a unity in *Asc. Isa.* (Michael A. Knibb, "Isaianic Traditions in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha," in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah* [Brill: Leiden, 1997], 633-50).

³ Latin, Coptic, and Slavonic translations are also extant. See Knibb, "Martyrdom and Ascension," *OTP* 2.144-146 for textual discussion.

⁴ Norelli, Simonetti, Hall, and Knight have argued versions of the thesis that the *Ascension* can be read as part of a debate within Christian circles. According to Norelli and Simonetti, "Isaiah" represents the side of the prophets against the episcopacy.

further and compares these texts to the perspective of the Johannine literature, especially the Gospel of John and the book of Revelation. These texts come from Asia Minor rather than from Syria, but the comparison is useful in understanding the place of *Ascension of Isaiah* within second century Christianity as it develops in Syria and Asia Minor. Hall identifies the Johannine school as representing a related perspective that affirms the centrality of prophetic ministry, but opposes prophetic heavenly ascent, as seen in *Ascension of Isaiah*, with declarations like, “No one has ascended into heaven but he who is descended from heaven, the Son of Man” (John 3:13).⁵

Ascension of Isaiah is presented as Isaiah’s account of the heavenly journey on which he was taken in the vision of Isaiah 6. He is taken by an angelic guide who leads him through the seven levels of heaven explaining to him what he sees. Eventually he is allowed into the seventh heaven itself, the dwelling place of God. There he is allowed to learn the future of salvation history including the incarnation and Christ’s conquest over

Ignatius is seen representing a parallel school in his church order with the bishop in the prophetic role. The identification of this polemic leads to the conclusion that *Ascension of Isaiah* must be roughly contemporary with those texts. Enrico Norelli, *L’Ascensione di Isaia. Studi su un apocrifo al crocevia dei cristianesimi* (Origini NS 1; Bologna: Centro editorial dehoniano, 1994), 271. Knight, *Disciples of the Beloved One*, 186-212, especially 203-205. Robert G. Hall takes the more conservative position that while the texts demonstrate the presence of these two schools of thought in Syria at the end of the first and beginning of the second century, they cannot be shown to be in direct interaction (“Astonishment in the Firmament: The Worship of Jesus and Soteriology in Ignatius and the *Ascension of Isaiah*.” *Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism: Papers from the St Andrew’s Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus* [ed. Carey C. Newman, James R. Davila, and Gladys S. Lewis; Leiden: Brill, 1999], 155). For a more general overview of the issue, see his “The *Ascension Of Isaiah*: Community Situation, Date, and Place in Early Christianity,” *JBL* 109 (1990) 289-306.

⁵ Robert G. Hall, “*Ascension Of Isaiah*: Community Situation,” 300-306. Hall follows the analysis of Johannine Christianity by Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza (“The Quest for the Johannine School: The Apocalypse and the Fourth Gospel,” *NTS* 23 [1976-77] 425) as prophetic-apocalyptic community led by prophetic ministers.

evil. Chapters seven and eight of *Ascension of Isaiah* describe Isaiah's ascent through the seven heavens. After passing through the angelic struggle in the firmament, Isaiah and his angelic guide progress through the heavens, encountering groups of angels on the left and right in the first through the fifth heavens. These groups of angels are led in worship by an enthroned angel who directs their praise to the highest heaven, to "the One who rests in the holy world, and to his Beloved ..." (7:17) Just before entering the sixth heaven Isaiah joins the angels in praise (7:37).

I. High Onomanology

When Isaiah describes joining the angels of the fifth heaven in their worship/praise he indicates to whom that praise was offered.

And I praised the One who is not named and *the Unique One* who dwells in the heavens, whose Name is not known to any flesh, who has bestowed such glory on the several heavens, and who makes great the glory of the angels, and more excellent the glory of Him who sitteth on the throne.⁶

"Him who is not named" must be understood as a reference to the Father – or Great Glory, as *Ascension of Isaiah* often refers to him.⁷ In addition to the second reference to the "One who is not named" in 8:7, "He" is revealed as the Great Glory and the Father in the chapters that follow: the Great Glory at 9:37, and the Father in both 8:18 and 10:6.

What is less clear in 7:37 is that there is also a reference to the Beloved, *Ascension of Isaiah*'s preferred term for the Son. Isaiah directs his praise to "Him who is

⁶ *Asc. of Isa.* 7:37. My translation alters Knibb's by reference to the text and to Norelli's commentary.

⁷ *Father* is less common, but it is a term from *Asc. Isa.* itself. See 8:18, and 10:6 for two examples.

not named, and [the] *beḥut*⁸ (unique).” The question is whether the Ethiopic word *beḥut* describes the Father, or designates a second figure, and thus whether the “Name” is borne by the Father or by the Beloved in the passage I quoted earlier. In his translation for the *OTP*, Knibb treats it as an adjective and translates *beḥut* as “and is unique.”⁹ In his rendering it serves as the first in a series of clauses modifying what is then the only noun, “the one who is not named.”

The alternative, represented in my translation, is to take *beḥut* as a substantive in parallel to “the one who is not named.”¹⁰ Both are possible, however there are two reasons to prefer the latter translation. Enrico Norelli has laid out the argument in his commentary on *Ascension of Isaiah*.¹¹ In order to follow Knibb’s reading, *beḥut* must be read as an adjectival clause. It would then, however, be different from the rest of the series, all of which are relative clauses introduced by the relative pronoun *za* (“who”): “*who* dwells in the heavens, *whose* Name is unknown to all flesh, the One *who* has given such glory to the different heavens, *who* makes the glory of the angels great and the glory of the one who sits on the throne greater.”¹² Norelli calls this structure possible, but syntactically difficult.

⁸ Or *beḥuta* according to several manuscripts. Most scholars, including Dillmann, Charles and Norelli retain *beḥut*, the nominative form, while assuming that it functions as an accusative (thus explaining the tendency to correct to the accusative *beḥuta*) in context. Norelli, *Commentarius*, 419.

⁹ *OTP* 2, 168.

¹⁰ R. H. Charles translates *beḥut* as “Only Begotten” (*The Ascension of Isaiah*, [London: Adam & Charles Black: 1900], 54).

¹¹ Norelli, *Commentarius*, 419.

¹² *Asc. Isa.*, 7:37. Italics added for emphasis.

The second reason to reject this difficult reading is comparison with the similar expression at 8:15: “where the One who is not Named dwells, and his Chosen One, whose Name is unknown and no heaven can learn his Name.” The parallels between the verses are compelling. Both verses have to do with the heavenly praise of the angels, but in 8:7 there is a clear distinction between the One who is not named and “his chosen one.” The chosen one in 8:7 is described as having a Name that is unknown, the same description of the Name in 7:37 (*nkr* in each). These parallels lead Norelli to the conclusion that the *Chosen* of 8:7 is the same as the *Unique* of 7:37, and that the clear distinction in 8:7 ought to be read in 7:37 as well. “The Unique” should be identified as a second figure, “another appellation” for the Beloved, not as another designation for the Great Glory.¹³ If *behut* is indeed a second individual, it then follows that the series of relative clauses that follow should be applied to the Unique one whose Name cannot be learned. Since gender and number do not definitively connect the relative clauses to either “the one who is not named” or to “the unique one,” the most natural interpretation is to take them as referring to “the unique one” which stands immediately before them in the sentence. These descriptions make 7:37 an important verse for the Christology of *Ascension of Isaiah*.

¹³ Norelli, *Commentarius*, 419-420. Charles and Tisserant followed the same analysis as Norelli, and treat the passage as referring to two separate figures, but use “unique” as an adjective, for which they supply a head noun. The nouns they supply introduce an explicitly Christological reference to the text which is not actually present. (“Only Begotten,” and “le Fils unique” respectively. Norelli concludes that although Charles and Tisserant are overly interpretive in their translations, they are right in identifying the “Unique” as a second figure, not as another designation for the Great Glory. His translation “l’Unico” preserves the ambiguity of the reference, but establishes *behut* as a parallel to “the one who is not named.”

The first description given in each passage is that the Beloved possesses a Name that “is unknown,” (*nkr*) and in fact cannot be known, taking up the theme of concealing the Name that was present in several Second Temple texts.¹⁴ The Beloved is distanced from the angels by the fact that even they cannot learn his Name. This restriction portrays him as beyond knowledge, creating a point of similarity with the Great Glory. A further such point is the fact that the Beloved dwells in the seventh heaven alongside the “one who is not named.” He is not just permitted to be there, in the way that the angels or “all the righteous” are permitted to be; rather, he belongs there. The seventh heaven is defined as the place where the Great Glory and the Beloved dwell, and it takes its character from his presence there just as it does from the presence of the Great Glory. For *Ascension of Isaiah*, one function of onomanology is to express the close association between the Beloved and the Father.

There is a further consequence of the recognition that the “Unique” in 7:37 is the Beloved rather than a descriptive term for the Father. On this reading, the Beloved is portrayed as an appropriate recipient of worship, unlike the angelic guide who forbade Isaiah to worship him at 7:21. Isaiah, along with the angels of heaven, gives praise to both the Father and to the Beloved.¹⁵ Loren Stuckenbruck has outlined the evidence for worship of the Beloved in *Ascension of Isaiah*, finding evidence of that worship in vv.

¹⁴ See my section “Concealment” in ch. 2. Notable texts include *Apoc. Ab.* 10; *Jos. Asen.* 15:12x; *Pr. Jac.*; and *I En.* 69:14.

¹⁵ Knight identifies the Christology of *Asc. Isa.* as “binitarian,” but in line with a first century subordinationist Christology that acknowledges the Beloved as a “heavenly power” alongside the Father, presents him as the divine “Lord,” but insists upon his worship of the Father. Notably, it insists on his status as a heavenly power before the descent, not only for a post-resurrection glorified Beloved (*Disciples of the Beloved*, 79-84, 150-153).

9:27-32 and 11:24, 26.¹⁶ *Ascension of Isaiah* 7:37 should be added to that evidence.¹⁷

Stuckenbruck pointed to the Similitudes of *I Enoch*, especially the worship of the Son of Man in *I En.* 48:5, as the “closest analogy to the worship of Christ in an early Jewish text.”¹⁸ Including 7:37 in the assessment of *Ascension of Isaiah*’s worship of the Beloved allows for the recognition of another similarity between it and *I En.* In both texts the worship offered to the second figure is connected with his possession of a Name that is used to establish his association with the Father. I argued in Chapter 2 that the Son of Man is a proper recipient of worship precisely because he has been given the Divine Name. *Ascension of Isaiah* describes the Son’s Name in such a way to make him like the Father, insofar as the Beloved’s Name is “not known to any flesh,” whereas the Father is said to be entirely unnamed. The remaining Christological points from 7:37 will be addressed in the following sections.

II. Authority Through the Name

Ascension of Isaiah expresses another Christological characteristic through its use of the Name: the Beloved’s authority. *Asc. Isa.* 7:37 describes an authority that allows the one whose Name cannot be known to maintain the arrangement and order of worship that Isaiah had seen during his ascent:

And I praised Him who is not named and *the Unique One* who dwells in the heavens, whose Name is not known to any flesh, who has bestowed such glory on

¹⁶ Loren T. Stuckenbruck, “Worship and Monotheism in the *Ascension of Isaiah*,” in *Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 82-86.

¹⁷ Stuckenbruck takes the verse to refer only to God (“Worship and Monotheism,” 73).

¹⁸ Stuckenbruck, “Worship and Monotheism,” 88, 89.

the several heavens, and who makes great the glory of the angels, and more excellent the glory of him who sitteth on the throne.¹⁹

The glory is apparently a visible feature.²⁰ Isaiah had early on been astonished upon seeing the glory of the *angelus interpres* which he says is far beyond the glory of the ordinary glory of angels.²¹ The angels in each level of heaven have greater glory than those in the lower levels. Within each heaven order is strictly maintained. The clearest description is at *Asc. Isa.* 7:30-31: “And the praise and glory of the angels on the right was greater than that of those on the left. And again the glory of the one who sat on the throne was greater than that of the angels who were on the right.”²² The hierarchical order of increasing glory, left – right – throne – next heaven, is consistent throughout the heavens, with only the variation that starting in the sixth heaven the angels are equal and do not require an enthroned leader. All of this order, and all of this distinction in grades of glory, is given to the angels by the Beloved according to 7:37.

Hall understands *Asc. Isa.* 7:37 to refer exclusively to the Father, and understands the function of the glory differently. He treats the glory as a visible aspect of the worship given by the angels to God, as well as having been given by “the unnamed one.”²³ In

¹⁹ *Asc. Isa.* 7:37. My translation alters that of Knibb by reference to the text and to Norelli’s commentary.

²⁰ *Kabod* and related δόξα traditions are behind the description of God’s glory. Moshe Weinfeld, “*kābôd*,” *TDOT* 7.22-38. Gerhard Kittel, “δóξα,” *TDNT* 2.233-53. Also, Jarl Fossum, “Glory,” *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*, 348-352. God’s glory was conceived of as a radiant phenomenon of light, which was shared with angels according to Luke 2:9, Moses and Elijah at Luke 9:30-31, and apparently Christian believers according to 2 Cor 3:18.

²¹ *Asc. Isa.* 7:2.

²² The same pattern is maintained in each level. This passage is chosen simply because it is the most compact expression.

²³ Hall, “Isaiah’s Ascent to See the Beloved,” 480-481.

another article, he refers to the “respiration of glory” in which the glory of God “streams down to the lowest heaven,” and returns to him in the praises of the angels. Hall understands this glory to nourish and order the heavens, and ultimately human beings as well.²⁴ There are two problems with this assessment. The first is that while *Ascension of Isaiah* refers often to the choirs of angels offering praise to God, it never describes them returning glory to him. The second is that *Asc. Isa.* 7:37 does not describe the glory as establishing order in heaven, but in fact describes the glory being dispensed in accordance with the order that is established and maintained by the Beloved, “[the] Unique, whose Name cannot be known.”

The Beloved’s authoritative role is confirmed in *Asc. Isa.* 8:7-8, where the Beloved (here called the Chosen One) has authority to direct the praise of the angels, who are directed by the power of the seventh heaven. The angels of the sixth heaven are arranged differently than those in the levels below. They are all equal in terms of glory, and they do not require an enthroned choirmaster to direct them. According to 8:6 they do not require a choirmaster because they have direct access to the Beloved’s direction. The angels of the sixth heaven are not unique in following his direction, however, only in their proximity to it. All the heavens obey and answer exclusively the voice of the Beloved.

This statement, that the sixth heaven has no director because the heavens answer only to the direction of the power of the seventh heaven and in the sixth heaven they have

²⁴ Hall, “Astonishment in the Firmament,” 149-150.

direct access to it, is the basic content of the Angel's answer to Isaiah's question.²⁵ The additional material in v. 8b-d is a Christological aside which is required to identify the power of the seventh heaven as the Beloved himself, and to justify his position as the sole director. The angel tells Isaiah two things about the Beloved in order to ground his authority: he dwells in the seventh heaven, as does the Nameless One, and the Name that he possesses is unlearnable for those in the heavens who nonetheless follow his direction. That Name thus sets him apart and above the rest of heaven. Just as in *Asc. Isa.* 7:37, the unknown Name is a significant part of the identity of the one who dispenses the glory given to the angels and to the enthroned angels, in 8:7-8 it is an important part of the identity of the one whom "all the heavens and thrones answer." This means that directing the praise of the sixth heaven is a subset of the Beloved's activity maintaining the order of the glory of the heavens.

²⁵ Norelli understands the question of v. 6 quite differently. Rather than asking about the corresponding groups of angels, Norelli understands Isaiah to be asking why the angel identified himself as Isaiah's companion, rather than as corresponding to the angels. He then takes all of vv. 7-15 as the angel's response, and 7-8 simply as the lead in to that response. This is necessary because only in 8b does the angel say anything that could be construed as a response to the question as Norelli poses it (*Commentarius*, 429-33). This interpretation of the question creates an unnecessary difficulty. Isaiah's interest throughout the *chapter* is the praise of the sixth heaven with which he is impressed. His first question, in which he mistakenly addresses the angel as "Lord," is about the praise. The angel corrects his form of address, without answering his question. When Isaiah says "And again I asked him," it suggests that he is returning to the original question, asking it in more precise terms (having to do with corresponding groups of angels) but still returning to his original question about the arrangement.

III. Concealment of the Name

Up to this point, I have bracketed off discussion of an important aspect of *Ascension of Isaiah*'s onomanology: its focus on the unknowability of the Beloved's Name. Nearly every reference to the Name in *Ascension of Isaiah* refers to it as being "unknown."²⁶ In the opening verses of *Ascension of Isaiah*, Isaiah introduces his prophecy to the King, "As the Lord lives, whose Name has not been transmitted to this world."²⁷ In so doing he introduces the absolute separation between the world and the Name of God that is emphasized in the later chapters. Both vv. 7:37 and 8:7 emphasize the restriction of knowledge of the Name, each one calling it "unknown," but that restriction is applied to different groups in the two cases. Verse 7:37 restricts the Name from "all flesh" but in 8:7 the revelation of the Name is restricted from "all heaven" as well." The greatness and thus unknowability of the Name is related to Christ's authority to order the angels' heavenly worship and to the obedience of the angels, who cannot learn his Name.

Ascension of Isaiah 9:5 also restricts knowledge of the Name: the angel tells Isaiah that he cannot hear the Name of the Beloved. Knowledge of the Name does not remain permanently disallowed, however. Verse 9:5 goes on to indicate that Isaiah will

²⁶ *Asc. Isa.* 7:3-5; 7:37; 8:7; 9:5. The two exceptions do not state that the name is unknown or unknowable, but they do preserve the mystery surrounding the name, saying that the name "has not been sent into this world" (1:7) and that the angels "cannot endure" it (a variant reading at 10:6 in Lat2 and Slav). This latter variant reading is noteworthy in that it gives possession of the name to the Holy Spirit.

²⁷ *Asc. Isa.* 1:7. In the theory that this is a composite text, this verse is part of the Jewish *Martyrdom of Isaiah*. (Knibb ends a Christian interpolation at 1:6. "Martyrdom and Ascension", *OTP* 2.156-157.)

eventually be allowed to hear the Name, but describes that revelation as taking place only after the end of life, only after Isaiah has “come up from this body.” The same language was used in vv. 7:3-5 when Isaiah asked to know the name of his angelic guide. He was told in 7:5 that he could not know the angel’s name because he had to “return into this body.” In like manner, no one can learn the Name of the Beloved according to v. 8:7.²⁸ *Joseph and Aseneth* 15:12x provides a parallel example from Judaism. Aseneth asks to know the name of the “man from heaven” and is refused on the grounds that his name was “in the heavens,” and was “written by the finger of the Most High.” In this respect, the man’s answer is similar to the Angel’s in *Ascension of Isaiah*. Furthermore, the restriction in *Joseph and Aseneth* is connected to location: “man is not allowed to pronounce nor hear them in this world.” The restrictions in *Ascension of Isaiah* are similar, and the point is that the Name is presently unknowable, but will be revealed. The two references in *Asc. Isa.* 7:5 and 9:5 suggest that the restriction from “all flesh” in 7:37 is not to be read as a reference to humanity, per se, but literally as a reference to the condition that forbids the revelation of the Name: corporeal existence or the flesh. When the believer is finally relieved of that burden and found to be among the saved, then he is clothed in heavenly garments and rewarded with the Name of the Beloved.

²⁸ It is also interesting to note another feature of the exchange between Isaiah and the angel in which the name is mentioned. Isaiah begins this journey by asking the name and purpose of his *angelus interpres*, who he describes as having glory that is different from the glory of angels he has seen before. Isaiah’s request and the angel’s refusal to answer are reminiscent of Jacob’s experience at Jabbok (Gen 32:29-30), an experience that led Jacob to conclude that he had wrestled with God himself. The similarity with the Gen passage strengthens the argument that the name borne by the angel in 7:3-5 and by the Beloved is the Divine Name.

One further suggestion that must be excluded is that the restricted Name to which the angelic guide refers is Jesus, or Son. As Knibb points out, if the Name is Jesus, logically all references to Jesus must be later additions to the text.²⁹ This is particularly true at 9:5, where “Jesus” is given as the future earthly name of the Beloved immediately before Isaiah is told that he cannot hear the Name.³⁰

And the one who turned to you, this is your Lord, the Lord, the Lord Christ, who is to be called in the world Jesus, but you cannot hear his Name until you have come up from this body.³¹

Knight does not take a position on the secret Name, but his thesis that the titles “Jesus” and “Son” are particularly restricted to the Beloved’s human existence bears on this point. According to Knight, the restriction of these terms to use “in the world” means that they are inappropriate in heaven.³² Since the secret Name is not only restricted to the seventh heaven, but withheld until the believer’s contact with the world is complete, this Name functions as the direct opposite of the Name “Jesus,” or “Son.”

²⁹ *OTP* 2, 170.

³⁰ In his edition of the text, August Dillmann apparently understood the name to be Jesus, and so assumed that, references to “Jesus” and to “Christ” were later additions since it says the name cannot be heard (*Ascensio Isaiae Aethiopice et Latine cum Prolegomenis, Adnotationibus Criticis et Exegeticis Additis Versionum Latinarum Reliquiis* [Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus, 1877], xiii, 40-41, 72). Charles followed Dillmann in his earlier work, but in his polyglot edition and translation in 1900, he rejected that interpretation, restoring the text as original. Charles, *Ascension of Isaiah*, 60.

³¹ *Asc. Isa.* 9:5.

³² That the name is not “Jesus” or “Christ” is shown by the fact that Isaiah is told that the one whose voice he heard, and whose name he cannot know, is “your LORD, the LORD, the LORD Christ, who is to be called in the world Jesus...” The *Greek Legend* 2:25 (ed. R. H. Charles, *The Ascension of Isaiah*, 141-148) eliminates the name Jesus, a variant that Knight judges to be an alteration of the original in order to conform it to the NT (*Disciples of the Beloved One*, 22). Nonetheless, Knight apparently interprets the restricted name to be “Jesus” (*Disciples of the Beloved*, 142).

Summary of Conclusions Regarding Ascension of Isaiah

There are several things that can be said at this point about the onomanology in *Ascension of Isaiah* as it pertains to the Beloved. First of all, the Name appears to be the source of the authority by which the Beloved orders and rules heaven. Second, *Ascension of Isaiah* uses the Beloved's Name as a way to establish his commonality with the Father, especially by keeping his Name secret. The secrecy of the Beloved's Name is juxtaposed with the assumption of its eventual revelation throughout the *Ascension of Isaiah*. That assumption of revelation explains the way that *Ascension of Isaiah*'s onomanology relates to its soteriology, which is the third way *Ascension of Isaiah* uses the Name. "Until" in v. 9:5 indicates that the Name will be revealed, but only to the right people (the saints) and only under the right circumstances (after they leave behind corporeal existence and ascend to the seventh heaven). The knowledge of the Name will be revealed, but improper revelation must be guarded against; it will given as part of the rewards upon entry into heaven. These characteristics of the Name in *Ascension of Isaiah* appear to build on theologies of the Name represented in Jewish literature of the Second Temple period.

Part Two – Odes of Solomon

The *Odes of Solomon* are a collection of poems that have been characterized as an early Christian Hymnbook,³³ although they are not all formally hymns.³⁴ Their most

³³ This has been suggested by several commentators, most recently in James Charlesworth's updated translation: *The Earliest Christian Hymnbook: The Odes of*

common subject matter is, in fact, not simply the hymnic praise of God, but particularly salvation.³⁵ Even before the discovery of the full collection beginning in 1909³⁶ there had been debate as to whether they ought to be treated as Jewish, Christian, or Gnostic, however the recent conclusion has been that they are best described as Jewish-Christian.³⁷ It cannot be determined whether they are a compilation from numerous different authors or from a single “Odist,”³⁸ but Michael Lattke, who hesitates to accept single authorship, acknowledges their “general unity,” and suggests that they at least “originated in one religious community,”³⁹ which was of Jewish Christian origin.

The *Odes* are most completely preserved in two Syriac manuscripts. Between the two primary Syriac manuscripts, only Ode 2 is completely missing. James Charlesworth

Solomon (Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2009). This translation is a revision of the translation in Charlesworth’s earlier critical edition, *The Odes of Solomon: The Syriac Texts* (Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977). Unless otherwise noted, translations are taken from the 1977 edition, which was also reproduced in the *OTP* 2.

³⁴ Michael Lattke makes this point, even while conceding the generic use of “hymns” to describe the collection. *Odes of Solomon* (Hermeneia; St. Paul: Fortress, 2009) 12-13. Cf. Lattke, *Hymnus: Materialien zu einer Geschichte der antiken Hymnologie* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991), 251.

³⁵ See Lattke, *Odes*, 14-19 for an Alphabetical Form List indicating the priority of soteriology. For a more extensive discussion, see his *Die Oden Salomos in ihrer Bedeutung für Neues Testament und Gnosis* (5 vols.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979-1998), 36-88, on which the list is based.

³⁶ Five *Odes* were known prior to 1909, from their inclusion in the *Pistis Sophia*, but the larger manuscripts of the collection that we now know were discovered by Rendel Harris in 1909. See Rendel Harris and Alphonse Mingana, *The Odes and Psalms of Solomon* (2 vols.; Manchester: University Press, 1916-20), I.ix-xi; and the introduction in II.1-16 for an account of the identification of the *Odes*.

³⁷ For a survey of the debate, see James Charlesworth, “The *Odes of Solomon* – Not Gnostic,” in *Critical Reflections on the Odes of Solomon* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 176-191. Lattke comes to a similar description, summarized in the subject headings of his introduction: Jewish Influence – Gnostic Tinge – Christian Whole (*Odes*, 13-14).

³⁸ Charlesworth, *Earliest Hymnbook*, xiii.

³⁹ Lattke, *Odes* 5, 367.

has maintained that the *Odes* were composed in Syriac.⁴⁰ An alternative is that the Syriac manuscripts represent a translation from a Greek original. Lattke has argued the likelihood of this case on the basis of comparison of the Greek and Syriac of *Ode* 11 and the occurrence of Greek loanwords in the Syriac.⁴¹ His commentary makes frequent recourse to his own work retroverting the text to Greek. Most scholars assume the *Odes* to have originated in Syria, whether they argue for Greek or for Syriac as the original language. Lattke, who assumes a Greek original, ultimately remains uncommitted, but acknowledges that “links between the epistles of Ignatius and the *Odes of Solomon* do not mandate Antioch as the place of origin but do strongly suggest Syria as the area.”⁴² Those who believe the *Odes* to have been composed in Syriac have mainly debated between Antioch and Edessa.⁴³ There is also scholarly debate surrounding the date of composition for the *Odes*. The consensus on their dating places them in the early decades of the second century;⁴⁴ dissenting suggestions have ranged from the first to the third

⁴⁰ *OTP* 2:726; *Odes*, 14;

⁴¹ Lattke, *Odes*, 10-11.

⁴² Lattke, *Odes*, 11. See a brief discussion of the further options on, 11-12.

⁴³ Charlesworth, “An Overview,” *Critical Reflections*, 23. Han J. W. Drijvers is apparently unique in arguing for a late dating of the *Odes* (late second or early third century) and for Edessa as opposed to Antioch for the provenance (“Marcionism in Syria Marcionism in Syria: Principles, Problems, Polemics,” *Second Century* 6:3 [1987/1988], 156; “Salomo/Salomoschriften III. Sapientia Salomonis, Psalmen Salomos und Oden Salomos,” *TRE* 29:730-32). Franzmann suggest that the debate has elicited very little interest (outside of Drijvers’ work) since the 1930’s and 1940’s. *The Odes of Solomon: An Analysis of the poetical Structure and Form* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991), 2.

⁴⁴ This consensus can be represented by James H. Charlesworth, who presented his case in the introduction to the *Odes* in the *OTP* 2.726-27; and Michael Lattke, who has most recently argued for it in his commentary (*Odes*, 6-10).

centuries.⁴⁵ The arguments for placing composition of the *Odes* in the bilingual region around Antioch during the first quarter of the second century seem most persuasive to me, and will be assumed in this chapter. The following sections will consider the high onomanology found in the *Odes*, the nature of authority related to the Name, and way in which the Name is related to salvation in the *Odes*.

I. High Onomanology

The *Odes of Solomon* employ some, but not all, of the motifs we have observed in the preceding chapters concerning the Name of God. When the possessor is clearly identified, most often it is the Name of “God” or the “Most High,” as it is in Ode 39. The Odist uses poetic devices to structurally connect the Name with several different divine attributes. In *Ode* 14:5 the Name is chiastically parallel with glory.⁴⁶ It is in parallel with Grace in *Ode* 15:8 and with praise in a number of references to which I will now give more attention.

⁴⁵ Charlesworth allows for dating in the very late first century (see note above), although the more typical example of early dating is Rudolph Bultmann who assumes that the author of the Gospel of John knew some of the *Odes*, and so must place them earlier than John (*Gospel of John*, 30-31), which he dates to 80-120 C.E. (*Gospel of John*, 12). Han J. W. Drijvers has been the strongest advocate for a late, third century date for the *Odes*—a conclusion he comes to primarily on the basis of comparison with the *Psalms of Mani* (“Odes of Solomon and Psalms of Mani: Christians and Manichaeans in Third-Century Syria,” *Studies in Gnosticism and Hellenistic Religions presented to Gilles Quispel* [ed. R. van den Broek & M. J. Vermaseren; Leiden: Brill, 1981], 117-130), as well as the trinitarian content and echos of the Diatessaron he detects (“The 19th Ode of Solomon: Its Interpretation and Place in Syria Christianity,” *JTS* 31 [1980] 337-355, esp. 351).

⁴⁶ because of your glory // because of your name. Franzmann, *Odes*, 113-114. Franzmann also notes that the pairing of glory and name “enhances” the parallelism.

The *Odes* demonstrate an elevated view of the Name by picking up the biblical language of giving praise or glory to the Name in the three *Odes* (16, 18, and 20) that have formulaic conclusions that Lattke calls doxologies.⁴⁷ This language is taken up from the Psalms, where both expressions are frequently used of the Name of God.⁴⁸ Whether the original indicates “praise” or “glory,” the attribution of either associates the Name with God in worship.⁴⁹ The further application of the terms “majesty” and “honor” serve the same function of describing the Name in the same terms as God.

These statements could be understood simply as formulaic and contributing little to the onomanology of the *Odes*, except for the further “description of a doxology,”⁵⁰ that is found at *Odes* 6:7. There, praise⁵¹ for the Name is sufficiently important God attends to it himself to ensure its proper execution.

And he (the Lord) gave us his praise for his Name:
our spirits praise his holy Spirit.⁵²

⁴⁷ Lattke traces the Syriac *tešbuḥtā* to an original δόξα, and so translates “glory and honor to his name” in 16:20 and 20:10, and “glory and majesty to his name” in 18:16. Charlesworth, who believes in a semitic (Syriac?) original, translates *tešbuḥtā* as “praise” in each case (*The Odes of Solomon*, 72, 79, 86). The sole other doxology, *Ode* 17:16, does not refer to the name, but is directed to “our Head, Lord Messiah.”

⁴⁸ In each conclusion, *tešbuḥtā* is paired with another term: twice “honor” and once “majesty.” Lattke suggests that the doxologies derive directly from the Septuagint, mentioning passages like Psalm 95:7 [ET 96:7] for “glory and honor” (*Odes*, 232), and Psalms 8:2 [ET 8:1]; 20:6 [ET 21:5]; 28:4 [ET 29:4]; 67:35 [ET 68:34]; 70:8 [ET 71:8]; 95:6 [ET 96:6]; 110:3 [ET 111:3]; 144:5, 12 [ET 145:5,12], especially 20:6 [ET 21:5] for “glory and majesty” (*Odes*, 267).

⁴⁹ One further concluding doxology, *Ode* 17:16, does not refer to the name, but is directed to “our Head, Lord Messiah.”

⁵⁰ Franzmann, *Odes*, 46.

⁵¹ At 6:7 both Lattke and Charlesworth translate *tešbuḥtā* with “praise.” See Lattke’s comments, *Odes*, 78-79.

⁵² Lattke’s translation. Charlesworth is similar, but yields a slightly different sense: “His praise he gave us on account of his name” (*Odes*, 30-31). In Charlesworth’s translation

As Lattke says, “God ... is declared also to be the source of the gift of words for his praise.” Since God is an authoritative source, his ascription of praise, glory, honor, and majesty to the Name in the doxologies must be seen as normative for how people ought to view the Name according to the *Odes*.

The Name is not, however, exclusively the Father’s Name, as can be seen in *Ode* 23. There the Name is shared among all three: “And the Name of the Father was upon it (the letter), And of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.”⁵³ Lattke has observed that this is still “a long way short of ‘Trinitarian belief.’”⁵⁴ Nonetheless, the triadic formula does indicate that sharing a Name was an important aspect of the theology expressed in the *Odes* about what the three divine beings held in common.⁵⁵ This formula is reminiscent of Matt 28:19 “baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.” Just like the singular Name in Matthew,⁵⁶ the *Odes* refer to a single Name—not three Names—written upon the letter. The Name of the Son, in this case at least, is the same as

God is the object of praise, and it is for the sake of his name that God gives the speakers that praise.

⁵³ *Ode* 23:22.

⁵⁴ Lattke, *Odes of Solomon*, 339. In contrast, however, Charlesworth (*Odes of Solomon*, 96), and Leslie Baynes (“Christ as Text: *Odes of Solomon* 23 and the Letter Shot from Heaven,” *Biblical Research* 47 [2002], 63-72, here 69-70) appear to hold the opinion that it is in fact Trinitarian belief. Drijvers argues for it; however, Drijvers dates the *Odes* more than a century later. (“Die Oden Salomos und die Polemik,” “Kerygma und Logos in den Oden Salomos,” “The 19th Ode of Solomon,” and “Odes of Solomon and Psalms of Mani.” All these articles are gathered in Drijvers, *East of Antioch* (London: Variorum Reprints, 1984).

⁵⁵ Similar language, of course, is found at Matt 28:19 “baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.”

⁵⁶ Donald A. Hagner refers to the name in Matthew as a “threefold name” which points to unity of the three. He finds this to represent the perspective of the author’s time rather than being the original expression, which he assumes to have been “in my name” (*Matthew 14-28* [Word Biblical Commentary 33b; Waco, TX: Word, 1995], 887-88).

that of the Father. The text does not describe a Name that the Son (or Holy Spirit) possess merely by the grant of the Father. Other than placing the Father first in the list, the text does not privilege the Father. It seems to suggest that the Name belongs to the Son just as properly as it does to the Father.

The Son's proper possession of the Name is confirmed in *Ode* 42:20, where the Father is not in question at all. The Messiah claims the Name as his own, saying that the redeemed belong to him because of it: "And *I* placed *my* Name upon their head."⁵⁷ At *Ode* 33:13 there is a question about the best way to understand the speaker, but the *Ode* may provide further confirmation of the perspective that the Name truly belongs to the Son rather than being properly the Father's Name, which the Son is allowed to bear and use. "I will make my ways known to those who seek me, and cause them to trust in my Name." Lattke argues that the speaker, who is identified as the Perfect Virgin in 33:5 and as personified Grace in 33:1, ought not to be equated with Christ.⁵⁸ Many scholars, however, have identified the "Grace" (and so also the Virgin) with Christ.⁵⁹ Other similar

⁵⁷ Emphasis mine. I will return to the soteriological implications of this verse in my discussion on soteriology.

⁵⁸ Lattke, *Odes*, 450, 451, 459-461, 464-465.

⁵⁹ Harris and Mingnana, *Odes and Psalms* II, 376; W. E. Barnes, "An Ancient Christian Hymn Book," *Expositor* (1910): 62; Walter Bauer, *Johannesevangelium* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1912), 613; J. H. Bernard, *The Odes of Solomon* (Cambridge: University Press, 1912), 117-119; Charlesworth, *Odes*, 121. Going a different route altogether, Susan Ashbrook Harvey has identified the Virgin with the Holy Spirit, "Feminine Imagery for the Divine: The Holy Spirit, the *Odes of Solomon*, and Early Syriac Tradition," *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 37 (1993), 111-39, here 124. She is followed in this judgment by Cornelia Horn, "The virgin and the perfect virgin: traces of early eastern Christian Mariology in the *Odes of Solomon*," *Studia Patristica* 40 (Leuven: Peeters, 2006), 413-28, here 427-428.

references⁶⁰ to Christ's right to be called by the Name are less clear. Even in these, however, Christ is seen to bear the Name, act through the Name, and bestow the Name whether that is on his own behalf or on behalf of the Father.

By crediting the Messiah with the same Name that is praised and associated with the glory, grace, and praise due to God, the *Odes* associate the Messiah himself with those traits of God as well. As I will show in the following sections, however, it is the association with authority and salvific activity that the *Odes* most strongly retain when applying the Name to the Messiah.

II. Authority through the Name

There are three passages in *Ode* 23 that are helpful in understanding how it relates the Name to governing authority, the last of which I have already mentioned in the previous section. The subject of the *Ode* is a letter that represents the thought and will of God. In each of the three passages, the letter is related to authority, and in each one, something is shown to be on the letter as the source or evidence of its authority.

8b. And they were afraid of it
and of the seal which was upon it.
9. Because they were not allowed to loosen its seal;
For the power which was over the seal
was greater than they.

12. And with it was a sign
Of the kingdom and of providence.

17. The letter was one of command,
And hence all regions were gathered together.

⁶⁰ For example, *Ode* 25:11, 39:13 (where the name could be the name of the "Lord Messiah).

18. And there was seen at its head, the head which was revealed,
Even the Son of Truth from the Most High Father.

22. And the Name of the Father was upon it;
And of the Son and of the Holy Spirit,
To rule for ever and ever.

In this quotation from *Ode* 23:8b-9, “they” are those who have attempted to catch and read “it,” the letter. The Name in *Ode* 23:22 is the source of authority for the perpetual reign promised in v. 22c. The Name which “was upon it” recalls the seal of 23:8, which “was upon it” also. That seal is identified as the Name in 23:22, as it is also in *Odes* 39 and 42. In the same way, it is simplest to understand the v. 12 reference to “a sign of the kingdom and of providence” as another reference to the Name engraved upon the letter. Lattke has pointed out the similarities between this sealed letter and the scroll in Rev 5. Both the scroll of Revelation and the letter of *Ode* 23 are sealed, and both inspire anxiety among those who encounter them.⁶¹ In Revelation, it is only the Lamb who has the authority to break the seals and open the scroll. In *Ode* 23, the seal itself grants authority to the Son of Truth. By ascribing the Name, which *Ode* 23 has invested with such authority, to the Son, v. 22 explains why the Son of Truth has the status to appear at the head of a letter of command, gather all regions together, and possess everything in vv. 17-19.

The setting for this exercise of ruling authority is important for understanding the way this *Ode* relates to other descriptions of divine authority through the Name. The

⁶¹ Lattke, *Odes*, 330-31.

letter descends from on High according to 23:5.⁶² The images of mowing and cutting down in v. 13 are agricultural, as Franzmann has shown.⁶³ There are rivers in v. 14 and forests in v. 15.⁶⁴ At several points, people attempt to take hold of the letter and understand its contents. In short, the *Ode* describes the Son's activity in the world.⁶⁵ When the Son of Truth then takes possession of "everything" and rules forever, that ruling authority is exercised in the world as well. Matthew 28:18-20 also puts its reference to the threefold Name in a context that is concerned with earthly authority. There, vv. 18 and 20 refer to Jesus' "authority in heaven and on earth," and to the obedience that is due him. In spite of the coincidences, it would be implausible to argue that *Ode* 23 is dependent upon Matt 28; however, the Gospel does provide a separate witness that associates the Name with Son and gives him authority based on his possession of the same Name as the Father. The Similitudes of *First Enoch* likewise grant authority to the Son of Man based on his possession of the Name of the Lord of Spirits (*I En.* 48, 69:26-29).⁶⁶ *Ode* 23 is not unique in understanding the Name to grant earthly

⁶² The subject of the clause is actually "His will," but it appears that the letter represents both will and thought metaphorically. The letter returns explicitly in 23:7, and seems to have been the subject all along. See Baynes, "Christ as Text," 63-64; Lattke, *Odes*, 329;

⁶³ Franzmann, "The Wheel in Prov XX.26 and Ode of Solomon XXIII.11-16." VT 41 (1991): 121-3.

⁶⁴ Manuscript N has *peoples* instead of *forests* (Charlesworth, *Odes*, 96), but given the nature of the other images, there is no reason to doubt that *forests* is correct.

⁶⁵ This is not to say that the *Ode* must be about the incarnation. This has been the most common position since Harris argued it in his initial publication of the *Odes*, and Baynes has recently picked up that interpretation for her article on *Ode* 23. ("Christ as Text," 63-72.) See Lattke, however, for the argument that the letter which enters the world cannot be the Son, since the Son appears on the letter (*Odes*, 329).

⁶⁶ See my discussion of these passages from *I En.* in ch. 2.

authority, although it differs from *Ascension of Isaiah* on the earthly exercise of that authority.

III. Revelatory Salvation by the Name

One very important way that the Name's authority and power are exercised is for the purpose of salvation. The Messiah's soteriological role is similar to that of the Father, whose Name is salvific in *Ode 39*. Those at risk of being overwhelmed by the *dangerous* waters are assured that there is a way for them to cross:

Because the sign on them is the Lord,
And the sign is the Way for those who cross in the Name of the Lord.
Therefore put on the Name of the Most High and know Him,
And you shall cross without danger;⁶⁷

Three elements come together here that epitomize how the *Odes of Solomon* understand the Name to operate in salvation. 1) Salvation is “in” the Name. 2) It involves possession of the Name. In this case that is illustrated by “putting on the Name,” but other language and imagery are also used to convey the idea of possession. Finally, 3) it is connected to knowledge.

By saying that salvation is “in” the Name, I mean to do little more than to observe that the Name is consistently given a role in salvation in the *Odes*. This is true for the Name of the Father, who appears as the subject in *Ode 39* as well as in *Ode 8:22*: “And you shall be found incorrupted in all ages, On account of the Name of your Father.”⁶⁸ It is equally true where the Name is the Name of the Son. The faithful are saved “because

⁶⁷ *Ode 39:7-8*

⁶⁸ Lattke interprets this as indicating that the name of the Father is “a powerful means to achieve this future state [of salvation]” (*Odes of Solomon*, 128).

of⁶⁹ his Name, given life “by the truth of His Name,”⁷⁰ and they put on immortality “through” his Name. Taken together, these prepositions indicate shades of the basic idea which pervades the *Odes*’s soteriology, the conviction that the Name is involved in salvation.

The second two elements are more important for defining the operation of salvation through the Name. Lattke describes the image of “donning” the Name in *Ode* 39 as “sheltering under” it, but the *Odes* themselves offer several examples of similar imagery that point in a different direction. In *Ode* 42, the Messiah speaks of the dead who seek to find salvation through him: “And I placed my Name upon their head, because they are free and they are mine.”⁷¹ This verse recalls the imagery of Revelation 14:1 where the Divine Name is written upon the foreheads of the faithful to mark them out as a special possession and thus extend divine protection and salvation to them.⁷² This imagery explains the *Ode* 39 reference to putting on the Name at least as well as the

⁶⁹ *Ode* 14:5

⁷⁰ *Ode* 41:15

⁷¹ *Ode* 42:20

⁷² Two additional places where a mark is placed upon people may be relevant here as well. In Ezek 9:3-6, YHWH instructs the angel to place a mark upon the foreheads of those who are faithful to protect them against the outpouring of wrath upon Jerusalem. One version of the Damascus Document (CD-B XIX,10-14) appears to interpret this verse as applying to their own time. They explicitly expect the judgements to fall upon those who are not part of their community. Margaret Barker speculates, in light of this, that they may have actually used such a mark to identify themselves as the protected faithful. Barker brings together these texts, as well as later ones (*b. Horayoth* 12a; *T. Ps. Jon. Gen.* 4.15; *Pss. Sol.* 15.6-7) to connect this mark with the High Priest’s name plate, on which the tetragrammaton was inscribed, from Exodus 28:36 (*The Revelation of Jesus Christ* [Edinburgh : T&T Clark, 2000], 161-163). Teicher gives a similar interpretation of the Damascus Document, although he goes on to insist upon the equation of the Hebrew Tau with the Greek Chi, and concludes that the community was Christian (“Christian Interpretation of the Sign X,” *VT* 5 [1955]: 196-198).

notion of seeking shelter under it. Another reference may also support the conclusion that salvation comes through this type of possession of the Name rather than simply through the external activity of the Name. In *Ode* 8, the Messiah speaks of the faithful. The Messiah's saving act is very similar to that in *Ode* 42. Unlike *Ode* 42, in which the beneficiary of that salvation is those who are already dead, in *Ode* 8:13 it is those who have not yet been born.

And before they yet were,
I recognised them;
And their faces I sealed.⁷³

There is no explicit reference to a seal; it is implied by the verb (*ἔβαλε*: to imprint, to mark⁷⁴). This seal is best understood to be the Name written upon the faces of the redeemed, and not simply because of the comparison with the expressions in *Odes* 39 and 42. This phrase is part of Christ's address to the community reassuring the redeemed of the salvation that awaits them.⁷⁵ The seal on their faces serves as confirmation that Christ will not forget or reject them, and that they will forever continue to enjoy the benefits of

⁷³ *Ode* 8:13. Translation from Majella Franzmann, *The Odes of Solomon*, 65. (Franzmann and Lattke number this verse as 8:15.) Charlesworth and (strangely) Lattke are somewhat misleading in their translations, which suggest the presence of a noun, "seal," which is only implied by the verb. See Lattke, *Odes*, 122, for grammatical discussion.

⁷⁴ Lattke (*Odes*, 122) discusses the possible meanings, as well as his conclusion that the *vorlage* was a form of *σφραγίζω*, excluding the idea that it meant sealing up for the purpose of keeping secret.

⁷⁵ There are several ways of analyzing this passage. Harris and Mingana see the *ex ore Christi* beginning at v.8 (*Odes and Psalms*, 2:257), as do Charlesworth who labels it "Christ speaks" (*Odes*, 41), but says that "no linguistic device announces the shift in speakers" (43), and Franzmann, who bases her division on the "return to the imperatives addressed to the community" that begins with v.8 (*Odes*, 65). Lattke concludes that the *Ode* should be divided differently, beginning the address at v.9, on the grounds that "the actual first-person address only commences, linguistically, at stanza IVb (9)" (*Odes*, 112).

its presence. In 8:18, Christ repeats the statement that “they are [his] own,” and he continues in 19, saying that “they shall not be deprived of my Name; For it is with them.” Here, it is his Name that serves as further evidence that the redeemed will indeed ultimately be saved, just as Christ’s act of sealing does in 8:13. Both the Name of 19 and the seal of 13 are permanent features. The concluding address to the community confirms this important role for the Name, as the assembled redeemed are commanded to pray and increase, and are told “And you shall be found incorrupted in all ages, On account of the Name of your Father.” With this statement, the redeemed have been assured twice at the end of the *Ode* that they will be saved on the basis of the permanent possession of the Name. What this means is that when they are sealed in v.13, they are sealed with the Name.⁷⁶

Salvation in the *Odes of Solomon* involves a certain cognitive awareness, which is often linked with the possession of the Name. This is the third point made in *Ode* 39:8. It connects the Name with knowledge by saying “put on the Name of the Most High, and know (yḏʿ) Him.” This cognitive awareness is referred to by several different terms. “Knowledge” is referred to in *Ode* 39, but other terms that function in a similar way include truth, faith, and wisdom. For the purpose of this investigation, these are best

⁷⁶ It is possible that *Ode* 25:11 also contributes to this understanding of the possession of the name as bringing about the salvific experience of being possessed by God when it says “I became the Lord’s by the name of the Lord.” (The line is missing in Coptic.) Unfortunately, it is impossible to say with certainty who the speaker is (options include the redeemed, Christ, or a second redeemer figure) or who the two instances of κύριος refer to. What can be said is that *Ode* 25:11 indicates that *some* name effects possession of the speaker by *some* Lord. For discussion of the problems in interpreting this verse, see Harris and Mingana, *Psalms and Odes*, 2:143-147; Lattke, *Odes*, 367.

taken together since they all assume some intellectual awareness of the particular truth, faith, or wisdom in question.

The structurally simplest example is *Ode* 41:16⁷⁷, in which it is said that the Messiah “give[s] life to persons forever by the truth of His Name.” This verse is one of the clearest examples of the *Odes*’ soteriological use of “truth.” Lattke points out that the concept of truth is “generally found in proximity to the knowledge of salvation.”⁷⁸ In *Ode* 41, the truth that leads to salvation is defined as the truth “of His Name.” This could indicate knowledge of the Name itself, or it could indicate true knowledge of the Messiah. The structure of the *Ode* lends weight to the latter understanding that it is the Messiah who is known, but this involves a look to the slightly more complex structure of the preceding context.

Franzmann analyzes 16a as the conclusion of a single strophe which begins at 41:13.⁷⁹ She treats the declaration in 15a, “The Messiah in truth is one,” as a pivot point

⁷⁷ Because I am dealing with her structural analysis, I will follow Franzmann’s versification (for which she follows Harris & Mingana) on these verses. Franzmann calls this line 41:16—in Charlesworth it is the last line of 41:15. Otherwise, their versification is the same for *Ode* 41 (Franzmann, *Odes*, 276).

⁷⁸ Lattke, *Odes*, 580. Lattke offers *Ode* 8:12 and 12:13b as primary examples. For his discussion of *truth*, and the other words that derive from the *šr[r]* stem, see “Excursus 1: “Truth” in the *Odes of Solomon*,” where he relates the dualism of truth and falsehood to “soteriological dualism” in the same way that the opposition of light and darkness are related to it. *Odes*, 31-32.

⁷⁹ For the sake of simplicity, I am following Franzmann’s usage of poetical terms for the *Odes of Solomon*. These are laid out in her introduction, *Odes of Solomon*, xx-xxii. Lattke appears to employ the same terminology.

between its two halves.⁸⁰ For purposes of this chapter, only the second half (vv. 15a-16a)⁸¹ is important, and so only that portion is reproduced here.

15a The Messiah in Truth is One
 15b And **he was known** before the foundation of the world,
 16a that he might give life to souls forever by the **truth of his Name**.⁸²

In this structure, the “truth of His Name” in v. 16a is coordinated with the Messiah being known⁸³ according to v. 15b. This means that in order for the Messiah to bring about salvation by the truth of His Name, He must be known.

We have already seen that in *Ode* 33:13 the believers trust in the Name with salvation as the ultimate goal. This *Ode* is particularly interesting because of the way it relates the Name to both faith and to knowledge. Whereas in the other verses we have seen, the Name itself is given to believers, in *Ode* 33 it appears that the faithful trust because they are “lead to trust” in the Name. Despite Charlesworth’s objections,⁸⁴ the best reading is to understand that the believers are given faith or caused to have faith.⁸⁵ This need not be read as some sort of compulsion to faith. The call to return earlier in the chapter assumes that the people will, themselves, respond to that call and choose to

⁸⁰ Franzmann, *Odes of Solomon*, 279-280.

⁸¹ *Ode* 41:15a-c in Charlesworth’s numbering.

⁸² Franzmann, *Odes*, 276. I have added indentation.

⁸³ Again, *yd'*, as in 39:8. Lattke concludes that in this case it more likely corresponds to ἐγνώσθη than to γνωστός ἐστι (*Odes*, 580).

⁸⁴ Charlesworth translates the phrase “And I will promise them my name,” on the grounds that “making ‘the chosen ones’ to trust is poor theology, and inconsistent with the general tone of the Odes” (*Odes of Solomon*, 122).

⁸⁵ See Lattke’s grammatical notes, *Odes*, 465. For *tkl* (trust) see Payne Smith II.4433. As Lattke points out, the same verb is used, in the same stem, at Psalm 118:49 (119 ET) “you have made me hope.” *Old Testament in Syriac: According to the Peshitta Version* Part 2,3 Book of Psalms (ed. D. M. Walter; Leiden: Brill, 1980), 144.

return. Note, however, that if they do, *Ode* 33:8 says that the speaking “Grace” will bring about certain effects in them.

And I will enter into you,
And bring you forth from destruction,
And make you wise in the ways of truth.⁸⁶

Verse 13 simply extends the same logic: those who are the “elect ones,” who respond to the call, will be given faith in his Name.

The soteriological results of this imparted faith have been emphasized in the verses leading up to this conclusion. We already saw that they will be brought forth from destruction (33:8). They will also not be corrupted or perish (9), they will be saved (10, 11), and blessed (11), and possess incorruption (12). One additional soteriological act promised in *Ode* 33:8 yields another connection to the cognitive element in the *Odes*’ soteriology. The elect are promised that they will be made “wise in the ways of truth” This cognitive component is also repeated in *Ode* 33:13, where the “double promise of salvation”⁸⁷ sets the two soteriological acts parallel to one another.

(A) And my ways	(B) I shall make known	(C)to them who seek me
(B')and I will lead	(C') them to trust	(A')in my Name. ⁸⁸

Franzmann identifies a “balanced structure” (A B C // B' C' A') in the grammar of the Syriac,⁸⁹ which ties the lines together more closely than their mere proximity requires.

⁸⁶ *Ode* 33:8.

⁸⁷ Lattke, *Odes*, 464.

⁸⁸ *Ode* 33:13. Franzmann’s translation (*Odes of Solomon*, 235). I have added spacing to make the structural components more apparent.

⁸⁹ Franzmann, *Odes of Solomon*, 239. The conceptual parallels that are apparent even in translation are reinforced by formal parallels in Syriac which Franzmann points out. “A = noun (attribute of the Perfect Virgin) with 1st sing. Suffix; B = 1st sing. Imperf. Verb; C +

Assuming that she is correct, in the salvation of the believer the act of bringing about trust in the Name is inseparable from the act of making know the “ways” of the speaker.

I believe there is a similar structural relationship in *Ode* 15:6-8.⁹⁰ Lattke recognizes the connection between the two verses, describing them as each containing “dualistic statements of salvation,”⁹¹ but this description does not reveal the correspondence between the Name and knowledge that the poetic structure contains. Franzmann’s analysis, while it points to certain specific congruities, comes to different conclusions about that relationship because of the way she arranges the lines.⁹² The “dualistic statements of salvation” that Lattke points out are arranged in such that they are conceptually reversed from one another, in a sort of loose chiasmic arrangement.⁹³

3rd masc. pl. pron./pron. With dependent cl. [dir./indir. Obj. of the 1st sing. Imperf. Verb]).”

⁹⁰ Lattke reorganizes Franzmann’s arrangement of the Ode, and I will follow his arrangement for this section (Lattke, *Odes*, 206).

⁹¹ Lattke, *Odes*, 210.

⁹² Franzmann recognizes the grammatical similarities between 6 and 8, which both have 1st person singular subjects and 3rd singular masculine objects, but she breaks v.6 into three lines:

- a The way of error I abandoned,
- b and went towards him,
- c and received salvation from him who (is) without jealousy.

By treating ‘6a’ as an introduction to all that follows, the possibility of correspondence to v.8 is obscured.

⁹³ Loose in that the parallelism is conceptual, but lacks the strict grammatical parallels that Franzmann identifies in other *Odes*. Lattke describes the stanza as “more or less parallel” (*Odes*, 210). Franzmann discusses the structural patterns she is able to identify on *Odes*, 119-120.

Exclusion of the declarations about the Lord's actions in verse seven makes the relationship between vv. 6 and 8 more apparent.⁹⁴

- 6a I forsook the way of error and went to him
 6b and received salvation from him without envy.
- 8a I put on imperishability by his Name
 8b and took off perishability by his grace.

Vv. 6a and 8b each describe the movement away from a prior state of existence, one which would have ended in death. This prior state is called “error”⁹⁵ in 6a. The central lines, 6b and 8a, describe the alternative that has been embraced: salvation and imperishability. These terms are particularly important because they connect this stanza to what came before in vv. 15:3-5. There, the grace that had been given by the Lord was said to involve gaining eyes to see, ears to hear “his truth,” and “the thought of knowledge.” By presenting salvation as a new ability to perceive truth and knowledge, this passage gives content to the error in 6a. Error is equated with “perishability,” and the *Odes* tie together two concepts in the rescue from that state. Rescue comes through the new perception the Lord gives in vv. 3-5, but also “by means of his Name” in v. 8a.

Of course, the Name is not the only concept linked with salvation, or even with the knowledge associated with salvation. In my analysis of *Ode* 15 much the same can be

⁹⁴ V. 7 is structurally paired with v. 9 in a similar way as vv. 6 and 8. The arrangement of the whole stanza is not necessary for the point made here, and would over-complicate the presentation of the text. For further structural analysis, see Franzmann, *Odes*, 119.

⁹⁵ Lattke entertains both the possibility that “error” is a personification, and that it merely describes a way of life (*Odes*, 210-212). He does not declare a conclusion on this verse, but does treat error as a personification in its reappearance at 31:2 (*Odes*, 426).

said for “grace” as I have said for “Name,”⁹⁶ and I would not attempt to claim that the Name is given an exclusive role in salvation. The *Ode* does, however, give the Name an important role in salvation. Most importantly, believers are given the Name or imprinted with it for their salvation. This Name cannot subsequently be taken away from them, and on the basis of their possession of the Messiah’s Name they are recognized as the elect and are saved. In addition to this directly soteriological role, the Name exercises authority and power in the world, especially in *Ode* 23. The connection between the Name and these qualities is not simply coincidental, but is consistently applied. These qualities, along with the praise, and divine attributes ascribed to the Name contribute to the high onomanology that the *Odes* express. The relevance of these points becomes apparent when the *Odes* are contrasted with the soteriology of *Ascension of Isaiah*.

Conclusions: Comparison of Ascension of Isaiah and the Odes of Solomon

The *Odes of Solomon* and *Ascension of Isaiah* have several important similarities in their deployments of Name Theology. First of all, both use Christ’s possession of the Name as a way to associate him with the Father. Both texts treat the Name as the basis for Christ’s exercise of authority to rule and to bring order. Furthermore, both *Ascension of Isaiah* and the *Odes* use Name language to describe the believer’s salvation. Specifically they hold that salvation has something to do with the believer coming to

⁹⁶ Indeed, Lattke does not separate their roles in his discussion, referring to them as “the two terms of power,” and noting that “redemption occurs in other passages as well by God’s ‘name’ or ‘grace.’” He points to 8:23 and 14:5 for name, and 9:5; 25:4; and 29:5 for grace (*Odes*, 213).

possess the Name, albeit in different ways: as knowledge of the Name in *Ascension of Isaiah*, and as something to be borne as a seal, or worn as a garment, in the *Odes*.

On these last two points, however, there are important differences in precisely how the authority and salvific role are viewed. Put simply, the *Odes of Solomon* and *Ascension of Isaiah* differ on the timing and the location of the revelation and activity of the Name. These differences are all the more interesting because of the fact that they both hail from the region of Syria and from the early decades of the second century. If Lattke is correct that the *Odes* are originally composed in Greek, that adds one more point of contact for these two texts, and makes their differences that much more important. Even if the *Odes* are composed in Syriac, however, in bilingual Syria the communities responsible for the *Odes* and *Ascension of Isaiah* would have had ample opportunity for interaction.⁹⁷ In this section I will examine the implications of their differences.

With regard to the believer's possession of the Name, *Ascension of Isaiah* repeatedly withholds the revelation of the Name from the prophet – even though he is allowed to visit the seventh heaven, the very presence of God. There are many things that he is allowed to learn. He is allowed to know that the Beloved, who is the Son of the Great Glory, will descend to earth in the likeness of a man and he is allowed to know that

⁹⁷ This is, of course, not to say direct dependence. Many of the problems with demonstrating dependence between *Asc. Isa.* and the *Odes Sol.* are present in the related discussion about the relationship between the *Odes* and John. I adopt a similar position for both. Charlesworth lays out the difficulties in demonstrating dependence in either direction between the *Odes* and the Johanne literature in his essays “The Odes of Solomon and the Gospel of John,” and “Qumran, John and the Odes of Solomon,” both reproduced in *Critical Reflections on the Odes of Solomon*. See especially the section “Summary of Scholarly conclusions” 251-257. I will assume the position taken by the majority of scholars, which I believe to be both the most conservative and the best: the *Odes* and Gospel both come from the same religious environment.

on earth he will be called Jesus; however, he is specifically told that he cannot know the Name of the Beloved until he leaves the body of flesh and ascends finally to enter heaven permanently. Only at that time, after his earthly life is complete and his salvation has been realized, will the Name be given to him.

Contrast this view with the *Odes*. According to the timing of its soteriology, the Name has already been given to the believer. The *Odes*' conviction that the Messiah set his Name on the believer before the creation and that believers "will not be deprived of [his] Name"⁹⁸ must be seen as a contrast with the *Ascension*'s delay of that gift.

The *Odes* and *Ascension of Isaiah* also differ on the realm of the Name's activity. Whereas *Ascension of Isaiah* cannot even allow for the possibility that the Name could enter into the world,⁹⁹ the *Odes* consistently portray believers as possessing the Name in this world,¹⁰⁰ marked by the Name even before they are born,¹⁰¹ and rescued not only from this world but even from Sheol¹⁰² by the act of having the Name placed upon their heads.

Odes of Solomon portrays the revelation of the Name in this way because of the particular way in which it relates the Name to salvation. Unlike *Ascension of Isaiah*, in which the Name is given only once salvation has been completed, almost as a reward upon entering the presence of Glory, the Name in *Odes of Solomon* appears to effect salvation in the believer. It is the Name that preserves the believer in the trials of this

⁹⁸ *Ode* 8:19.

⁹⁹ *Ascension of Isaiah* 1:7.

¹⁰⁰ *Ode* 15:6-8; 33:8-13; 39:7-8; 41:15.

¹⁰¹ *Ode* 8:13.

¹⁰² *Ode* 42:20

world, and also in the age to come. They do not receive the Name because they are found previously enrolled in some way and allowed to enter heaven, but instead they are found to be incorruptible in eternity *because* they possess the Name.

A similar assessment can be made concerning the places where Christ exercises authority in relation to the Name. In both *Ascension of Isaiah* and *Odes of Solomon* Christ is shown to exercise authority through his possession of the Name. That exercise of authority is portrayed in different settings, however, and the differences can be seen to follow along the same lines as the difference in where and to whom the Name is revealed. In the *Odes of Solomon*, particularly in *Ode 23*, the Messiah takes control of the world and rules over it. On the other hand, in *Ascension of Isaiah*, when the Beloved is shown to exercise the authority of his Name, it is in heaven. He orders the heavens, the angels in heaven, and the worship in heaven. In contrast with these heavenly acts, and also in contrast with the Messiah's earthly activity in the *Odes*, when the Beloved does enter the world in *Ascension of Isaiah*, he keeps his identity a secret and goes unnoticed by the angels of the firmament. Only when he returns to his heavenly setting is his authority revealed and acknowledged.

The references to salvific and governing authority of the Name are portrayed in a manner consistent with the differing foci of the *Ascension of Isaiah* and the *Odes*. The *Odes* envision the salvific revelation of the Name in this existence, and also the governing authority of the Name on earth. In *Ascension of Isaiah* the revelation is reserved for heaven, as is the exercise of its governing authority. Both *Ascension of Isaiah* and *Odes of Solomon* find support in other Jewish and Christian literature for their positions on the relationship of the Name to the world. *Ascension of Isaiah's* restriction

of both knowledge and activity of the Name reflects the same concern with secrecy that is central in the Name Theology of *Apocalypse of Abraham*, *Prayer of Jacob*, and *Joseph and Aseneth*. *Ascension of Isaiah* however, goes beyond those texts in restricting even the Name's activity to heaven, since they allow for the Name to act in creation, and according to *Apoc. Ab.* even to be responsible for maintaining the creation. In that regard, the *Odes* are within a much larger tradition crediting the Name with cosmological activity in *I En.* 69 and other texts.¹⁰³ The different traditions within Jewish literature that they seem to follow is not primary, however. That is to say, I do not believe that they adopt the positions they do about the Name's role in the world and in salvation purely as a result of the Name theologies they have inherited. I believe that they adopt those positions regarding the Name because of another related theological question that scholars have identified in the early second century.

Some scholars, including Norelli, Simonetti, Hall, and Knight¹⁰⁴ have located the *Ascension of Isaiah* within a community of prophets who insist on the importance of ascent for revelation, as well as the centrality of the prophet in the leadership of the church. In this model, the pro-ascent *Ascension of Isaiah* is placed in opposition to the generally anti-ascent perspective of Johannine Christianity, particularly as presented in the Gospel of John. Although the Gospel of John and the book of Revelation most likely come from Asia Minor, the comparison of their parallels regarding prophetic ministry has clarified the position of each text on the means of prophecy. This "prophetic schools"

¹⁰³ *Jub.* 36:7; *Pr. Man.* 2-3; *Pr. Jac.*; and also *Apoc. Ab.* 10 as mentioned above. My discussion of these passages is in ch. 2.

¹⁰⁴ see note 4

scheme casts the debate as one about heavenly ascent – does the prophet ascend to heaven in order to receive revelation, or does he remain on earth for that revelation? Questions such as these about revelation can be related to Name Theology, in that both documents place importance on the revelation of the Name. The prophetic scheme can be adapted to describe Name Theology by shifting the focus away from the prophet, as the one receiving revelation, and onto the revealer. In this case, the question becomes whether the revealer remains in heaven, dispensing the revelation from that place as he does in *Ascension of Isaiah*, or descends into the world to give revelation, as in the Gospel of John. Rephrasing it in this way still describes the prophet’s action accurately, but it allows us to see that the texts adhere to the same principles in their differences on Name Theology. The Name is restricted in the same ways as is the revealer. In *Ascension of Isaiah* the Name is completely restricted from the world, and made known only at the end. In contrast, John portrays the Name as having been brought into the present world, and in fact having already been given to Christians,¹⁰⁵ as Jesus says at John 17:26: “I made your Name known to them, and I will make it known.”¹⁰⁶

¹⁰⁵ This perspective can be viewed as being in keeping with John’s “inaugurated eschatology,” in that the giving of the name is one part of the eschatological salvation that is already realized, not put off until the final consummation of eschatology. For further studies of points of contact between the *Odes* and John, see James H. Charlesworth and Dean Alan Culpepper, “The Odes of Solomon and the Gospel of John,” *CBQ* 35 (1973), 298-322; Brian McNeil, “The Odes of Solomon and the Scriptures,” *Oriens Christianus* 67 (1983), 104-122; Lattke, “The Apocryphal Odes of Solomon and the New Testament Writings,” *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche*, 73 no 3-4 (1982), 294-301. For further discussion about points of contact between the *Odes* and the NT Apoc, see Michael A. Novak, “*The Odes of Solomon* as Apocalyptic Literature,” *VC* 66.5 (2012), 527-50.

¹⁰⁶ I have discussed the Johannine material in ch. 3.

Hall places the *Odes* in a similar context,¹⁰⁷ finding them to reflect the same side as *Ascension of Isaiah* in the debate over the issue of prophetic ascent. On the basic question of ascent, this is true in that both have a positive view of ascent. However, the *Odes* understand ascent to work in a very different way than does *Ascension of Isaiah*. The ascent references Hall points to in the *Odes* suggest that ascent is conceived of as contributing to the communities worship, and allows for present participation in eschatological heavenly worship. The *Odes* do not emphasize the role of prophetic ascent in bringing back particular revelation to the community. Therefore, with regard to their perspectives on ascent, the *Odes* allow a place for ascent, but it is not the kind of prophetic ascent Hall has identified as the polemical issue between John's gospel and the *Ascension of Isaiah*.

With regard to Name Theology, we see that the *Odes* can also be described by my adaptation of the "prophetic schools" scheme. The *Odes* envision the Name entering the world and wielding authority there. More importantly, in the *Odes* the Name is revealed to believers while they are still in the world for the purpose of their salvation, and it cannot be taken away from them. As such, the *Odes* contain an onomanology that is very

¹⁰⁷ Hall indicates that the *Odes* and *Asc. Isa.* are similar on matters of prophetic leadership and heavenly ascent. The *Odes* certainly have no polemic against ascent. See Hall, "Community Situation," 303-304 for a description of the *Odes*' perspective that the community participates in the ascent of the "Beloved" (*Ode* 39, 42), and that the *Odes* are sung before the heavenly throne (*Ode* 36:1-8; 35:5-7; 21:6-7; 11:16-17). The connections Norelli points out regarding themes of ascent and descent more often have to do with the reality (or lack thereof) of the incarnation, or the descent into Hades to liberate the dead, than they have to do with the revelation of the Messiah's identity (*Commentarius*, 56-7, 271, 469).

much like that found in the Gospel of John, except that the *Odes* lack the negative evaluation of ascent in general.

The differences observed between the Book of Revelation and the Fourth Gospel can also be described in terms of this conflict about revelation. The onomanology of Revelation is best described as being in general agreement with that in the Gospel of John. The differences are along the lines of nuance rather than disagreement. Both envision the Name being given to believers in the world and in the present existence, not only in heaven in a later, final state. As such, Revelation conflicts with the *Ascension of Isaiah*'s extreme restriction of the Name. It is not as liberal with the revelation of the Name as is John, however. Whereas in John Jesus reveals the Name broadly, almost as an evangelistic tool, Revelation does not seem to allow for the Name to be revealed to non-believers. It is given to mark the saved, not to draw people to salvation. Assuming again that Norrelli, Simonetti and Hall accurately describe the conflict; Revelation can be read as a middle ground between the two. It acknowledges the present possession of the Name by believers in the world as well as the restricted nature of that revelation. The *Odes of Solomon* may represent a similar moderating perspective. Although the Name is certainly given to believers already, there is no indication that it is publicly revealed, as it seems to be in John, as the content of the message that must be accepted.

Chapter Seven

Name Theology at Alexandria in the Second Century: *The Gospel of Truth and Excerpta ex Theodoto*

Introduction

It would be difficult to break new ground on the well studied texts that are the subject of this chapter, *Gospel of Truth* and *Excerpta ex Theodoto*. Much of the standard work on the *Excerpta* was done in the years before the discovery of the *Gospel of Truth* among the Nag Hamaddi codices in 1945. One of the important conclusions that scholars have come to is that it is no longer possible or appropriate to speak of Valentinianism, especially the Valentinianism of the period represented by the *Gospel of Truth* and the *Excerpta ex Theodoto*, as something distinct from Christianity.¹ The fully developed Valentinian system that Irenaeus describes in *Adversus Haereses* is not yet worked out in these texts. They identify as Christian, and they appear to have existed within a Christian context. As such, they are of value to this study, in that they represent a way of incorporating the implications of Name Theology into a Valentinian Christian system.

¹ Robin McL. Wilson describes the difficulty in establishing the authorship or date of the *Gos. Truth* because of its divergence from the Valentinianism of Irenaeus in “Valentinianism and the Gospel of Truth,” in *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism*, vol. 1, ed. Bentley Layton (Leiden: Brill, 1980), 133-145. Michel Desjardins calls for the need to read “Gnostic” texts within a Christian context in “Rethinking the Study of Gnosticism,” *Religion & Theology* 12 (2005): 370-84. Einar Thomassen makes the case for Rome, that early Valentinian teachers were active within the broader phenomenon of Roman Christianity (“Orthodoxy and Heresy in Second Century Rome,” *Harvard Theological Review* 97:3 [2004]: 241-56).

Einar Thomassen has done the most work on the Name in these texts,² however his work is concerned with Valentinianism as a whole and so includes material from later texts in addition to *Gospel of Truth* and *Excerpta ex Theodoto*. For the purpose of understanding Christological Name Theology as it was used in the second century, I will limit my discussion to these two texts. In what follows, rather than attempt to present a novel exegesis of the texts, I will describe the soteriological and cosmological roles of the Name in both texts, which the scholarship on them has long emphasized.

Part One – Gospel of Truth³

The *Gospel of Truth* is the title given to the third tractate of Codex I from Nag Hammadi on the basis of its opening words: “The gospel of truth is joy.” It is preserved in the subachmimic Coptic dialect, and is most likely a translation of a Greek original.⁴ It was initially considered to be the Valentinian document Irenaeus refers to at *AH* 3.11.9,⁵ but many scholars have expressed skepticism about this identification more recently.⁶

² Einar Thomassen, “Gnostic Semiotics: The Valentinian Notion of the Name,” *Temenos* 29 (1993) 141-56.

³ The critical edition of *Gos. Truth*, which includes an English translation and extensive notes, is Harold W. Attridge and George W. MacRae, “The Gospel of Truth,” 2 vols. in *Nag Hammadi Codex I: The Jung Codex* (ed. Harold W. Attridge; Leiden: Brill, 1985). I have used Attridge and MacRae’s translation for most quotations from *Gos. Truth*. An earlier translation with commentary is Kendrick Grobel, *The Gospel of Truth: A Valentinian Meditation on the Gospel* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1960).

⁴ Attridge and MacRae summarize the dissenting arguments for Syriac (P. Nagel) and Coptic (G. Fecht), but characterize the choice of Greek as a consensus (*Codex I*, 1.59-64).

⁵ “Indeed, they have arrived at such a pitch of audacity, as to entitle their comparatively recent writing the ‘Gospel of Truth’” (Irenaeus, *AH* 3.11.9 ANF).

⁶ Marksches summarizes the scholarship up to 1991, and compares the known fragments of Valentinus to the theology contained in *Gos. Truth*, and argues that it should not be attributed to Valentinus (*Valentinus Gnosticus* [J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck): Tübingen,

Thomassen has suggested that it is highly unlikely that there would be two different “gnostic” texts, one beginning with the same words as the title of the other. He considers it to be the work of Valentinians, not of Valentinius himself, and most likely the document Irenaeus mentioned.⁷ Whether it is the work of Valentinius or of a later disciple, the most common provenance assigned is Alexandria,⁸ sometime before Irenaeus wrote about it between 180 and 189.⁹

Probably the most well known expression of Name Theology in *Gospel of Truth* is the pithy statement at 38:6 that “The Name of the Father is the Son.” Joel Fineman understands the “Name” passages to reflect a complex metaphor allowing the author to establish a pious separation from the actual divine by consciously linguistic means;¹⁰ however most scholarship has seen in the statement as more than metaphor. Jacques Ménard finds in this statement evidence that *Gos. Truth* understands the Name as a

1991), 339-56). Among those who disagree is Michel Tardieu, “Une diatribe antignostique dans l’interpolation eunomienne des *Recognitiones*,” in *Alexandria: Hellenisme, judaïsme et christianisme à Alexandrie: Mélanges offerts au P. Claude Mondésert* (Paris: Cerf, 1987), 37.

⁷ Thomassen, *The Spiritual Seed: The Church of the Valentinians* (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 146-47.

⁸ Birger Pearson, for example, accepts Tardieu’s argument that the original part of the text is written by Valentinius, and assigns it to his earlier “Alexandrian period” (*Gnosticism and Christianity in Roman and Coptic Egypt*, [New York: Continuum, 2004], 67). Bentley Layton, *The Gnostic Scriptures*, (Garden City: Doubleday, 1987), 251.

⁹ For issues surrounding the dating of *AH 3*, see Anthony Briggman, *Irenaeus of Lyons and the Theology of the Holy Spirit* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012) 97-103.

¹⁰ Joel Fineman, “Gnosis and the Piety of Metaphor: The Gospel of Truth,” in *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism* (ed. Bentley Layton; 2 vols; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1980), 1.289-318.

hypostasis.¹¹ Arai assumes the same in his study of *Gos. Truth's* Christology.¹² Jarl Fossum agrees with this assessment, calling the Name “a distinctly personified entity.” He describes the theology developed in the col. 38 as a foreshadowing of the doctrine of consubstantiality eventually expressed in the Nicene creed.¹³ Raoul Mortley believes the hypostasization of the Name to be so pronounced that he suggests the doctrine is best explained as a fourth century Valentinian response to Arianism.¹⁴ The suggestion that the Name is hypostasized in *Gos. Truth* is supported by the repeated statements at 39.19-20 that “the Son is His Name,” and at 40.23-25 that “it pleased Him that His Name should become His beloved Son.”¹⁵ Beyond the simple observation that the Name is

¹¹ Jacques-É. Ménard, “les élucubrations de l’*Evangelium Veritatis* sur le ‘Nom,’” *Studia Montin Regii* 5 (1962) 214.

¹² Sasagu Arai, *Die Christologie des Evangelium Veritatis: Eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (Leiden: Brill, 1964), 68-69.

¹³ Fossum distinguishes between the approaches of the two texts, describing the perspective of *Gos. Truth* to be less developed in its recognition of an idea that the Creed seeks to understand and explain (he contrasts them as ontic and ontological, respectively). Fossum disagrees, however, with Ménard’s opinions about the origins of this theology in Rabbinic Judaism (*The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord* [WUNT 36; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1985], 108).

¹⁴ Raoul Mortley, “The Name of the Father is the Son (Gospel of Truth 38),” in R. T. Wallis, ed. *Neoplatonism and Gnosticism* (Albany, NY: ,1992) 239-52; Mortley, *From Word to Silence* (Bonn: Hanstein, 1986). Mortley’s thesis on dating has not been widely accepted, and G. Stroumsa rejects his argument that the Judaeo-Christian background of the text is not important for dating or interpretation (*Hidden Wisdom: Esoteric Traditions and the Roots of Christian Mysticism* [Leiden: Brill, 1996], 196).

¹⁵ Others who affirm the personal nature of the name include Cullen I.K. Story, *The Nature of Truth in ‘The Gospel of Truth’ and in the Writings of Justin Martyr*, (Leiden: Brill, 1970) 36; Charles A. Gieschen, “The Divine Name in Ante-Nicene Christology,” *VC* 57.2 (2003), 115-158, here 155. Elliot Wolfson (“Inscribed in the Book of the Living: Gospel of Truth and Jewish Christology,” *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 38 [2007] 234-271) appears to follow Fineman’s entirely linguistic reading of the text, and so does not take account of the personal nature of the name.

hypostasized in *Gos. Truth*, it is important to consider the purpose for which the Son is identified with, and as, that hypostatic Name.

I. Soteriology

In the passages that follow 38.6, Name Theology is a central feature in the soteriology expounded, not a marginal one. Over the course of three publications, Einar Thomassen has provided an outline of the soteriology of *Gos. Truth*.¹⁶ The redemption of Valentinian believers is dependent upon the redemption of the aeons, and *Gos. Truth* will shift between “the aeons of protological myth” and “the human beings of history.”¹⁷ The Valentinian believers’ redemption is in part their recognition of their true identity as the aeons. What follows, in large measure presents Thomassen’s outline with certain variations in emphasis. Thomassen calls the bestowal of a Name the most primitive soteriological notion present in *Gos. Truth*.¹⁸ Since bestowal of the Name on the Son is conceptually prior to any bestowal upon the Valentinian believers, I will begin with the Son.

In *Gos. Truth*, bestowal of the Name is concurrent with the generation of the Son. As the text develops the brief assertion in 38:6, it says in vv. 7-10:

It is he who first gave a Name to the one
who came forth from him,

¹⁶ Einar Thomassen, “Gnostic Semiotics,” Thomassen, *The Spiritual Seed*; Thomassen, “Baptism Among the Valentinians,” in *Ablution, Initiation, and Baptism: Late Antiquity, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity* (Berlin: DeGruyter, 2010), 895-916.

¹⁷ Thomassen, *Spiritual Seed*, 150.

¹⁸ Thomassen, “Gnostic Semiotics,” 145.

who was himself,
and he begot him as a son.¹⁹

Sonship is inherent in this emanation from the Father. It did not become the Son; it was begotten as a son.²⁰ The son appears to be the first in a series of emanations which are the Aeons of this particular Valentinian system.²¹ *Gospel of Truth* 38.32-39.1 refers to the begetting of the First Emanation:

Since the Father has not come into being, he alone
begot him for himself as a Name,
before he brought forth the
aeons, in order that the Name
of the Father should be on their head as
a proper Name, that is the true Name.²²

¹⁹ The translation is from Attridge and MacRae, the arrangement to clarify parallels is mine.

²⁰ Grobel reads this passage as a reference to the incarnation (*Gospel of Truth*, 181). That interpretation has been rejected by most scholarship, including Attridge & MacRae (*Notes*, 119) and Thomassen (*Spiritual Seed*, 162). Jacqueline A. Williams understands the passage as asserting an even closer association between Father and Son than is presented in Heb 1:5. She allows for the possibility that *Gos. Truth* builds directly upon Heb 1:5, but prefers the explanation that it represents a similar but independent exegesis of Ps 2:7 “You are my son, today I have begotten you” (*Biblical Interpretation in the Gnostic “Gospel of Truth” from Nag Hammadi* [SBLDS 79; Atlanta: Scholars, 1988], 156-57).

²¹ Kendrick Grobel calls the aeons ambiguous, claiming that the word could refer simply to the world or universe rather than the “population of the Pleroma.” In spite of his note of caution, however, he does opt for “Eons” in his own translation (*Gospel of Truth*, 182-83).

²² Thomassen’s translation (*Spiritual Seed*, 163). Thomassen’s “a proper name” represents his reconstruction of an original κῶπτον ὄνομα. Attridge and MacRae translate the same passage to say that the Name “should be over their head as lord.” Their translation assumes that the passage indicates that the hypostatized name rules over the aeons. Thomassen takes the preposition to be “on” rather than “over” meaning it refers to the aeons bearing the name (*Spiritual Seed*, 162). It is tempting to read the expression as a possible reference to the Divine Name, and Story gives an extended grammatical argument for construing it in this way—especially where it reappears in *Gos. Truth* 40.7-9 (*Nature of Truth*, 36-37). Story’s argument relies entirely upon Coptic grammar, and is weakened if *Gos. Truth* is translated from Greek. Most scholars reject “Lord” in ch. 40,

Verses 7-10 say that he was given a Name and begotten as a son. Verse 34 then says he was begotten as a Name. It appears, then, that neither sonship nor the identity as the Name is conceived of as a later addition to the first emanation.²³ The single being is both Name and son; both are original to his generation. He exists to be Son and Name of the Father. Thomassen argues that in this passage the idea of generation (the Father giving birth to a Son) and the idea of naming are merged into a single act.²⁴ The notion and language of giving the Father's Name are similar to John 17 but *Gos. Truth* goes beyond John's statements by attempting to work out the details of the relationship that are suggested by the Son's possession of the Father's Name.²⁵

Two other points are emphasized in the text of col. 38. One is that this Name is in fact the Father's Name. The entire "Name" passage follows upon and flows from the statement in 38:5-6 that the series of emanations existed for "the glory and the joy of his Name," *his* Name being there the Name of the Father. The lines that follow those cited above give more conclusive proof that the Father is intended. *Gospel of Truth* 38.11-12

reading it instead as "proper name" (Attridge & MacRae, *Notes*, 127). Thomassen's more limited rendering is preferable at 38.38 as well. For a different view, see Mortley, who believes that the proper name in 40.7-9 is "Christ" (*Word to Silence*, 1.90).

²³ Arai interprets these lines, along with col. 39, as indicating that the Son gains existence by virtue of his possession of the name, and does so before any of the other aeons have existence (*Christologie*, 66).

²⁴ Thomassen, "Gnostic Semiotics," 146. Possession of a name is also associated with generation in *Gos. Truth* 27.16-18 where it is suggested that name and form are given to the aeons concurrently. Williams assumes an association between generation ("begetting") and naming to bolster the case for a comparison between this line and Phil 2:9 (*Biblical Interpretation*, 159-60).

²⁵ Williams, *Biblical Interpretation*, 159. *Gos. Truth* 38.7-10 could also be construed as reminiscent of *I En.* 48:2-5, where the Son of Man is given the Divine Name, but *I En.* does not understand the Son of Man to have been begotten *as* a name.

says of the Father that “He gave him his Name, which belonged to him.” According to 38:22-24, “The Father’s Name is not spoken, but it is apparent through a Son.”

That the Name becomes apparent in the Son raises the second point of emphasis about the Name: why is the Son described as the Name? The Son, who is the first emanation, is given the Father’s Name so that he can reveal and manifest it. This point is made repeatedly in col. 38. It is implied early on, in 38.15-17, and then made clear in vv. 21-23.

His is the Name; his is the Son. It is possible for him (i.e. the Son) to be seen. The Name, however, is invisible because it alone is the mystery of the invisible which comes to ears that are completely filled with it by him. For indeed, the Father’s Name is not spoken, but it is apparent through a Son.

Finally, 38.35, which was quoted earlier, goes a step further. Not only does the son reveal the Name that he is, he was in fact generated as a name “in order that” the Name could be revealed to the subsequently generated aeons and given to them as well. These emanations could not perceive the Father directly and perfectly, but they were able to receive the Name through the mediation of the Son, who exists as the Name.

The revelation and granting the Name to the aeons in this way is absolutely essential to the soteriological system in the *Gospel of Truth*, as Thomassen’s work has made clear. The Name is central to Valentinian soteriology because the Name is precisely what is lost in the Valentinian version of a “fall.” It must therefore be restored to the aeons. Thomassen describes Valentinian soteriology as a move between soteriology and

protology that merges the two,²⁶ and on this point, the original loss of the Name sets up the need for its salvific recovery.

Before the aeons were even fully created, while they existed only within the Father, the aeons fell into fear and error.²⁷ They fell because of their ignorance of their origin in the Father. This error eventually led to their creation of the material cosmos as an attempted substitution for the truth. Their salvation from the material world would require them to overcome ignorance of the Father and of their true identities. The Father provides knowledge of himself as a means of restoring the aeons:

He reveals what is hidden of him—what is hidden of him is his Son—so that through the mercies of the Father the aeons may know him and cease laboring in search of the Father, resting there in him, knowing that this is the (final) rest... Since the deficiency came into being because the Father was not known, therefore, when the Father is known, from that moment on, the deficiency will no longer exist.²⁸

The Father's chief characteristic is that he is "incomprehensible and inconceivable."²⁹

The Savior's mission is to reveal the Father to the aeons since it is impossible for the aeons to perceive the Father directly. The Name is introduced into the scheme in order to resolve this problem. Only the Son, as the Name of the Father (according to 38:6), is capable of knowing the Father. Because the Son has made the Father's Name a personal being, the aeons are able to perceive the Father through him. Even so, the Name cannot

²⁶ Thomassen, *Spiritual Seed*, 156. Elsewhere, Thomassen categorizes use of the name in Valentinianism into four categories: protology, soteriology, epistemology, and aeonology. He then describes how the last two are effectively collapsed into the first two, making all Valentinian Name Theology protological, soteriological or both ("Gnostic Semiotics.")

²⁷ *Gos. Truth* 17.5-13.

²⁸ *Gos. Truth* 24.12-20, 28-32.

²⁹ Attridge and MacRae, "Introduction," 72. Cf. *Gos. Truth* 17.8-9; 19.32; 30.24.

be spoken, and so the Son cannot simply reveal it to the aeons in the way that Jesus reveals the Name to the disciples in the Gospel of John. According to *Gos. Truth* 38:22-24, “the Father’s Name is not spoken, but, it is apparent through a Son.” The Name exists as the person of the Son, allowing those who know the Son to also know the Name.³⁰ *Gospel of Truth* 27.16-18 describes the aeons, prior to salvation, as having “not yet received form nor yet received a name.” That lack is addressed in col. 38.37-38 when they receive the Father’s Name upon their heads. Thomassen connects these two Names, so that the aeons achieve unity with the Father through the mediation of the Son-Name.³¹

II. Cosmology and Sacrament

Two features of the Name’s role in *Gospel of Truth* are important to its soteriology. The first is that this Name is active in salvation through a creative power. *Gospel of Truth* displays less cosmological interest than is typical of Valentinian texts. Fossum says that the Son is not even credited with any cosmogonic role,³² but there is still evidence that the Name has a certain place within *Gos. Truth*’s cosmology. I have already described how the relationship between the Name and creation begins with the Son, whose naming and generation are merged in 38.35 where he is generated as a Name.

The creative function of the Name is also important for the aeons. Their fall into material existence comes before they have true existence at all. The *Gospel of Truth* opens with an account of this fall in 16.31-17.20. At that time, they existed only within

³⁰ *Gos. Truth* 38.22-24. Williams describes this as an advance upon the theology of Heb 1:5 (*Biblical Interpretation*, 156-7).

³¹ Thomassen, *Spiritual Seed*, 163.

³² Fossum, *Name of God*, 108.

the Father. By design, the aeons would have gained true existence in and as the Pleroma when the Father gave them form and Name. Instead, they provide their own substitute for the knowledge of the Father that the Name would have supplied. The substitute serves the same creative role, but in a flawed way. It plunges the aeons into a flawed material existence.

When the savior manifests the Name to them, they first discover that their existence is a lie, and that they do not truly exist.

Having filled the deficiency, he abolished the form—the form of it is the world, that in which he served.—for the place where there is envy and strife is deficient, but the place where (there is) unity is perfect. Since the deficiency came into being because the Father was not known, therefore, when the Father is known, from that moment on the deficiency will no longer exist.³³

When I quoted a portion of this passage earlier, my purpose was to show that the manifestation of the Father's Name is central to the aeons' restoration from their fallen state. In addition, their salvation has a cosmological aspect. When their restoration takes place, the previous material existence ceases to be. It is replaced by the existence that was originally intended for them.

Then, when they receive form by his knowledge, though truly within him, they do not know him. But the Father is perfect, knowing every space within him. If he wishes, he manifest whomever he wishes by giving him form and giving him a Name, and he gives a Name to him and brings it about that those come into existence who, before they come into existence, are ignorant of him who fashioned them.³⁴

Thomassen stresses the paradox of this situation. "The act of revelation presupposes what it purports to eliminate; it presupposes the empirical existence of the receivers of the

³³ *Gos. Truth* 24.20-32

³⁴ *Gos. Truth* 27.20-33.

revelation, while at the same time proposing to disclose this existence as unreal.”³⁵ The way the Name saves is by radically redefining what it means to exist. Cullen Story points out that *Gos. Truth* 39.11-14 takes up the same point in its observation that a-gnostic lacks a name “because he has no being.”³⁶

The second feature of *Gospel of Truth*’s soteriology that requires attention is the means by which the Name operates in the world. The primary language is of hearing and knowing, but in *Gos. Truth* 22.38-23.18 Jesus reveals the aeons’ true names in a book which is hung upon a cross. The book contains letters which are called “his letters.”

This is the knowledge of the living book which he revealed to the aeons, at the end, as [his letters], revealing how they are not vowels nor are they consonants, so that one might read them and think of something foolish, but they are letters of the truth which they alone speak who know them. Each letter is a complete <thought> like a complete book, since they are letters written by the Unity, the Father having written them for the aeons in order that by means of his letters they should know the Father.

When 23:18 says that they know the Father by means of “his letters,” it should be read in light of *Gos. Truth*’s consistent claim that neither the aeons nor the Valentinian believers are able to know the Father without mediation.³⁷ In the passages considered in the previous section the aeons come to know the Father through the mediation of the Son, the manifestation of the Name.³⁸ Col. 22:38-39 begins a paragraph with the statement that the Father revealed knowledge in order to save the aeons. The next paragraph begins at 23:19

³⁵ Thomassen, *Spiritual Seed*, 153.

³⁶ Story, *Nature of Truth*, 35.

³⁷ Fossum finds the unpronounced name to be significant in its connection to the revelatory role of the Son (*Name of God*, 107).

³⁸ Thomassen emphasizes the point that the book is a manifestation of the Valentinian church as well as of Jesus’ physical body. He relates this to *Exc. Theod.* 26.1 (“Gnostic Semiotics,” 152-53).

with another reference to the Father's revelation: "While his wisdom contemplates the Word, and his teaching utters it, his knowledge has revealed it." The opening of the next paragraph discloses what that revelation is: "what is hidden of him is his Son." Since 38.37-38 explains that "the Name of the father should be upon their heads" the mysterious Names in col. 23, composed of unpronounceable letters and able to grant saving knowledge, are the Father's Name.³⁹

It is possible that the "Name upon their heads" refers to a ritual anointing that reflected in the believers' historical context what true in the aeons' protological context. Based on numerous references to ointment and anointing in the passage from 36.13-34, as well as the probable reference to scented oil in 33.39-34.34,⁴⁰ Thomassen demonstrates the importance of the anointing ritual for the soteriology of *Gos. Truth*.⁴¹ Near the end of this selection, the redeemed are described as jars that are sealed with the ointment.⁴² From the rest of the text, however, it is clear that the reception of the Name is a central fact of *Gos. Truth*'s soteriology, and so Thomassen concludes "the ritual alluded

³⁹ Wolfson, "Inscribed," 271.

⁴⁰ Williams believes that the passage probably uses 2 Cor 2:14 and that the "scent" is the knowledge of God rather than scented oil (*Biblical Interpretation*, 138-39).

⁴¹ The ointment is the mercy of the Father (*Gos. Truth* 36.18), which is given to those who return to him (*Gos. Truth* 36.16), and who become perfect (*Gos. Truth* 36.20). Williams, however, says that the ointment is limited to a spiritual reference to the Father's mercy, and claims that there is not a good reason to see evidence here of the sacramental chrism that is documented in later Gnostic practice (*Biblical Interpretation*, 151). Her reasoning is not sufficient to ignore the material and ritual implications, and to spiritualize the text.

⁴² *Gos. Truth* 36.30-31 "But from him who has no deficiency, no seal is removed."

to in *Gos. Truth* must have featured the reception of the Name. The most likely location for this event is the anointing.⁴³

Indeed, in col. 38 the believer's possession of the Name is described in terms that fit with Thomassen's suggestion that it was placed upon them as part of the anointing ritual. At 38:25-30 the Name is described as resting in the redeemed:

Who, therefore, will be able to utter a Name for him, the 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?

The mention a few lines later that the Name was brought forth "in order that the Name of the Father should be on their heads as a proper Name"⁴⁴ clarifies that the Name rests in them because it is put on them.⁴⁵ The sacramental act of anointing is one of the means by which the Name acts upon Valentinian believers, sealing them for salvation. It is possible that this anointing occurred in the context of a baptismal ritual like the Name giving in *Exc. Theod.*, but this is by no means certain. The text simply indicates anointing.⁴⁶

⁴³ Thomassen, (*Spiritual Seed*, 385).

⁴⁴ Thomassen, *Spiritual Seed*, 385. (For his translation, *Spiritual Seed*, 164).

⁴⁵ Story appears to assume that the Valentinian's reception of the name is not ritual because there is no reference to baptism in the *Gospel*. He interprets it to mean that "the nature of Christ is given to believers" (*Nature of Truth*, 35). He may be correct that *Gos. Truth* does not envision a baptismal ritual; however, the evidence for an anointing in which the name is given is convincing.

⁴⁶ The *Gospel of Philip*, also from Nag Hammadi, contains extensive discussion of baptism, which has been the subject of much of the scholarship on *Gos. Phil*. It is not included in this study because it is generally dated to the third century. Nonetheless, *Gos. Phil*. provides evidence of a perspective that devalued baptism in favor of anointing in the third century, as does Irenaeus for the late second (*AH* 1.21.3-4). *Gos. Truth* appears to have a concern with anointing and a lack of interest in baptism, in contrast with the explicit devaluation of baptism of the other two texts. Thomassen says that *Gos. Truth* makes no explicit mention of baptism, but allows for the possibility that Jesus' baptism is intended in the statement that he that "having stripped himself of perishable rags he put on imperishability" in 20.30-32 (Thomassen, *Spiritual Seed*, 163). Attridge and MacRae

As a brief summary before moving on to the *Excerpta ex Theodoto*, in *Gos. Truth*, the Name is treated as a hypostatic entity that is identical with the Son of God. It is soteriologically active in that separation from the Father and ignorance of one's identity as his emanation is the problem that results in the material existence of the cosmos. Reunion with that Name is necessary to address that issue and enter the pleroma, both for the Valentinian believer, and for Sophia. It is important to note that Valentinian believers encounter and receive this Name within the cosmos by means that are explicitly material and sacramental.

Part Two – Excerpta ex Theodoto

Clement of Alexandria's *Excerpta ex Theodoto*⁴⁷ appears to be largely a compilation from Valentinian source material that Clement produced around the turn of the third century. Clement's own theology is contained in numerous paragraphs that are

point out that while this language is common in a baptismal context it is not limited to one, and so they are less sure that baptism should be inferred (Attridge and MacRae, *Notes*, 60). This passage is within the discussion of those whose names appear in the book of the living, and who are saved by the knowledge of the letters of the name, and so an association between the name and baptism would be possible if baptism were intended at 20.30-32. It seems most likely that the verse is not about Jesus' baptism but about his death, in which he put off the material body.

⁴⁷ My primary text for *Exc. Theod.* will be that of *Clemens Alexandrinus 3: Stromata VII–VIII, Excerpta ex Theodoto, Eclogae prophetae, Quis dives salvetur, Fragmenta* (ed. O. Stahl, L. Fruchtel, and U. Treu; GCS 17, 2nd ed; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1970). Other editions of the *Excerpta* include: Robert Pierce Casey, *The Excerpta ex Theodoto of Clement of Alexandria* (London: Christophers, 1934); François Sagnard, *Clément d'Alexandrie: Extraits de Théodote*, SC 23 (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1948). Unless otherwise noted, quotations from *Exc. Theod.* are my revisions of Casey's English translation.

phrased as responses.⁴⁸ According to the title, it preserves information about Eastern Valentinianism, especially as represented by one of its teachers, Theodotus.⁴⁹ Analysis of the theological perspectives represented in the document is complicated by the fact that Clement uses more than one source in compiling his account of Valentinian theology. The sources do not always agree; Clement is not always clear about the sources of his quotations; and scholars have differed greatly over the question of how to assign the various blocks of text.⁵⁰

I. Soteriology

Excerpta ex Theodoto preserves a Name Theology that is similar in several ways to that in the *Gospel of Truth*. In spite of the difficulty in identifying sources, it is clear that in the Valentinian sources Clement read the Name has a significant soteriological role, just as it does in *Gosp. Truth*. The *Excerpta* also contain a statement about the Name

⁴⁸ These responses have typically been dismissed as of little value. Recently Bogdan Bucur has argued that they, along with the more substantial content of *Eclogae Propheticae* and *Adumbrationes*, actually represent the *Hypotyposeis* which Clement conceived of as the highest level of his teaching ("The Place of the *Hypotyposeis* in the Clementine Corpus: An Apology for 'The Other Clement of Alexandria'," *JECS* 17 [2009] 313-335).

⁴⁹ A detailed explanation of the distinguishing features of "Eastern" and "Western" Valentinianism is among Einar Thomassen's major tasks in Part I of *The Spiritual Seed* (9-129). Joel Kalvesmaki has attempted to undermine the division between eastern and western Valentinians, arguing that the contemporary writings that mention such a distinction are sufficiently inconsistent that the geographical distinction should not be utilized at all ("Italian versus Eastern Valentinianism?" *VC* 62 [2008], 79-89).

⁵⁰ Casey assigns as much of the Valentinian text to Theodotus as possible, understanding φησί, to refer to Theodotus as a default (*Excerpta*, 5). On the other hand, Thomassen is only willing to attribute the five texts that explicitly name Theodotus (22.7; 26.1; 30.1; 32.2; 35.1) plus a single φησί passage, the rest he assumes to be from another Valentinian source, even if that source might agree with Theodotus (*Spiritual Seed*, 29).

that is similar to *Gosp. Truth's* "The Name of the Father is the Son." That section, *Exc. Theod.* 26, is a convenient place to begin consideration of the onomanalogy in *Excerpta ex Theodoto*.

The visible part of Jesus was *Sophia* and the Church of the superior seed which he put on through the flesh, as Theodotus says; but the invisible part was the Name—the very thing that is the only-begotten Son. Thus when he says "I am the door," he means that you, who are of the superior seed, shall come up to the boundary where I am. And when he enters in, the seed also enters with him into the Pleroma, brought together and brought in through the door.⁵¹

I will return to the cosmological framework in which this soteriology is placed, but at this time I want to point out that the end of the passage describes salvation as entry into the Pleroma. That entry cannot be accomplished by the Spiritual Seed alone,⁵² but is dependent upon the relationship between the visible, incarnate Jesus and the invisible Son, who is also the Name.

Several lines earlier in *Exc.* 22.4, Clement recorded another Valentinian understanding of salvation that is also dependent upon the Name.⁵³ "So that we also, having the Name, may not be held back and prevented from entering the Pleroma by the Limit and the Cross."⁵⁴ The Valentinian believer (who is indicated by "we" in *Exc.* 22)

⁵¹ My modification of Casey's translation.

⁵² The "spiritual seed" is the term many Valentinian groups take for themselves. They are distributed (secretly) among the souls of people within the cosmos. These people constitute the church of the spiritual (or occasionally "superior" as in *Exc. Theod.* 26.1) seed.

⁵³ Casey attributes the entire section to Theodotus based on the reference to him at its end (*Excerpta*, 5). Thomassen, as usual, is more reticent about that attribution. He is only willing to attribute the last line of ch. 22 to Theodotus as an explanatory reference clarifying the more generally Valentinian doctrine described in its first 6 verses, and so he attributes this passage to other Valentinians with whom Theodotus differed (*Spiritual Seed*, 32).

⁵⁴ My translation.

benefits from possession of the Name. It serves as a token of sorts that allows them to pass through the boundaries that would otherwise limit them, and gain salvation.

These comments serve only to indicate that the Name is given a soteriological function in *Exc. Theod.* Even in the two references above, it is clear that the Name's soteriological role is described in a context of Valentinian cosmology. Unlike *Gos. Truth* which does not clarify its cosmology, Clement stressed cosmology in his excerpts. To understand the Name's soteriological role I must now outline the cosmological system within which it functions. There is necessarily some repetition from the system found in *Gospel of Truth*, but the differences are best presented in the context of the whole system.

II. Cosmology

Unlike many Valentinian systems, including *Gospel of Truth*, the *Excerpta* do not contain an account of the emanations from the Father which make up the pleroma. Nonetheless, something like this must have been in the Valentinian sources Clement uses because he refers to a "twelfth Aeon" at 31.2.⁵⁵ Continuing in vv 2-4, Clement makes clear that he understands Theodotus to mean Sophia as this twelfth aeon.⁵⁶

Moreover, through the passion of the twelfth aeon the whole was instructed, as they say, and shared in his passion. For then they knew that what they are, they are by the grace of the Father: unnameable Name, form and knowledge. However, the aeon that wished to grasp what is beyond knowledge ended up in ignorance

⁵⁵ Casey considers *Exc.* 31 to be from Theodotus, and so would include this description of Sophia in his reconstruction of Theodotus' theology (*Excerpta*, 16). Thomassen does not include it with the Theodotian evidence, but does use it as part of a more generally consistent theology covering *Exc.* 1-43 (*Spiritual Seed*, 35-36).

⁵⁶ I take Clement's use of Theodotus to continue the cosmological account as evidence that he at least considered Theodotus to teach the same doctrine as that contained in 31, even if 31 is not in fact taken directly from Theodotus.

and lack of form. For that reason it produced a void of knowledge that is a shadow of the Name, that which is the Son, the form of the aeons. Thus the Name of the aeons distributed part by part is a loss of the Name.⁵⁷

The Aeons originally occupy and constitute the pleroma. They individually, and by extension the Pleroma collectively, exist as “unnameable Name, form, and knowledge.”⁵⁸ As Casey says, “The Name was not only a possession of the Aeons, it supplied the very structure of their existence.”⁵⁹ The aeons do not know this originally, however; they come to know it only through the suffering of the twelfth aeon. On this point, the *Excerpta* present a similar situation to that in *Gosp. Truth*, where the aeons require the mediation of the Son for the revelation of the Name.

As is typical in Valentinian schemes, Sophia is the source of the trouble in the Pleroma to which Valentinian soteriology sought a solution. Sophia attempts to expand her knowledge and communion with the Father beyond her original limit. In so doing, instead of gaining greater connection to the Father she loses even the limited communion with him that she had enjoyed in her original state. She falls from knowledge into ignorance, from form to formlessness, and by attempting to grasp the Name, she loses possession of the “Nameless Name.” As a result, she falls outside the Pleroma into unformed error.

At this point, with Sophia fallen into error outside the Pleroma, the initial problem is clear. Sophia herself is separated from the Pleroma. She then compounds the problem, however, by attempting to replace the object of her desire, the Father. Her offspring,

⁵⁷ *Exc. Theod.* 31.2-4. My modification of Thomassen’s translation (*Spiritual Seed*, 471).

⁵⁸ *Exc.* 31.3

⁵⁹ Casey, *Excerpta*, 19.

modeled upon him, is the Christ. It is here that scholars divide on the scheme presented in the *Excerpta*. Casey and Sagnard assume that Theodotus conforms to the typical Valentinian myth in which Sophia divides into two, the second of which is called Achamoth in Irenaeus, but can be more generally labeled a “second Sophia.”⁶⁰ The original Sophia repents and is accepted back into the Pleroma (although this point was not explicit in the extracts), whereas the derived Sophia (the parallel to Achamoth) remains outside the Pleroma in error. They believe this because of certain coincidences between the trajectory of Sophia in *Excerpta* and Achamoth in Irenaeus’ account. Achamoth is never mentioned, however, as Casey acknowledges. His distinction between the Sophia of 31.2-3 and 67.4, where her fall is described, and the “banished and dissociated” Sophia in the rest of the text is forced and not necessary. Thomassen argues that in *Exc. Theod.* 1-43 there is no second Sophia, but that the myth differs here from what is familiar from other sources.⁶¹ In fact, the Christ who is Sophia’s son takes the place played by the rehabilitated Sophia in other accounts. He leaves behind his mother and enters the Pleroma, being apparently the residue of the “Nameless Name, form, and knowledge” from his mother. There he is accepted by the Aeons and is adopted “as a Son.”

Having lost her son, the Christ, Sophia attempts to create an image of him. This replacement becomes the demiurge, who functions within the realm of Sophia’s error in the way that the Name functions in the Pleroma, giving the error (1) material form as a false substitute for form, (2) ignorance as a false knowledge, and (3) a shadow in place of

⁶⁰ Casey, *Excerpta*, 16. Sagnard, *La Gnose Valentinienne* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1947), 538-540.

⁶¹ Thomassen, *Spiritual Seed*, 35-37.

the Name.⁶² In the course of the demiurge's creation of human beings, the Logos secretly distributes the "spiritual seed" among some of those human souls. These become the elect of the Valentinian church.⁶³

This account of Sophia's fall and the creation of matter and humanity gives rise to two problems that Valentinian soteriology attempts to address. The seed implanted in Valentinian believers by the Logos needs to be redeemed and restored to its source in the Pleroma. More significant for the Aeons is the fate of Sophia herself. As I pointed out above, Sophia's absence from the Pleroma leaves that "fullness" incomplete. Contrary to Casey's and Sagnard's reconstruction, Sophia does not return to the Pleroma prior to the creation of matter. In spite of the Christ's admission at that time, the Pleroma remains incomplete as long as Sophia remains outside.⁶⁴ According to *Exc.* 31.4 it is not only that the Pleroma is incomplete without Sophia:

Thus the Name of the aeons distributed part by part is a loss of the Name.⁶⁵

Because her fall distributed the Name part by part (κατὰ μέρος), the Name lost unity and is no longer able to provide the proper structure for the Pleroma and the Aeons

⁶² Sagnard provides a brief chart summarizing the inversion described in *Exc.* 31.3-4. He includes the opposition between the void [*vide*, κένωμα], and the Pleroma (*Extraits*, 128). I have left out this pair because the Pleroma is not mentioned in the text. Thomassen describes the cosmology of *Exc. Theod.* as assuming that everything that comes into being is an image, but they are different kinds of images. Only the spirituals are true images ("Gnostic Semiotics," 151).

⁶³ *Exc. Theod.* 1.3-2.2

⁶⁴ Thomassen offers this as one of the two possibilities of what the text might mean—the other being that the fractured name becomes the shadow that is the material world. Ultimately he opts for a combination of the two ideas that affirms each possibility (*Spiritual Seed*, 471-72). Both interpretations are supported in the text, and probably intended by the ambiguous phrasing.

⁶⁵ Οὕτως τὸ κατὰ μέρος ὄνομα τῶν Αἰώνων ἀπώλεια ἐστὶ τοῦ Ὄνόματος. My translation.

themselves. The Aeons are not seen to fall into the material existence brought about by the Name's "shadow" counterpart, but their state of existence is affected. Thus, in order to restore proper form as well as unity to the Pleroma, the Aeons take pity on Sophia and arrange for her rescue. They produce Jesus as an image of the Christ.⁶⁶ Jesus is sent from the Pleroma into the material world, where he takes on a material body.

This rescue of Sophia is the organizing point of Valentinian soteriology. Clement records two references to Sophia's re-entry into the Pleroma, at *Exc. Theod.* 34-35 and at col. 64. From these two excerpts it appears that Sophia enters the pleroma at the same time as the reunited "spiritual seed," going in with and by the agency of the Son. Sophia is referred to as the Mother in these excerpts.

So after the entry of the Mother with the Son and the seeds into the Pleroma, then Space will receive the power of the Mother and the position that the Mother now has.⁶⁷

For, they [*the angels*] nearly need us in order to enter, for without us they are not permitted—for this reason, they say, not even the Mother has entered with them without us—naturally they will be bound for us.⁶⁸

Once in the Pleroma, Sophia is able to join the "spiritual elements" in a vision of the Father (col. 64). This last idea, that Sophia attains to a vision of the Father, comes from Valentinian sources other than Theodotus, but it is very much like what is found in

⁶⁶ Jesus and Christ must be strictly distinguished in the *Exc. Theod.* This is different from *Gosp. Truth*, which equates them. In *Exc. Theod.*, as Casey phrases it, "Christ emanated from Sophia outside the Pleroma, but was adopted into it. Jesus originated in the Pleroma, but departed from it" (*Excerpta*, 17).

⁶⁷ *Exc.* 34.2

⁶⁸ *Exc.* 35.4. My translation.

the Theodotian material at col. 34-35.⁶⁹ In both places, Sophia's readmission is bound up with the readmission of the spiritual element of the Valentinian believers and it is framed as an eschatological event rather than as having come long before the salvation of the Valentinians themselves. In this way, it stands in contrast to the redemption of the first Sophia in the heresiological accounts.⁷⁰

The second line of Valentinian soteriology is the salvation of the Valentinian believers themselves. They are those people among whom the spiritual seed has been spread, and it is important to restore that seed to the Pleroma. The origin and restoration of the seed are described in *Exc. Theod.* 21:

The Valentinians say that the finest emanation of Sophia is spoken of in "He created them in the image of God, male and female created he them." Now the males from this emanation are the "election," but the females are the "calling" and they call the male beings angelic, and the females themselves, the superior seed. So also, in the case of Adam, the male remained in him but all the female seed was taken from him and became Eve, from whom the females are derived, as the males are from him. Therefore the males are drawn together with the Logos, but the females, becoming men, are united to the angels and pass into the Pleroma.

⁶⁹ *Exc.* 35 is explicitly Theodotian. Casey attributes both 34 and 35 to Theodotus, picking up from the reference in 30, and saying "the same discussion is continued with no indication of a change of source through *Exc.* 34" (*Excerpta*, 5-6). Thomassen is more skeptical about assigning excerpts to Theodotus (*Spiritual Seed*, 29). He makes no direct reference to *Exc.* 34, but his general rule is to exclude the φησί-passages, and he does not use 34 in describing Theodotus' doctrine. He limits the Theodotian quotation to the suggestion that κενόω in Phil. 2:7 means that Jesus left the Pleroma (*Spiritual Seed*, 33). In my opinion, there is no compelling reason to excise 34 from the context. Theodotus is mentioned by name in 30.1 and 32.2, and again in 35.1, all in a continuous description of the myth. The material in 34 forms an integral part of the narrative, and can be assumed to come from the same Theodotianic stream of Valentinianism.

⁷⁰ Irenaeus *A.H.* I.ii.5; Hippolytus *A.H.* VI.31. Irenaeus and Hippolytus both refer to Sophia's restoration, or the correction of her absence, as preceding the remaining soteriological activity directed at the Valentinians.

Therefore the woman is said to be changed into a man, and the church here on earth into angels.⁷¹

With regard to these female seeds, Jesus' mission is to restore them to unity with their male counterparts who are the angels. The following section contains the quotation mentioned above in which the Valentinian believers are not "held back and prevented from entering the Pleroma by the Limit and the Cross" once they too possess the Name.⁷² This is why the Name must be given to Jesus, to initiate the process of reintegration that would allow him to rescue both Sophia and the Valentinian church from the material world.

III. Action with the Cosmos

I have shown that much of the Name's soteriological role is related to its place in the cosmology of the *Excerpta*. Before addressing the question of how that Name comes to act upon the Spiritual Seed, it will be useful to consider a few other aspects of how the Name is conceived of by Theodotus and the other Valentinians represented therein. To do so, I will return to the long quotation from *Exc.* 26, especially the first line:

The visible part of Jesus was *Sophia* and the Church of the superior seed which he put on through the flesh, as Theodotus says; but the invisible part was the Name—the very thing that is the only-begotten Son.

First, Jesus is associated with the Name. That Name is the invisible part, as distinct from the visible, material body that he took on from Sophia prior to entering the cosmos. This Name is identified with the only-begotten Son (ὁ Υἱὸς ὁ Μονογενής). In

⁷¹ *Exc. Theod.* 21.

⁷² *Exc. Theod.* 22.4.

spite of this association, it is important not to equate the Name, the Son, and the only-begotten with Jesus directly, or with Christ for that matter. As Casey points out, this *μονογενής* cannot be Jesus.⁷³ The Thedotian Jesus is hardly an only-begotten son, being instead the production of the Aeons. Further, Jesus receives the Name at his baptism, and it seems unlikely that Theodotus would have conceived of the same being in both roles

Both the terms used of the Name in this passage, *υἱός* and *μονογενής* need to be distinguished from two similar terms that are applied to the Christ. Upon his entry into the Pleroma, the Christ is accepted as an adopted son (*υἱόθετος*), and as the first-born (*πρωτότοκος*). The sonship that Christ is awarded and his status as firstborn are different from those of the Name. The Name is the only begotten of the Father, whereas the Christ is in fact not begotten by the Father at all, being instead the independent generation of Sophia. The Name is begotten as a Son; the Christ is adopted. Conflating Christ and Name can lead the reader to assume that Jesus and Christ function together in these texts in the way that they do in Irenaeus' account of Cerinthus.⁷⁴ The Name is not identical with either of them, but is active in the work of each. This united activity explains why the Name occasionally overlaps with Jesus or the Christ.

Instead, the Name is the divine substance that enables the Son to be the manifestation of the Father. Müller had suggested that the Name was the Pleroma itself, but Casey argued against that interpretation, and subsequent scholars have agreed with

⁷³ Casey, *Excerpta*, 121.

⁷⁴ Irenaeus, *AH* 1.26.1 (ANF): "Moreover, after his baptism, Christ descended upon him in the form of a dove from the Supreme Ruler, and that then he proclaimed the unknown Father, and performed miracles. But at last Christ departed from Jesus, and that then Jesus suffered and rose again, while Christ remained impassible, inasmuch as he was a spiritual being."

Casey on this point.⁷⁵ Sagnard calls it the “expression of the Father,” and it seems more accurate to follow Sagnard’s analysis that the Name gives shape and structure to the Pleroma by expressing the otherwise inexpressible Father.⁷⁶

Excerpta ex Theodotus 26.1 also stresses the distinction between the visible body of Jesus and the invisible Name. The need to distinguish “the invisible part” stems from the dualism of Valentinian salvation. Sophia and the Spirituals were lost in the material existence of space and so could only come to knowledge through the senses. Their salvation, however, had to come through immaterial means. In the *Excerpta*, this was achieved by the production of Jesus to enter space and take on physicality so that he could engage with the spiritual seed. This entry into space in fact has a defiling effect on Jesus himself, leaving him also in need of redemption. He is then endowed with the Name, which remained immaterial and insensible. As Thomassen says, the Name enters just enough to awaken the seed, but without actually taking on matter itself, lest it be defiled.

IV. Sacrament

Sophia’s salvation is arranged for in her encounter with the Savior. She must, however, wait for the redemption of the Spiritual Seed before her entry into the Pleroma can be realized. For the Name to affect the believers who bear that seed, the cosmological soteriology of the *Excerpta* requires that the Name enter the world so that it can (1) be

⁷⁵ Casey, *Excerpta*, 117; Citing K. Müller, “Beiträge zum Verständnis der valentinischen Gnosis,” *Göttingische gelehrte Nachrichten* (1920), 180-81.

⁷⁶ Sagnard, *Extraits*, 100.

encountered by the spiritual seed, and (2) rejoin them with their angelic-male counterparts. According to the material Clement preserves, this is accomplished through the sacramental activity of the Name. Baptism is the most important element of this sacramental view, but both eucharist and anointing are integrated into it as well.

At Jesus' baptism he receives and is reunited with the Name, which descends on him as a dove. In an interpretation of 1 Cor 15:29, *Exc. Theod.* 22 explains not only Jesus' own baptism, but its farther reaching effects as well.

And when the Apostle said, "Else what shall they do who are baptised for the dead?" . . . For, he says, the angels of whom we are portions were baptised for us. But we are dead, who are deadened by this existence, but the males are alive who did not participate in this existence.

"If the dead rise not why, then, are we baptised?" Therefore we are raised up "equal to angels," and restored to unity with the males, member for member. Now they say "those who are baptised for us, the dead," are the angels who are baptised for us, so that we also, having the Name, may not be held back and prevented from entering the Pleroma by the Limit and the Cross. Wherefore, at the laying on of hands they say at the end, "for the angelic redemption" that is, for the one which the angels also have, in order that the person who has received the redemption may, be baptized in the same Name in which his angel had been baptized before him. Now the angels were baptized in the beginning, in the redemption of the Name which descended upon Jesus in the dove and redeemed him. And redemption was necessary even for Jesus, in order that, approaching through Wisdom, he might not be detained by the Notion of the Deficiency in which he was inserted, as Theodotus says.⁷⁷

Although Jesus' mission was to redeem, his entry into material meant that he himself was "inserted into deficiency" and stood in need of redemption. Receiving the Name at his baptism accomplishes that redemption, and Theodotus describes this event as Jesus becoming the first to experience redemption and paving the way for the others to follow. Others are able to follow because Jesus is not alone in baptism, at least not alone in the

⁷⁷ My modification of Casey's translation.

redemptive benefits baptism imparts. The angels (i.e. the male seed) are joined with Jesus in baptism. Because they participate in his baptism, they also participate in receiving the Name. When Valentinian believers are later united with their respective angels, they are said to be baptized in the same Name as the angels.

The closing chapters of *Exc. Theod.* return to the subject of baptism and its redemptive character.⁷⁸ As in ch. 21, the transformation that takes place in baptism is related to the Name. The formula from Matthew 28:19 is found in ch. 76, as the Savior commands his disciples to “baptise in the Name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.”⁷⁹ The triple formula is mentioned again in ch. 80: “For he who has been sealed by Father, Son and Holy Spirit is beyond the threats of every other power and by the three Names has been released from the whole triad of corruption.” Thomassen suggests that the “three Names” that seal the believer here are in fact the one Name of God.⁸⁰ The identity of the three Names with the Name of God is shown by the fact that in *Exc. Theod.* 86.2 the believer is said to have “the Name of God through Christ as a superscription.” This superscription is then called the “seal of truth” that the faithful

⁷⁸ This is part of a long interconnected section that runs from 66-86, sometimes referred to as D in scholarship. Casey concludes that this section is all Theodotian (*Excerpta*, 5, 7). Thomassen says that the attribution to Theodotus is unsure, but that “nothing in the text speaks against such an attribution either” (*Spiritual Seed*, 133-34).

⁷⁹ The verse is not quoted directly, although the baptismal formula itself is quite similar. The *Exc. Theod.* is shorter in that it lacks the articles.

⁸⁰ Thomassen, *Spiritual Seed*, 334. Gieschen believes that Clement’s interaction with Theodotus’ teaching led him to incorporate certain aspects of it into his own understanding of baptism, as evidenced at *Exc. Theod.* 27 and in *Str.* 5.38.6-7 (“Ante-Nicene,” 156).

receives.⁸¹ The believer must receive the Name as the seal while immersed in the water during baptism, because ch. 83 warns that evil spirits cannot later be removed if they also “go down into the water ... and gain the seal.”

The closing chapters of *Exc. Theod.* stress the literal, tangible nature of the baptism they describe. The quotation above from ch. 83 describes entering the water, as well as ascending out of the water. The language of ascending was already present in ch. 77, which makes the distinction between the physical act and the real spiritual effect. “But the power of the transformation of him who is baptised does not concern the body but the soul, for he who ascends is unchanged.” The dual effect of the material water is emphasized in the argument of *Exc. Theod.* 81: “And baptism is also analogously dual, on the one hand sensible through water which extinguishes the sensible fire, on the other hand the spiritually intelligible guards against the intelligible fire.”⁸² From these quotations it is evident that the baptism in which the immaterial Name was active was a material baptism.

In addition to baptism, the Valentinian believers receive the Name through an anointing ceremony that may have accompanied baptism.⁸³ *Excerpta ex Theodoto* 82 mentions both the bread of Eucharist and the anointing oil:

⁸¹ *Exc. Theod.* 86.1-2: In the case of the coin that was brought to him, the Lord did not say whose property it is, but, “whose image and superscription? Caesar’s,” that it might be given to him whose it is. So likewise the faithful; he has the name of God through Christ as a superscription and the Spirit as an image. And dumb animals show by a seal whose property each is, and are claimed from the seal. Thus also the faithful soul receives the seal of truth and bears about the “marks of Christ.”

⁸² My translation.

⁸³ Elizabeth A. Leeper interprets the anointing as an exorcism that was performed prior to baptism (“From Alexandria to Rome: The Valentinian Connection to the Incorporation of

And the bread and the oil are sanctified by the power of the Name, and they are according to appearance just as when they were received, but according to power they are transformed into spiritual power. Thus, the water, also, both in exorcism and baptism, not only keeps off evil, but gives sanctification as well.⁸⁴

The Name plays a purifying role in this ceremony, sanctifying the oil and the bread, but it also gives them spiritual power analogous to the spiritual power of the baptismal water.

The next section indicates that purification is necessary prior to baptism to prevent unclean spirits being baptized along with the believer and becoming permanent by sharing in the seal. Irenaeus describes a similar Valentinian ceremony at *AH* 1.21.3-4:

But there are some of them who assert that it is superfluous to bring persons to the water, but mixing oil and water together, they place this mixture on the heads of those who are to be initiated, with the use of some such expressions as we have already mentioned. And this they maintain to be the redemption. (ANF)

Irenaeus' account gives some confirmation to the interpretation that anointing was a central element of Valentinian initiation. The group he describes, however, seems to have been different in certain respects from those represented by Theodotus. Whereas Theodotus emphasizes a literal water baptism, the Valentinians in Irenaeus apparently deny the need for a separate baptism, combining the water and oil into a single act.

Whether or not the anointing directly accompanied baptism,⁸⁵ the passage clearly

Exorcism as a Prebaptismal Rite," *VC* 44 (1990), 6-24, here 9). Thomassen disagrees with her thesis (*Spiritual Seed*, 338), and while he is right to question whether this refers to a formal exorcism ritual rather than a component of the baptism ritual intended to ward off evil spirits, I believe she is correct to see it as coming prior to baptism rather than afterwards.

⁸⁴ My translation.

⁸⁵ Thomassen suggests that it is a post-baptismal ritual rather than a pre-baptismal exorcism (*Spiritual Seed*, 333-34). Casey understands it as part of a baptismal chrism, comparing it to Clement's own comments at *Paedia* 2.19.4 (*Excerpta*, 159).

communicates that the oil is a material element through which the spiritual power of the Name affects Valentinian believers.

The spiritual activity of the Name being made active through material means can also be seen in the reference to the Eucharistic bread in the same sentence of *Exc. Theod.* 82. This verse is the only reference to the Eucharist in *Exc. Theod.*, however. Thomassen assumes that the lack of reference to wine, when combined with lack of wine in Irenaeus' account at *AH* 1.21 indicates that wine was not used.⁸⁶ Even though the Eucharist and the anointing were less heavily emphasized than baptism in this Valentinian system, all three show that Theodotus and the Valentinians Clement associated with him understood the Name to have an effect on the Valentinian believers through tangible means while itself remaining intangible. This sacramental view of the Name is in agreement with the understanding that the Name was the means by which the Father and the Pleroma could affect the material world, through Jesus, without becoming defiled themselves.

Conclusion

Gospel of Truth and the *Excerpta* present very similar systems with regard to their soteriology and relation of that soteriology to onomanology. Furthermore, both give the Name similar cosmological function as the basis of structure and true existence. This is less apparent in *Gos. Truth*, but what we can see of its cosmology fits well within the scheme found in *Excerpta*. If, as is often argued, *Gos. Truth* is intended for wide consumption, it would explain why esoteric details of cosmology are not made explicit.

⁸⁶ Thomassen, *Spiritual Seed*, 336. Casey points out that the wine was frequently less emphasized (*Excerpta*, 159).

Both *Excerpta ex Theodoto* and *Gospel of Truth* have a soteriology that is closely related to their understanding of the Name's cosmological role. It is the Name that provides structure and true existence for the aeons and the pleroma. The soteriological problem that they face is the loss of possession of the Father's Name. The *Excerpta* are more explicit about how the Name was originally lost by the aeons, but both texts assume that redemption of the aeons and the Valentinian believers depends on the restoration of the Name. Reunion with the Name is the only way that they can have knowledge of the Father, and so the Savior enters the world in order to reveal the Name to them. Entry into material existence defiles the Savior as well, and so the beginning of the redemption is his own reunion with the Name. He is redeemed, and it is by participation in his redemption that all the others are redeemed. They learn the Name and thus being reunited with it they are restored to their true identities and their true existence.

Both texts also place the reception of the Name in a context that could be described as sacramental, in that these physical material rituals have a significance that transcends their physical material limitations. *Gospel of Truth* describes an anointing in which the Name is placed upon the believers, sealing them for salvation. Comparison with other similar systems suggests that this anointing is probably part of a baptismal ritual. The baptismal context is explicit in *Excerpta*. In addition to describing a baptismal ritual in which the believer is sealed for salvation, the *Excerpta* also make clear how the baptismal redemption of the believer is connected to the baptism of the Savior. Jesus received the Father's Name at his baptism, as did the angels who were present with Jesus at his baptism. The baptism of Valentinian believers allows them to be baptized in the same

Name as their corresponding angels, reuniting with them through their joint participation in Jesus' baptism and reception of the Name.

There are several differences between the texts as well. The most obvious difference is that the *Excerpta* have far more cosmological content than does *Gospel of Truth*. The *Gospel* develops the personal nature of the Name more than the *Excerpta*, however. The *Excerpta* do contain the notion of a hypostasized Name, and like *Gos. Truth* they also identify it with the Son in *Exc. Theod.* 26,⁸⁷ but this is not a controlling concept in the rest of the *Excerpta*. The concept is not contradicted, but it is also not repeated or built upon as it is in *Gospel of Truth*. The two texts describe different ritual applications of the Name as well. Neither text is systematic or necessarily comprehensive in describing these rituals, and so the anointing in *Gospel of Truth* is sometimes considered to be a part of the same sort of baptism that is described in the *Excerpta*. This interpretation minimizes the difference between them; however, it still does not answer the question of why the author of *Gospel of Truth* focused on one single part of the baptismal ritual to the exclusion of even mentioning baptism itself. The best explanation is that although there is a formal similarity between the two rituals, the two authors understand effect differently. The *Excerpta* stress participation in the savior's baptism, in which the Savior received the sealing of the Name when it descended upon him. Baptism is merely the context in which anointing takes place in *Gospel of Truth*. Baptism is less important than anointing, because anointing effects the reception of the Name.

⁸⁷ "the invisible part is the name which is the only begotten Son."

Gospel of Truth and *Excerpta ex Theodoto* pick up some of the same themes of Name Theology from earlier Jewish and Christian literature. Possession of the Name is central to their soteriology, and is described as being borne, or put on, by the believer. Knowledge of the Name is an important aspect of how the believer comes to possess the Name in both texts. Finally, both texts connect the creative orientation of the Name's activity to salvation, and do so even more explicitly than the earlier texts from Rome or from Syria. Neither *Gospel of Truth* nor *Excerpta ex Theodoto* use any of these themes in a way that suggests dependence on any particular Jewish source; they take up what one might call "stock themes" from Jewish and Christian theology. There are two points that are distinctive to the way these two texts employ Name Theology. One is that the Name is hypostatically identified with the Son, rather than only being given to the Son, as it is elsewhere in the Christian texts I have considered. The second feature that is distinctive is the way that knowledge of the Name functions in soteriology. "Knowledge" is, of course, expected in texts that are often classified loosely as "Gnostic," but they are not alone in placing importance on knowing the Name. *First Clement*, and *Ascension of Isaiah* make knowledge of the Name central to their understandings of the Name's role in soteriology, as does the Johannine literature of the NT. The knowledge in these texts is different from the knowledge in *Gospel of Truth* and *Excerpta ex Theodoto*, however. In the other texts, the knowledge is knowledge about Christ or about God. In *1 Clement*, where knowledge is most emphasized, proper saving knowledge leads to praise and to obedience. The knowledge is different in the Valentinian texts. There, knowledge is salvific because in addition to being knowledge of God, it is knowledge of one's own true identity. This is most clearly presented in *Gospel of Truth*'s description at 22.38-23.18 of a book

containing the Names of the aeons. Neither of these points comes as a surprise to anyone who is familiar with Valentinian theology, but they serve to illustrate the way that Name Theology could be adapted to function within a Valentinian system.

Conclusions

This study set out to consider the possible backgrounds for second century Christian Name Theology, the distinct regional applications of Name Theology to Christology, and also to compare Rome, Syria, and Alexandria to one another and reveal how that application was different in each of the three regions. All the texts surveyed in this study make use of Jewish ideas about the Name of God or special Names given by God. All of them adapt that theological term to their own immediate concerns.

The most consistent characteristic of how Name Theology is deployed is that it is almost always used in relation to soteriology. The various writers understand that soteriology in terms of the knowledge or possession of the Name, and finally, with regard to the Name's relationship to the cosmos. There are additional elements particular to each region, but these categories dominate, and are present across regional boundaries. They provide a helpful framework for comparison within the regions and from one region to another. In what follows, I will first present how Name Theologies compare within each region. I will then compare the three regions to one another, both in terms of their own theologies and in terms of their various debts to earlier Jewish and Christian theology.

Intra-Regional

In Rome in both Clement's epistle to Corinth and in the *Shepherd of Hermas*, there are very similar theological frameworks around the Name. Both authors expect that believers will come into contact with the Name and come to know it. In order to be salvific, that encounter must lead to obedience in both Roman texts. Clement describes this explicitly as knowledge of the Name and as obedience rendered to the Name. In the

Shepherd, the cognitive component is less emphasized, but it is obvious that those who bear the Name are aware that they do. Some bear the Name with gladness, and for them the Name exercises a saving power. Others bear the Name with shame. While they can still be brought to salvation, further repentance is required before they can benefit from the saving power of the Name.

Both writers also understand the Name of God to provide a supporting foundation that is related to its ability to save. Clement calls the Name the “primal source of all creation” and relates that role in supporting and preserving the world to its role in supporting and preserving the church as a unified body. This motif is even more strongly ecclesiological in the *Shepherd*, where the cosmological imagery of the world as supported on a watery foundation is adapted for the church. By Similitude 9, the church becomes a tower that rests upon the Name, represented as a rock.

The chief difference between the Name Theology expressed by these two Roman writers is on the question of Christology. Clement himself never applies the Name to anyone other than the Father. Several times the one who has the Name is juxtaposed with the Son. The one time Clement quotes a passage that refers to the Son’s Name (also found in Hebrews, whether Clement quotes from there or a shared source), he passes over it without comment in his exposition of the passage. Clement’s deployment could be construed as entirely Jewish, except that he employs it precisely because he finds its creative activity to be directly involved in the preservation of the church. *Shepherd of Hermas* follows the same track as *I Clement* in all the early references to the Name. The author makes a significant change in Sim. 9, however: every reference to the Name in that section describes it as the Name of the Son of God. I believe that this provides

additional evidence that *Shepherd of Hermas* was composed over an extended period of time, and that at least Sim 9-10 are composed later than the earlier material. They are most likely composed by the same author as the earlier material, since the Name is used in the same way throughout. The best explanation for the shift from the Father to the Son in *Sim. 9* is influence from the onomanology of John 17. In between the composition of *Sims. 8* and *9*, the author of *Shepherd* either read for the first time, or first understood the implications of that chapter for his Name Theology.

In Syria, *Ascension of Isaiah* argues against the possibility of knowing the Name. The Name cannot be known on earth, and Isaiah is even told that he cannot learn it yet in heaven because he still has to return to his earthly body. *Ascension of Isaiah* relates knowledge of the Name to salvation by treating the Name as a reward bestowed upon the believer at the time of entry to the seventh heaven. It is a final part of one's salvation, and a token that demonstrates having attained heaven. By contrast, in the *Odes of Solomon* the Name is repeatedly assumed to be a possession of believers while that are still alive on earth. At one point *Ode 8:19* even declares that the Name cannot be taken away from them.

The two texts are also at odds over the exercise of power and authority that is related to the Name. The *Odes* show this onomonological power being used within human history on earth. In salvation it is already given to the believer, and serves as the indicator that one is truly saved, thus it signals permission to enter heaven rather than being given there upon entry. The Name also represents the authority to order and govern the cosmos, and *Ode 23* portrays the exercise of that authority. The Name inspires fear on the earth, gathers together all regions, and exercises command and rule over them. In

Ascension of Isaiah the Name is credited with the same sort of organizing and governing authority, but that authority is limited to heaven. The Name arranges, but only the heavens and heavenly thrones. These same heavens and thrones obey the Name, and the Name ultimately leads the angels throughout heaven as they offer worship.

These two aspects of the Name's interaction with and restriction from the world align with a model that has been put forward regarding Syrian theology in the late first and early second century. In that model, which is promoted in varying forms by scholars such as Enrico Norelli and Robert Hall, there is a disagreement about the role of the prophet and the location of prophecy. *Ascension of Isaiah* is understood to represent the perspective that the prophet must ascend to heaven to receive revelation over against the perspective found in the Gospel of John that prophetic revelation is given on earth without the need for ascent. It would seem that the importance of the revelation of the Name in soteriology led to that revelation being positioned within the same polemical framework.

The Alexandrian materials are in loose agreement on the major points. Much of the scholarship on these and other Valentinian sources assumes enough agreement to allow the texts to inform and fill out one another's readings. In spite of certain differences of detail, *Excerpta ex Theodoto* and *Gospel of Truth* agree on enough points to conclude that they employ similar frameworks.

Both *Excerpta ex Theodoto* and *Gospel of Truth* assume that receiving the Name is a key element of soteriology. Because the Name of God is possessed also by the elect as their own proper Name, learning the Name involves coming to know one's own true identity. Both texts emphasize the place such self-realization holds in the process of

salvation, which is understood as being admitted to the pleroma. The Name is absolutely required for salvation, and according to *Exc. Theod.* 22.4 it is absolutely effective: “When we, too, have the Name, we may not be hindered ... from entering the Pleroma.”

The creative aspect of the Name is heavily emphasized in both texts. The Name of God saves because it transfers the believers existence from the illusory material world to the pleroma, where it provide the form and the structure for both the aeons and for the pleroma itself. The form and structure of the material world is understood to be based upon a false substitute provided by the demiurge, just as all aspects of the material world are false reproductions of pleromic counterparts.

A further distinctive point of the onomanology in these two Valentinian texts is the fact that the Name of God is fully hypostatic. Especially in the long passage at *Gos. Truth* 38:6-40:29, the Name is an independent personal entity who is in fact identical with the Son. Even though the Name descends upon and cooperates with the person Jesus, the Son-Name must not be confused with either Jesus or Christ because it is a distinct person from them.¹

¹ Jesus and Christ are not distinguished in *Gos. Truth.*, although they are distinct from one another in *Exc. Theod.* Although the name is understood to be a separate entity from them, the hypostatic name descends upon Jesus at baptism.

Inter-Regional

Having reviewed the distinctive points from each region, I will also add a few notes of comparison among the regions on the key areas of possession of the Name—including knowledge—and the cosmological role of the Name.

I have already pointed out that both Roman texts place soteriological value on the way in which the individual responds to the Name. Many people are brought to some kind of knowledge of the Name, and even bear the Name, but not all are finally included among those who are saved. In order to be saved, the person must willingly accept their association with the Name and all that is connected to that association, including obedience. These texts both follow a trajectory that is also found in the *Similitudes of I Enoch*. There the Name elicits responses of acknowledgement, which save, and responses of denial, which condemn. The implication is that some will receive the Name but will refuse to acknowledge it or will be ashamed of their association with it. Knowledge of the Name is required, but it is not a guarantee of salvation which is still dependent upon the believer.

On the other hand, for all their disagreement regarding the time or the place of the revelation of the Name, the Syrian texts agree that the revelation and inscription of the Name is to be considered absolute, and it is powerful in and of itself. This is why *Ascension of Isaiah* chooses to restrict that revelation until salvation has been fully realized. The *Odes* grant it earlier than that, and in the world, but here also the Name cannot be taken away once it is given. It is the identifying mark that allows admission to heaven. The Valentinian texts from Alexandria also consider the revelation of the Name to effect salvation, but they understand that revelation differently. Although the Name is,

in fact, the Name of the Father, it saves because by learning it the believer gains self-knowledge, for it is also the Name that has been given to each of them. In Rome, knowledge was necessary for, and led to the possibility of salvation. In Syria, possession of the Name was in direct correspondence with salvation, and so was guarded to one degree or another. In Alexandria the knowledge itself virtually amounted to salvation, and so was only possible for the elect.

The texts from Rome and Syria seem to take very different approaches when they relate the Name to the material world. The Roman writers understand the Name as a cosmogenic force. This idea is not part of the Syrian discussion at all. The Syrian authors instead focus on the exercise and restriction of the authority vested in the Name within the spaces of heaven and earth. Both Clement and Hermas assume a certain kind of authority for the Name, but they never consider the kinds of restrictions that might be placed upon that authority, such as those envisioned in *Ascension of Isaiah*. The Valentinian texts in Alexandria do not display any awareness of the other four texts, but they do appear to share both an interest in the Name's creative capacity and one in the proper location for the exercise of its authority.

The anti-material predisposition one would expect in a Valentinian system is reflected in the positions both *Excerpta ex Theodoto* and *Gospel of Truth* take on the Name's activity in the cosmos. They are superficially similar to *Ascension of Isaiah* in that the Name is primarily active in the pleroma rather than in the material world. The interactions between the Name and the created world must be mediated through the Savior. The two texts arrive at these similar positions in different ways, however, and so they represent different theological trajectories.

In *Ascension of Isaiah*, the Name cannot be shared on earth because it is inappropriate for anyone who does not belong in the church to have contact with the Name. Even those who will eventually belong must wait in order to protect the holiness of the Name. It would be possible, but dangerous and so forbidden, for the Name to be known on earth—even by outsiders. The question is one of propriety. In Alexandria this assumption is not shared. Ultimately the Name is, in fact, known on earth. The separation between the Name and creation lies in the fact that the Name functions within an entirely different existence from the material world in which the Valentinians find themselves. Trapped in material, the Valentinians cannot perceive the Name, and so require a mediator who can enter space, bear the Name, and reveal it to the Valentinian elect. What this means is that Valentinian salvation depends upon precisely what *Ascension of Isaiah* forbids—the Name entering the world. It therefore constructs an elaborate system to overcome the near impossibility of a revelation that *Ascension of Isaiah* sees as so likely that it must be actively prevented.

Roman onomanology also shares a key feature with Alexandria in understanding the Name as providing essential support for the very existence of the believer. There are variations in how this model is applied: Clement talks about this as having to do with the world itself, Hermas adapts the cosmological imagery to focus on the existence of the church as a special case of the world, and the Valentinian texts in use in Alexandria maintain a separation between the immaterial Name and the material world by applying its creative power only to the Pleroma. Through the mediation of the Savior the Name enters the material world, but it has no role in establishing or preserving that world, as it does in Rome. On the contrary, when it finally does have an impact on the existence of

the material world, it is to do away with it by restoring the spiritual seed to real existence in the Pleroma.

The Valentinian scheme in *Excerpta ex Theodoto* and *Gospel of Truth* stands apart from those found in the Roman texts. In both regions, the Name performs a “creative” function: providing a foundation and a support, maintaining order, or exercising authority within a realm—either the cosmos or the pleroma. The Name does not create so much as it provides a framework or a pattern that allows for existence. This functional similarity makes the differences in application more striking. Ultimately both *I Clement* and *Shepherd of Hermas* see the Name providing a basis for existence within the realm of creation. This view cannot be reconciled with that of the *Excerpta ex Theodoto* and *Gospel of Truth*. In contrast to the two Roman texts, they assume that the Name’s creative work results in undoing the existence of the cosmos, replacing it with existence in the pleroma.

Neither the Hebrew Bible nor the New Testament associate the Name with creative power, but Jewish literature of the period does make this association. The theme is widespread, appearing in *Jubilees*, *Prayer of Manasseh*, and a long section of *I Enoch*. In these texts the Name of God is called “creator of heaven and earth.” It is treated as a stable foundation, in fact the cosmological image that Hermas adapts for the church, of the world resting securely upon a watery foundation, is found in its original earthly context in *I En.* 69. The assumption that the Name provides order as a part of its creative activity is also present in *I En.* 69 as well as in the brief reference in *Pr. Man.* In all of these cases, however, the Name acts in an explicitly cosmological, material context. Clement and Hermas reflect this usage. The Valentinian writers adapt the theme of the

Name's power to preserve, organize, and give structure; but, they do so in a very new way. Their system allows for, and in fact requires a theory of existence in which the Name of God continues to be the foundation for true existence without being polluted by responsibility for material existence.

Excerpta ex Theodoto and *Gospel of Truth* also adapt Name Theology in ways that are similar to what was done in Rome and in Syria. Radical views about material creation force them to adapt the creative work in a much different way – distancing the Name from the material, and giving it that creative role only in the pleroma. However, the mechanics remain the same, as is apparent from the fact that since the Name is removed from a cosmological role in the material world it is replaced with the demiurge, who is a false copy of the Name. The greatest difference between the theology found in *Excerpta ex Theodoto* and *Gospel of Truth* and that found in the Jewish theologies of the Name that precede them is the Valentinian hypostatization of the Name. This hypostatization is also the biggest difference between their Name Theologies and those in the other second century Christian texts. The only possible Jewish background for this adaptation is the tendency seen in the Deuteronomistic History to separate the Name from YHWH, leaving YHWH in heaven and his Name on earth. If this is indeed the theological trajectory picked up by the Valentinian theologians, it would have involved some significant changes. The first is that the Name in *Excerpta ex Theodoto* and *Gospel of Truth* cannot, in fact, directly interact with creation. It requires the mediation of the Savior. In contrast, the Name is precisely the aspect of the divine that is able to enter into creation in 1 Kings, and so if there is a mediator in those passages it is the Name itself. The second major shift is that the Valentinian Name is an active entity. It maintains order

and in so doing provides structure and existence itself for the pleroma. The Deuteronomic *šēm* does not do this; it is a passive feature in contrast to the intervening activity of YHWH himself.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources – Editions and Translations

Ascension of Isaiah

Bettolo, Paolo. et al. ed. and trans. *Ascensio Isaiae: Textus*. Corpus Christianorum, Series Apocryphorum 7. Turnhout: Brepols, 1995.

Charles, R. H. *The Ascension of Isaiah*. London: Adam & Charles Black: 1900.

Dillmann, August. *Ascensio Isaiae Aethiopice et Latine cum Prolegomenis, Adnotationibus Criticis et Exegeticis Additis Versionum Latinarum Reliquiis*. Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus, 1877.

Excerpta ex Theodoto

Sagnard, François. ed., trans., and notes. *Clément d'Alexandrie: Extraits de Théodote*. Sources Chrétiennes. Paris: Cerf, 1948.

Clemens Alexandrinus 3: Stromata VII–VIII, Excerpta ex Theodoto, Eclogae prophetae, Quis dives salvetur, Fragmente. Edited by O. Stahlin, L. Fruchtel, and U. Treu. Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller 17. 2nd ed. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1970.

Casey, Robert Pierce. *The Excerpta ex Theodoto of Clement of Alexandria*. London: Christophers, 1934.

First Clement

Jaubert, Annie. ed., trans., and notes. *Épître Aux Corinthiens [Par] Clément De Rome*. Sources Chrétiennes 167; Paris: Cerf, 1971.

Lightfoot, Joseph B. ed., trans., and notes. *The Apostolic Fathers: A revised text with Introductions, Notes, Dissertations, and Translations*. 5 vols. London: Macmillan, 1890. Reprinted Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1973.

Shepherd of Hermas

Joly, Robert. intro., ed. and trans. *Hermas le Pasteur*. Sources Chrétiennes 53; Paris: Cerf, 1958.

Leuttsch, Martin. intro., ed., trans. and notes. *Papias Fragmente Hirt des Hermas*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1998.

Marique, Joseph M.-F. *The Apostolic Fathers*. Fathers of the Church 1. New York: Fathers of the Church, 1947.

Snyder, Graydon. *The Shepherd of Hermas*. Apostolic Fathers 6; Camden, NJ: Nelson, 1969.

Whittaker, Molly. intro. and ed. *Der Hirt Des Hermas*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1967.

Odes of Solomon

Harris, Rendel and Alphonse Mingana. *The Odes and Psalms of Solomon*. 2 vols.; Manchester: University Press, 1916-20.

Charlesworth, James H. ed. *The Odes of Solomon: The Syriac Texts*. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977.

Charlesworth, James H. *The Earliest Christian Hymnbook: The Odes of Solomon*. Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2009.

Gospel of Truth

Attridge Harold W., ed. *Nag Hammadi codex I (the Jung Codex)* [2 vols]. Leiden: Brill, 1985.

Grobel, Kendrick. *The Gospel of Truth, a Valentinian Meditation on the Gospel. Translation from the Coptic and Commentary*. New York: Abingdon, 1960.

First Enoch

Dillmann, August. *Das Buch Henoch: ubersetzt und eklart*. Leipzig: Vogel, 1853.

Charles, R. H. *The Ethiopic Version of the Book of Enoch*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906.

Black, Matthew. *The Book of Enoch or I Enoch, A New English Translation with Commentary and Textual Notes*. *Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha* 7. Leiden: Brill, 1985.

Other

Burchard, Christoph, Carsten Burfeind, and Uta Barbara Fink. *Joseph und Aseneth*. *Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece* 50. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Charlesworth, James H. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. Garden City: Doubleday, 1981-83.

Holmes, Michael W. *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007.

García Martínez, Florentino. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English*. Leiden: Brill, 1995.

García Martínez, Florentino and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, eds. *Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Secondary Sources

Achtemeier, Paul J. *1 Peter*. *Hermeneia*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996.

Ackroyd, Peter R. *The Second Book of Samuel*. *Cambridge Bible Commentary* 46. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

Arai, Sasagu. *Die Christologie des Evangelium veritatis: eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*. Leiden: Brill, 1964.

Attridge, Harold. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. *Hermeneia*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989.

Aune, David. *Revelation*. *Word Biblical Commentary*. 3 vols. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1997.

Bakke, Odd Magne. "The rhetorical composition of the First Letter of Clement." *Studia patristica* 36 (2001): 155-62.

Bakke, Odd Magne. "Concord and Peace": *A Rhetorical Analysis of the First Letter of Clement with an Emphasis on the Language of Unity and Sedition*. *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2 Reihe*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.

- Barker, Margaret. *The Revelation of Jesus Christ*. Edinburgh : T&T Clark, 2000.
- Barnes, W. E. "An Ancient Christian Hymn Book." *Expositor* (1910): 52-63.
- Barney, Rachel. *Names and Nature in Plato's Cratylus*. New York: Routledge, 2001.
- Barrett, Charles Kingsley. *The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Text*. Second Edition. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978.
- Barrett, Charles Kingsley. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. 2 vols. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994-98.
- Batten, Loring W. *A critical and Exegetical Commentary on the books of Ezra and Nehemiah*. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1913.
- Bauckham, Richard. "The Worship of Jesus in Philippians 2:9-11." Pages 128-139 in., *Where Christology Began: Essays on Philippians 2*. Edited by R. P. Martin and B. J. Dodd. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1998.
- Bauckham, Richard. "The Throne of God and 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*, edited by C. C. Newman, J. R. Davila and G. S. Lewis, 43-69. Leiden: Brill, 1999
- Bauckham, Richard. "Monotheism and Christology in the Gospel of John." Pages 148-166 in *Contours of Christology in the New Testament*. Edited by R. N. Longenecker. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- Bauckham, Richard. "Monotheism and Christology in Hebrews 1." Pages 167-185 in *Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism*. Edited by L. T. Stuckenbruck. London: T. & T. Clark, 2004.
- Bauckham, Richard. "Paul's Christology of Divine Identity." Paper delivered to the Pauline Epistles Section of the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature. Toronto. November 25, 2002.
- Bauckham, Richard. *Jesus and the God of Israel: God Crucified and Other Studies on the New Testament's Christology of Divine Identity*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.
- Bauer, Walter. *Johannesevangelium*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1912.
- Baynes, Leslie. "Christ as Text: *Odes of Solomon* 23 and the Letter Shot from Heaven." *Biblical Research* 47 (2002): 63-72.
- Beale, Gregory. *The Book of Revelation: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.

- Bedenbender, Andreas. "The Place of the Torah in the Early Enoch Literature." Pages 65-79 in *The Early Enoch Literature*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Bénétreau, S. "Le Nom Mystérieux de *Philippiens* 2,9." *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* 89 (2009): 313-331.
- Bernard, J.H. *The Odes of Solomon*. Cambridge: University Press, 1912.
- Bigg, Charles. *The Christian Platonists of Alexandria*. 1913. Reprinted Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.
- Blenkinsopp, Joseph. *Ezra-Nehemiah: a commentary*: Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1988.
- Boccaccini, Gabriele. *Middle Judaism : Jewish Thought, 300 B.C.E. To 200 C.E.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991.
- Boccaccini, Gabriele. *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis : The Parting of the Ways Between Qumran and Enochic Judaism*. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Boccaccini, Gabriele. "Enochians, Urban Essenes, Qumranites: Three Social Groups, One Intellectual Movement." Pages 301-327 in *The Early Enoch Literature*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Boccaccini, Gabriele, ed. *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Boccaccini, Gabriele and John J. Collins, eds. *The Early Enoch Literature*. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Boccaccini, Gabriele. "Preface: The Enigma of Jubilees and the Lesson of the Enoch Seminar." In *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*, edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba, xiv-xix. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.
- Bockmuehl, Marcus "1QS and Salvation at Qumran." In *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism*, edited by D.A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien, and Mark A Seifrid, vol. 1 of *Justification and Variegated Nomism*, 381-414. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.
- Bradshaw, Paul F. *Eucharistic Origins*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2004.
- Breytenbach, Cilliers. "Civic Concord and Cosmic Harmony: Sources of Metaphoric Mapping in 1 Clement 20:3." Pages 115-181 in *Encounters with Hellenism: Studies on the First Letter of Clement*. Edited by Cilliers Breytenbach & Laurence L. Welborn. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

- Briggman, Anthony. *Irenaeus of Lyons and the Theology of the Holy Spirit*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Broek, Roelof van den, & Wouter J. Hanegraaff, eds. *Gnosis and Hermeticism from Antiquity to Modern Times: Two Roads to Salvation*. Albany: State University of New York. 1998.
- Brown, Raymond E. *Gospel According to John: A New Translation and Commentary*. 2 vols. Anchor Bible. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966.
- Brox, Norbert. *Der Hirt des Hermas*. Kommentar zu den Apostolischen Vätern. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991.
- Bohak, Gideon. *Ancient Jewish Magic : A History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Boling, Robert G and G. Ernest Wright. *Joshua: A New Translation and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 6. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1982.
- Bousset, Wilhelm. *Kyrios Christos: A History of Belief in Christ from the Beginnings of Christianity to Irenaeus*. Translated by J.E. Steely. New York: Abingdon, 1970.
- Bowe, Barbara Ellen. *A Church in Crisis : Ecclesiology and Paraenesis in Clement of Rome*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1988.
- Bowman, John. *The Samaritan Problem: Studies in the Relationships of Samaritanism, Judaism, and Early Christianity*. Translated by Alfred M. Johnson, Jr. Pittsburgh: Pickwick, 1975.
- Brox, Norbert. *Der Hirt des Hermas*. Kommentar zu den Apostolischen Vätern 7. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991.
- Buchanan, George Wesley. *To the Hebrews: A New Translation*. Anchor Bible 36. Garden City: Doubleday, 1972.
- Bucur, Bogdan G. "The Son of God and the Angelomorphic Holy Spirit: A Rereading of the Shepherd's Christology." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 98 (2007): 121-143
- Bucur, Bogdan G. "The Place of the *Hypotyposeis* in the Clementine Corpus: An Apology for 'The Other Clement of Alexandria.'" *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 17 (2009): 313-335.
- Bucur, Bogdan G. "The Other Clement of Alexandria: Cosmic Hierarchy and Interiorized Apocalypticism." *Vigiliae Christianae* 60.3 (2006): 251-268.
- Bultmann, Rudolph. *Das Evangelium des Johannes*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968.

- Bultmann, Rudolph. *Theology of the New Testament*. Translated by Kendrick Grobel. London: SCM Press,
- Bumpus, Harold Bertram. *The Christological Awareness of Clement of Rome and its Sources*. Cambridge, MA: University Press of Cambridge, 1972.
- Burkitt, F.C. "The Nontitular Son of Man: A History and Critique." *NTS* 40 (1994): 504-21.
- Casey, M. "Idiom and Translation: Some Aspects of the Son of Man Problems." *NTS* 41 (1995): 168-82.
- Casey, Robert P. "Clement of Alexandria and the Beginnings of Christian Platonism." *Harvard Theological Review* 18.1 (1925): 39-101.
- Cogan, Mordechai. *1 Kings: A New Translation and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 10. New York: Doubleday, 2001.
- Charlesworth, James H. "Christian and Jewish Self-Definition in Light of the Christian Additions to the Apocryphal Writings." In *Jewish and Christian Self Definition* 2. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981.
- Charlesworth, James H. *Critical Reflections on the Odes of Solomon*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- Charlesworth, James H. and Dean Alan Culpepper. "The Odes of Solomon and the Gospel of John." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 35 (1973): 298-322.
- Chialà, Sabino. "The Son of Man: The Evolution of an Expression." In Boccaccini, *Messiah Son of Man*, 153-178.
- Childs, Brevard S. *Isaiah*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001.
- Collins, John J. "The Son of Man in First-Century Judaism," *NTS* 38.3 (1992): 448-66.
- Collins, John J. "A Response to Sabino Chiala and Helge Kvanig." In Boccaccini, *Messiah Son of Man*, 216-27.
- Craigie, Peter. *Psalms 1-50*. Word Biblical Commentary 19. Waco: Word, 1983.
- Crown, Alan D. "The Samaritan Diaspora" Pages 195-217 in *The Samaritans*. Edited by A. D. Crown. Tübingen: J.C.B Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1989.
- Crown, Alan D. "Redating the Schism between the Judaeans and the Samaritans." *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, New Series 82 (July-Oct, 1991): 17-50.
- Daniélou, Jean. "Une ancienne liturgie judéo-chrétienne." *Cahiers Sioniens* 52 (1950): 1-11.

- Daniélou, Jean. *Théologie du Judéo-Christianisme*. Tournai, Belgium: Desclée & Co., 1958.
- Daniélou, Jean. *The Theology of Jewish Christianity*. The Development of Christian Doctrine before the Council of Nicaea 1. Translated & edited by John Baker. London: Darton, Longman, & Todd, 1964.
- Daniélou, Jean. *Gospel Message and Hellenistic Culture*. The Development of Christian Doctrine before the Council of Nicaea, 2. Translated & edited by John Baker. London: Darton, Longman, & Todd, 1973.
- Davila, James R. *Liturgical Works*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Davila, James R. *The Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha: Jewish, Christian, or Other?* Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Davis, Carl Judson. *The Name and Way of the Lord: Old Testament Themes, New Testament Christology*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- Davison, James. "Structural Similarities and Dissimilarities in the Thought of Clement of Alexandria and the Valentinians," *Second Century* 3.4 (1983): 201-218.
- De Conick, April D. *Voices of the Mystics: Early Christian Discourse in the Gospels of John and Thomas and Other Ancient Christian Literature*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- Dempsey, Deirdre A. "The Verb Syntax of Second Isaiah and Deuteronomy Compared." Ph.D. diss., Catholic University of America, 1989.
- Desjardins, Michel. "Rethinking the Study of Gnosticism." *Religion & Theology* 12 (2005): 370-84.
- Dillon, John. *The Middle Platonists*. Ithaca: Cornell, 1996.
- Donfried, Karl P. and Peter Richardson. *Judaism and Christianity in First-Century Rome*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Drijvers, Han J.W. *East of Antioch: Studies in Early Syriac Christianity*. London: Variorum Reprints, 1984.
- Driver, Samuel R. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy*. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1902.
- Dunn, James. *Christology in the Making: a New Testament Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1980.
- Dunn, James. *Did the First Christians Worship Jesus: The New Testament Evidence*. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox, 2010.

- Ekbald, Eugene Robert Jr. *Isaiah's Servant Poem According to the Septuagint: An Exegetical and Theological Study*. Leuven: Peeters, 1999.
- Edwards, M.J. "Clement of Alexandria and His Doctrine of the Logos," *Vigiliae Christianae* 54.2 (2000): 159-177.
- Ellingworth, Paul. *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Greek text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.
- Erdmann, Martin. "Mission in John's Gospel and Letters." Pages 207-226 in *Mission in the New Testament: An Evangelical Approach*. Edited by William J. Larkin Jr. and Joel F. Williams. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1998.
- Erlemann, Kurt. "Die Datierung des ersten Klemenbriefes—Anfragen an eine Communis Opinio." *New Testament Studies* 44 (1998): 591-607.
- Fensham, F. Charles. *The Books of Ezra and Nehemiah*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.
- Fineman, Joel. "Gnosis and the Piety of Metaphor: The Gospel of Truth." Pages 1.289-318 in *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism*. Ed. Bentley Layton; 2 vols; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1980.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph. *Acts of the Apostles*. Anchor Bible 31. New Haven: Yale, 2008.
- Fleming, D. E. "'House'/'City': An Unrecognized Parallel Word Pair." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 105 (1986): 689-693.
- Foerster, Werner. *Gnosis: A Selection of Gnostic Texts*. English Translation Edited by R. McL. Wilson. Oxford: Clarendon, 1974.
- Fossum, Jarl. *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord: Samaritan and Jewish Concepts of Intermediation and the Origin of Gnosticism*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1985.
- Fossum, Jarl. *The Image of the Invisible God: Essays on the Influence of Jewish Mysticism on Early Christology*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995.
- Ford, Josephine Massingberd. "A Possible Liturgical Background to the Shepherd of Hermas," *Revue de Qumran* 6.24 (1969): 531-551.
- Franzmann, Majella. "The Wheel in Prov. xx 26 and Ode of Solomon xxiii 11-16." *Vetus Testamentum* 41 (1991): 121-3.
- Franzmann, Majella. *The Odes of Solomon: An Analysis of the Poetical Structure and Form*. Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus 20. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991.

- Garnet, Paul. *Salvation and Atonement in the Qumran scrolls*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1977.
- Gieschen, Charles A. *Angelomorphic Christology: Antecedents and Early Evidence*. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Gieschen, Charles A. "The Divine Name in Holy Baptism." Pages 67-77 in *All Theology is Christology: Essays in Honor of David P. Scaer*. Edited by Dean O. Wenthe, et al. Fort Wayne, IN: Concordia Theological Seminary, 2000.
- Gieschen, Charles A. "The Divine Name in Ante-Nicene Christology." *Vigiliae Christianae* 57 (2003): 115-158.
- Gieschen, Charles A. "The Name of the Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch." Pages 238-249 in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Giet, Stanislas. *Hermas et les pasteurs, Les trois auteurs du Pasteur d'Hermas*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1963.
- Ginzberg, Louis. *Legends of the Jews*. 7 vols. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1928-1938.
- Goldingay, John. *Psalms*. 3 vols. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006.
- Goldingay, John and David Payne. *Isaiah 40–55: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*. 2 vols. International Critical Commentary. London: T&T Clark, 2006.
- Grant, Robert M. and H. H. Graham. *The Apostolic Fathers: First Second Clement*. Apostolic Fathers II; New York: Nelson, 1965.
- Grant, Robert M. "The Odes of Solomon and the Church of Antioch." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 63 (1944): 363-77.
- Greenberg, Moshe. *Ezekiel 21-37: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 22A. New York: Doubleday, 1997.
- Grether, Oskar. *Name und Wort im Alten Testament*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 64. Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1934.
- Grillmeier, Aloys. *Christ in Christian Tradition: Volume One From the Apostolic Age to Chalcedon*. 2nd ed. Atlanta: John Knox, 1975.
- Grindel, John. "Matthew 12:18-21." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 29.1 (1967): 110-115.
- Gundry, Robert H. *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel: With Special Reference to the Messianic Hope*. Leiden: Brill, 1967.
- Haenchen, Ernst. *John: a commentary on the Gospel of John*. 2 vols. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.

- Hagner, Donald Alfred. *The Use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 34. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973.
- Hagner, Donald A. *Matthew 14-28*. Word Biblical Commentary 33b; Waco, TX: Word, 1995.
- Hall, Robert G. "The *Ascension Of Isaiah*: Community Situation, Date, and Place in Early Christianity." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 109 (1990): 289-306.
- Hall, Robert G. "Isaiah's Ascent to See the Beloved: An Ancient Jewish Source for the Ascension of Isaiah." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 113 (1994): 463-484.
- Hall, Robert G. "Astonishment in the Firmament: The Worship of Jesus and Soteriology in Ignatius and the *Ascension of Isaiah*." In *Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism: Papers from the St Andrew's Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus*, edited by Carey C. Newman, James R. Davila, and Gladys S. Lewis. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Harnack, Adolph von. "Schreiben der römischen Kirche an die korinthische aus der Zeit Domitians (I. Clemensbrief)." Pages 1-104 in *Encounters with Hellenism: Studies on the First Letter of Clement*. Edited by Cilliers Breytenbach & Laurence L. Welborn. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Harnack, Adolph von. *History of Dogma*. Translated by Neil Buchanan. 7 vols. 1896-1905. Reprinted New York: Dover, 1960.
- Harvey, Susan Ashbrook. "Feminine Imagery for the Divine: The Holy Spirit, the *Odes of Solomon*, and Early Syriac Tradition." *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 37 (1993): 111-139.
- Hauck, Robert J. "The Great Fast: Christology in the Shepherd of Hermas." *Anglican Theological Review* 75.2 (1993): 187-198.
- Heidel, Alexander. *The Babylonian Genesis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951.
- Hemer, Colin J. *The letters to the seven churches of Asia in their local setting*. Sheffield, UK: Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Press, 1986.
- Hengel, M. *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*. 2 volumes. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1981.
- Henne, Philippe. "La Polysémie Allégorique dans le Pasteur d'Hermas." *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 65.1 (1989): 131-135.
- Henne, Philippe. *La Christologie Chez Clément De Rome Et Dans Le Pasteur D'hermas*. Fribourg, Suisse: Editions Universitaires, 1992.

- Himmelfarb, Martha. "Temple and Priests in the Book of the Watchers, the Animal Apocalypse and the Apocalypse of Weeks." Pages 219-236 in *The Early Enoch Literature*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Hill, Charles E. *The Johannine Corpus in the Early Church*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Hjelm, Ingrid. *The Samaritans and Early Judaism: A Literary Analysis*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 303. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Hoek, Annewies van den. "Techniques of Quotation in Clement of Alexandria: A View of Ancient Literary Working Methods." *Vigiliae Christianae* 50.3 (1996): 223-243.
- Hoffmann, Mattias. *The Destroyer and the Lamb*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.
- Horn, Cornelia. "The virgin and the perfect virgin: traces of early eastern Christian Mariology in the *Odes of Solomon*." *Studia Patristica* 40 (2006): 413-28.
- Hornschuh, Manfred. *Studien Zur Epistula Apostolorum*. Berlin: De Gruyter. 1965.
- Humphrey, Edith McEwan. *The Ladies and the Cities: Transformation and Apocalyptic Identity in Joseph and Aseneth, 4 Ezra, the Apocalypse and The Shepherd of Hermas*. JSP Supp 18; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1995.
- Hurtado, Larry. *One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988.
- Hurtado, Larry. *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- Isser, Stanley Jerome. *The Dositheans: A Samaritan Sect in Late Antiquity*. Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity 17. Leiden: Brill, 1976.
- Jackson, F. J. Foakes and Kirsopp Lake (eds.) *The Beginnings of Christianity: The Acts of the Apostles*. 5 vols. London: Macmillan, 1926-1933.
- Janowitz, Naomi. *Icons of Power: Ritual Practices in Late Antiquity*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2002.
- Jenson, Philip Peter. *Graded Holiness: A Key to the Priestly Conception of the World*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 106. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992.
- Johnson, Luke Timothy. *Hebrews: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2006.

- Jonas, Hans. *The Gnostic Religion: The Message of the Alien God & the Beginnings of Christianity*. Boston: Beacon, 2001.
- Kalvesmaki, Joel. "Italian versus Eastern Valentinianism?" *Vigiliae Christianae* 62 (2008): 79-89.
- Keener, Craig S. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. 2 vols. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003.
- Kelly, J. N. D. *Early Christian Creeds*. London: Longman, 1972.
- Koester, Craig R. *To the Hebrews: A New Translation*. Anchor Bible 36. New York: Doubleday, 2001.
- Köstenberger, Andreas, "The Two Johannine Verbs for Sending: A Study of John's Use of Words with Reference to General Linguistic Theory." In *Linguistics and the New Testament: Critical Junctures*, 125-143. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and D.A. Carson. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 168. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Knibb, Michael A. *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments*. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978.
- Knibb, Michael A. "Isaianic Traditions in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha." In *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah*, edited by Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans, 633-50. Brill: Leiden, 1997.
- Knibb, Michael A. "The Structure and Composition of the Parables of Enoch," In Boccaccini, *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*, 48-64.
- Knight, Jonathan. *Disciples of the Beloved One: The Christology, Social Setting and Theological Context of the Ascension of Isaiah*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- Knopf, Rudolph. *Die Lehre der zwölf Apostel: die zwei Clemensbriefe*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1920.
- Kraemer, Ross Shepard. *When Aseneth Met Joseph: A Late Antique Tale of the Biblical Patriarch and His Egyptian Wife, Reconsidered*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Kraus, Hans-Joachim. *Theology of the Psalms*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Pub. House, 1986.
- Kulik, Alexander. *Retroverting the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha: Toward the Original of the Apocalypse of Abraham*. Text-Critical Studies 3. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

- Kvanig, Helge S. "The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch." In Boccaccini, *Messiah Son of Man*, 179-215.
- Lattke, Michael. *Die Oden Salomos in ihrer Bedeutung für Neues Testament und Gnosis*. 5 vols.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979-1998.
- Lattke, Michael. "The Apocryphal *Odes of Solomon* and the New Testament Writings." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 73.3-4 (1982): 294-301.
- Lattke, Michael. *Odes of Solomon: a commentary*. Translated by Marianne Ehrhardt. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2009.
- Lattke, Michael. *Hymnus: Materialien zu einer Geschichte der antiken Hymnologie*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991.
- Lampe, Peter. *From Paul to Valentinus: Christians at Rome in the First Two Centuries*. Edited by Marshall D. Johnson. Translated by Michael Steinhauser. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003.
- Lane, William. *Hebrews*. 2 vols. Word Biblical Commentary 47. Dallas: Word, 1991.
- Layton, Bentley. *The Gnostic Scriptures: A New Translation with Annotations and Introductions*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1987.
- Layton, Bentley. *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism: Proceedings of the International Conference on Gnosticism at Yale, New Haven, Connecticut, March 28-31, 1978*. Leiden: Brill, 1980.
- Leeper, Elizabeth A. "From Alexandria to Rome: The Valentinian Connection to the Incorporation of Exorcism as a Prebaptismal Rite." *Vigiliae Christianae* 44 (1990): 6-24.
- Leuchter, Mark. *The Polemics of Exile in Jeremiah 26-45*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Lilla, Salvatore. *Clement of Alexandria: A Study in Christian Platonism and Gnosticism*. Oxford Theological Monographs. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971.
- Lindemann, Andreas. *Die Clemensbriefe*. Die Apostolischen Väter 1. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1992.
- Lona, Horatio E. "Rhetorik und Botschaft in 1 Clem 49." *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 86 (1995): 94-103.
- Lona, Horatio E. *Der erste Clemensbrief*. Kommentar zu den Apostolischen Vätern 2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1998.

- Longenecker, Richard N. *The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity*. Naperville, IL: A.R. Allenson, 1970.
- Lowy, S. *The Principles of Samaritan Bible Exegesis*. Studia Post-Biblica 28. Leiden: Brill, 1977.
- Lundblom, Jack R. *Jeremiah 1-20*. Anchor Bible 21A. New York: Doubleday, 1999.
- Luz, Ulrich. *Matthew 8-20*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001.
- MacDonald, John. *The Theology of the Samaritans*. The New Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964.
- Marschies, Christoph. *Valentinus Gnosticus?: Untersuchungen Zur Valentinianischen Gnosis : Mit Einem Kommentar Zu Den Fragmenten Valentins*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1992.
- Marschies, Christoph. "Jesus Christ as a Man Before God: Two Interpretive Models for Isaiah 53 in the Patristic Literature and their Development." In *The Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 in Jewish and Christian Sources*. Edited by Peter Stuhlmacher and Bernd Janowski, 234-41. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
- Martin, Ralph P. *A Hymn of Christ: Philippians 2:5-11 in Recent Interpretation & in the Setting of Early Christian Worship*. Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press, 1997.
- McBride, S. Dean. "The Deuteronomic Name Theology." Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1969.
- McCarter, P. Kyle, Jr. *II Samuel*. Anchor Bible 9; Garden City: Doubleday, 1984.
- McClelland, J.C. *God the Anonymous: A Study in Alexandrian Philosophical Theology*. Patristic Monograph Series 4. Cambridge, MA: The Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1976.
- McDonough, Sean M. *YHWH at Patmos: Rev. 1:4 in its Hellenistic and Early Jewish Setting*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999.
- McHugh, John F. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on John 1-4*. London: T&T Clark, 2009.
- McNeil, Brian. "The Odes of Solomon and the Scriptures." *Oriens Christianus* 67 (1983): 104-122.
- McPolin, James. "Mission in the Fourth Gospel." *Irish Theological Quarterly* 46 (1969): 113-122.
- Mees, M. "Das Christusbild des ersten Klemensbriefes." *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 66 (1990): 297-318.

- Ménard, Jacques-É. "Les élucubrations de l'Évangélium Veritatis sur le 'Nom.'" *Studia Montin Regii* 5 (1962)
- Mettinger, Tryggve N. D. *The Dethronement of Sabaoth: Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies*. Translated by Frederick H. Cryer. Coiniectanea Biblica 18. Lund: Gleerup, 1982.
- Meyer, Ben F. *The Aims of Jesus*. London: SCM, 1979.
- Michaels, Ramsey. *Gospel of John*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- Milgrom, Jacob. *Cult and Conscience: The Asham and the Priestly Doctrine of Repentance*. Leiden: Brill, 1976.
- Milgrom, Jacob. *Leviticus: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. 3 vols. Anchor Bible 3-3b. New York: Doubleday, 1991-2001.
- Miller, Patricia Cox. "'All the Words Were Frightful': Salvation by Dreams in the Shepherd of Hermas." *Vigiliae Christianae* 42.4 (1988): 327-338.
- Mortley, Raoul. "The Theme of Silence in Clement of Alexandria." *Journal of Theological Studies* 24.1 (1973): 197-202.
- Mowinckel, Sigmund. *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1962.
- Mueller, Joseph. "First Clement in the Church Order Tradition" (paper presented to the Jewish Roots of Christian Mysticism Project, Milwaukee, Wisc., 12 Feb 2013).
- Norelli, Enrico. *L'Ascensione di Isaia. Studi su un apocrifo al crocevia dei cristianesimi*. Origini NS 1. Bologna: Centro editorial dehoniano, 1994.
- Norelli, Enrico. *Ascensio Isaiae: Commentarius*. Corpus Christianorum Series Apocryphorum 8. Paris: Brepols, 1995.
- Mortley, Raoul. "The Name of the Father is the Son (Gospel of Truth 38)." In R. T. Wallis, ed. *Neoplatonism and Gnosticism*, 239-52. Albany, NY: 1992.
- Mortley, Raoul. *From Word to Silence*. 2 vol. Bonn: Hanstein, 1986.
- George W. E. Nickelsburg. "Discerning the Structure(s) of the Enochic Book of Parables," In Boccaccini, *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*, 23-47.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. "Enochic Wisdom and its Relationship to the Mosaic Torah." Pages 81-94 in *The Early Enoch Literature*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Nickelsberg, George W. E. and James C. VanderKam. *1 Enoch 2: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 37-82*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2011.

- Novak, Michael A. "The *Odes of Solomon* as Apocalyptic Literature," *Vigiliae Christianae* 66.5 (2012): 527-50.
- Nötscher, F. *Zur theologischen Terminologie der Qumran-Texte*. Bonn: Hanstein, 1956.
- Orlov, Andrei. *Enoch-Metatron Tradition*. Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 107. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2005.
- Orlov, Andrei. "Praxis of the Voice: The Divine Name Traditions in the Apocalypse of Abraham." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 127 (2008): 53-70.
- Osiek, Carolyn. *Rich and Poor in the Shepherd of Hermas: An Exegetical-Social Investigation*. The Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 15. Washington, DC: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1983.
- Osiek, Carolyn. *The Shepherd of Hermas: A Commentary*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999.
- Pearson, Birger. *Gnosticism and Christianity in Roman and Coptic Egypt*. New York: Continuum, 2004.
- Peerbolte, L.J. Lietaert. "The Name Above All Names (Philippians 2:9)." In *The Revelation of the Name YHWH to Moses. Perspectives from Judaism, the Pagan Graeco-Roman World, and Early Christianity*. Edited by George H. van Kooten, 187-206. Themes in Biblical Narrative 9. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Pernveden, Lage. *The Concept of the Church in the Shepherd of Hermas*. Lund: Gleerup, 1966.
- Pervo, Richard. *Acts of the Apostles*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2009.
- Peterson, Erik. *Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis; Studien und Untersuchungen*. Rome: Herder, 1959.
- Philonenko, Marc. *Joseph et Aseneth*. Leiden: Brill, 1968.
- Pollard, T.E. *Johannine Christology and the Early Church*. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1970.
- Rad, Gerhard von. *Deuteronomium-Studien*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1947.
- Rad, Gerhard von. *Studies in Deuteronomy*. Translated by David Stalker. London: SCM Press, 1953.
- Rad, Gerhard von. *Das fünfte Buch Mose: Deuteronomium*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964.
- Rad, Gerhard von. *Deuteronomy in the Old Testament Library*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1966.

- Räisänen, Heikki. “‘Righteousness by Works’: An Early Catholic Doctrine? Thoughts on 1 Clement.” In Räisänen, *Jesus, Paul and Torah: Collected Essays*, 203–24. Trans. D. E. Orton. JSNTSup 43. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992.
- Reumann, John. *Philippians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Yale Bible 33b. New Haven: Yale, 2008.
- Richter, Sandra. *The Deuteronomic History and the Name Theology: lesakken semo sam in the Bible and the Ancient Near East*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 318. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2002.
- Roberts, Colin H. *Manuscript, Society, and Belief in Early Christian Egypt*. London: Oxford University Press, 1979.
- Ruck-Schröder, Adelheid. *Der Name Gottes Und Der Name Jesu: Eine Neutestamentliche Studie*. Freiburg: Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1999.
- Sagnard, François. *La Gnose Valentinienne et le témoignage de Saint Irénée*. Études de Philosophie Médiévale. Paris: J. Vrin, 1947.
- Schäfer, Peter. *Origins of Jewish Mysticism*. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2009.
- Schoedel, William R. “Enclosing, Not Enclosed: The Early Christian Doctrine of God.” In *Early Christian Literature and the Classical Intellectual Tradition: In Honorem Robert M. Grant*, Edited by W. R. Schoedel and R. L. Wilken, 75–86. Paris: Éditions Beauchesne, 1979.
- Schuller, Eileen M. *Non-Canonical Psalms from Qumran: A Pseudepigraphic Collection*. Harvard Semitic Studies 28. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.
- Segal, Alan. *Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports About Christianity and Gnosticism*. Leiden: Brill, 1977.
- Segal, Alan. “‘Two Powers in Heaven’ and Early Christian Trinitarian Thinking.” In *The Trinity: An Interdisciplinary Symposium on the Trinity*. Edited by Kendall Davis, 73–95. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Seeligman, Isac Leo. *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah: A Discussion of its Problems*. Leiden: Brill, 1948.
- Slater, T.B. “One Like a Son of Man in First Century CE Judaism.” *New Testament Studies* 41 (1995): 183–98.
- Slater, Thomas. *Christ and Community. A Socio-Historical Study of the Christology of Revelation*. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Speiser, E. A. *Genesis*. Anchor Bible 1. Garden City: Doubleday, 1964.

- Sperber, Alexander. *The Bible in Aramaic: The Former Prophets According to Targum Jonathan*. Vol. 2. Leiden: Brill, 1959.
- Staalduine-Sulman, Eveline van. *The Targum of Samuel*. Studies in the Aramaic Interpretation of Scripture 1. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Stec, David M. *The Targum of Psalms: Translated with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus, and Notes*. The Aramaic Bible 16. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2004.
- Story, Cullen I. K. *The Nature of Truth in "The Gospel of Truth" And in Writings of Justin Martyr: A Study of the Pattern of Orthodoxy in the Middle of the Second Christian Century*. Leiden: Brill, 1970.
- Stroumsa, Gedaliah. *Hidden Wisdom: Esoteric Traditions and the Roots of Christian Mysticism*. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Stuckenbruck, Loren T. "Worship and Monotheism in the *Ascension of Isaiah*." In *Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism*. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Suter, David W. "Temples and the Temple in the Early Enoch Tradition: Memory, Vision, and Expectation." Pages 195-218 in *The Early Enoch Literature*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Tardieu, Michel. "Une diatribe antignostique dans l'interpolation eunomienne des Reconnaissance." In *Alexandria: Hellenisme, judaïsme et christianisme à Alexandrie: Mélanges offerts au P. Claude Mondésert*. Paris: Cerf, 1987.
- Tate, Marvin. *Psalms 51-100*. Word Biblical Commentary 20. Waco, TX: Word, 1990.
- Teicher, J.L. "The Christian Interpretation of the Sign X in the Isaiah Scroll," *Vetus Testamentum* 5 (1955): 189-198.
- Theissen, Gerd. *Untersuchung zum Hebräerbrief*. SNT 2. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1969.
- Thomassen, Einar. "Gnostic Semiotics: The Valentinian Notion of the Name." *Temenos* 29 (1993) 141-56.
- Thomassen, Einar. "Orthodoxy and Heresy in Second Century Rome." *Harvard Theological Review* 97:3 (2004): 241-56.
- Thomassen, Einar. *The Spiritual Seed: The Church of the Valentinians*. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Thomassen, Einar. "Baptism Among the Valentinians." Pages 895-916 in *Ablution, Initiation, and Baptism: Late Antiquity, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity*. Berlin: DeGruyter, 2010.

- Thrall, Margaret. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994-2001.
- Tomson, Peter J. and Doris Lambers-Petry. *The Image of the Judaeo-Christians in Ancient Jewish and Christian Literature*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.
- Tov, Emmanuel. *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. Minneapolis : Fortress Press, 1992.
- Turner, John D., and Ruth Majercik, eds. *Gnosticism and Later Platonism: Themes, Figures, and Texts*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000.
- Ulrichsen, Jarl Henning. “Διαφορώτερον ὄνομα in Hebr 1:4 : Christus als Träger des Gottesnamens.” *Studia Theologica* 38 (1984): 65-75.
- van den Broek, R. and M.J. Vermaseren. *Studies in Gnosticism and Hellenistic religions: presented to Gilles Quispel on the occasion of his 65th birthday*. Leiden: Brill, 1981.
- van Unnik, W. C. “Studies in the So-Called First Epistle of Clement: The Literary Genre.” Pages 115-181 in *Encounters with Hellenism: Studies on the First Letter of Clement*. Edited by Cilliers Breytenbach & Laurence L. Welborn. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Vaux Roland de, “Le lieu que Yahvé a choisi pour y établir son nom.” in *Das ferne und nahe Wort, Festschrift Leonhard Rost zur Vollendung seines 70 Lebensjahres*. Edited by Fritz Maas. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1967.
- Venter, Pieter M. “Spatiality in the Second Parable of Enoch.” In Boccaccini, *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*, 403-412.
- Verheyden, Joseph. “The *Shepherd of Hermas* and the Writings that later formed the New Testament.” In *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*. Edited by Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett, 293-329. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- von Wahlde, Urban. *Gospel and Letters of John*. Eerdmans Critical Commentary. 3vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- Vööbus, Arthur. *Liturgical Traditions in the Didache*. Stockholm: ETSE, 1968.
- Wagner, Walter H. *After the Apostles: Christianity in the Second Century*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994.
- Walck, Leslie. “The Son of Man in Matthew and the Similitudes of Enoch.” Ph.D. diss., The University of Notre Dame, 1999.

- Walck, Leslie. "The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch and the Gospels." In Boccaccini, *The Messiah Son of Man*, 299-337 .
- Weinfeld, Moshe. *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1972.
- Welborn, Laurence L. "The Preface to 1 Clement: The Rhetorical Situation and the Traditional dates." Pages 115-181 in *Encounters with Hellenism: studies on the First Letter of Clement*. Edited by Cilliers Breytenbach & Laurence L. Welborn. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Welch, John W. *Chiasmus in Antiquity*. Hildesheim, Germany: Gerstenberg Verlag, 1981.
- Welhausen, Julius. *Analyse der Offenbarung Johannis*. Berlin: Weidmann, 1907.
- Wiles, Maurice F. *The Spiritual Gospel: The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel in the Early Church*. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1960.
- Wiles, Maurice F. *The Divine Apostle: The Interpretation of St Paul's Epistles in the Early Church*. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1967.
- Williams, Jacqueline A. *Biblical Interpretation in the Gnostic Gospel of Truth from Nag Hammadi*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988.
- Williamson, H. G. M. *Ezra-Nehemiah*. Word Biblical Commentary 16. Waco: Word, 1985.
- Wilson, Ian. *Out of the Midst of the Fire: Divine Presence in Deuteronomy*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 151. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.
- Wilson, John Christian. *Five Problems in the Interpretation of the Shepherd of Hermas*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen, 1996.
- Wilson, Robin McL. "Valentinianism and the Gospel of Truth." Pages 133-145 in *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism*. Vol. 1. Edited by Bentley Layton. Leiden: Brill, 1980.
- Witherington, Ben, III. *Revelation*. New Cambridge Bible Commentary. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Wolfson, Harry Austryn. *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1947. Repr. 1962.
- Wolfson, Elliot. "Inscribed in the Book of the Living: Gospel of Truth and Jewish Christology." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 38 (2007): 234-271.
- Young, Frances M. *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

- Zimmermann, Christiane. *Die Namen Des Vaters: Studien Zu Ausgewählten Neutestamentlichen Gottesbezeichnungen Vor Ihrem Frühjüdischen Und Paganen Sprachhorizont*. Leiden: Brill. 2007.
- Zuntz, Günther. *The Text of the Epistles: A Disquisition Upon the Corpus Paulinum: The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 1946*. London: Oxford University Press, 1953.