



## LIBRARY COPYRIGHT NOTICE

[www.huc.edu/libraries](http://www.huc.edu/libraries)

### Regulated Warning

See Code of Federal Regulations, Title 37, Volume 1, Section 201.14:

The copyright law of the United States (title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material.

Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specific conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be “used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research.” If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of “fair use,” that user may be liable for copyright infringement.

This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.

THE EVOLUTION OF THE TERM <sup>✓</sup>SEM YAHWEH

IN ITS VARIOUS IMPLICATIONS IN BIBLICAL LITERATURE

submitted to the faculty of the  
Hebrew Union College in partial  
fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of Rabbi and  
Master of Hebrew Letters

*recd. 11/78*

Dr. Julien Morgenstern,  
Referee.

Ernst M. Lorge  
March 27, 1942

H E B R E W   U N I O N   C O L L E G E

To

MY MOTHER

in gratitude for her loving care

and to

MY FATHER

who by his interest, encouragement, and help  
contributed considerably to this paper.

### Acknowledgement

This study was undertaken at the suggestion of Dr. Julian Morgenstern, who placed much of his valuable time and effort at the disposal of the writer in the performance of this task. Dr. Morgenstern generously permitted the writer to utilize his unpublished material. Dr. Morgenstern's books, articles, and instruction in class was of great value to the author of this thesis, and many ideas presented in this study suggested themselves to the author as a result of the work done in Dr. Morgenstern's classes and while reading his books. The writer is deeply grateful for all the help, guidance, and inspiration, which he received from his teacher and sponsor, Dr. Julian Morgenstern, President of the Hebrew Union College.

Furthermore, the writer owes thanks to the professors of the Bible Department of the Hebrew Union College, Dr. Sheldon H. Blank, Dr. Nelson Glueck, and Dr. Julius Lewy, for the help he received from his teachers both for this study in particular and through class instruction in general.

The writer gladly takes this opportunity to express his sincerest gratitude to Dr. Abraham Heschel for his friendship, and the encouragement and aid he so generously extended to the writer in his general course of study and likewise in the solution of some of the problems

that beset him in the writing of this thesis.

# T A B L E   O F   C O N T E N T S

|   | Page |
|---|------|
| <b>A. <u>INTRODUCTION:</u></b>  |      |
| I. DEFINITION OF THE PROBLEM .....  | 1    |
| II. METHOD <sup>S</sup> <del>SE</del> EMPLOYED IN SOLVING THE PROBLEM ... | 2    |
| III. DISCUSSION OF PREVIOUS TREATMENTS OF THE<br>SUBJECT .....            | 4    |
| <b>B. <u>DISCUSSION OF THE SUBJECT:</u></b>                               |      |
| I. THE MEANING OF THE WORD "NAME" IN VARIOUS<br>LANGUAGES .....           | 8    |
| II. THE WORD <u>SEM</u> AND ITS ETYMOLOGY .....                           | 13   |
| III. THE TERM <u>SEM YAHWEH</u> IN THE BIBLE .....                        | 17   |
| a. Definiton of the Biblical Term .....                                   | 17   |
| b. <u>Nomen Proprium</u> .....  | 20   |
| c. Magical Formulae .....   | 29   |
| 1. General Use .....  | 29   |
| 2. Military Use .....   | 31   |
| 3. Blessing .....   | 35   |
| 4. Curse .....  | 38   |
| 5. Oath .....   | 38   |
| d. Worship .....  | 42   |
| 1. General Use .....  | 42   |
| 2. Worship in Recognition of Yahweh ....                                  | 46   |
| e. Indication of Ownership and Intimacy ...                               | 48   |
| f. To Speak in the Name of Yahweh .....                                   | 52   |

|  | Page |
|--|------|
| g. Reputation .....  | 54   |
| 1. General Use .....   | 54   |
| 2. "For His Name's Sake" .....                               | 57   |
| 3. <u>Qiddus</u> and <u>Hillul Hašem</u> .....               | 59   |
| 4. <u>Yad<sup>e</sup>u kiy š<sup>e</sup>miy Yahveh</u> ..... | 61   |
| h. Power .....   | 62   |
| i. Earthly Manifestation, Revelation, and<br>Immanence ..... | 63   |
| 1. General Use .....   | 63   |
| 2. The Temple .....  | 69   |
| 3. Jerusalem .....   | 72   |
| j. Israel and the Covenant .....                             | 75   |
| k. Hypostasis .....  | 79   |
| IV. OUTLOOK INTO POST-BIBLICAL TIMES .....                   | 81   |
| C. <u>CONCLUSION</u> :                                       |      |
| SUMMARY .....  | 83   |
| NOTES  |      |
| INDEX  |      |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY   |      |

## Definition of the Problem

As far as the Bible is concerned, Goethe is wrong when he says:

The Name is sound and smoke  
Obscuring Heaven's clear glow. 1

A point that can hardly fail to strike the Bible student is the frequency with which we are directed to the Name of the Lord. It is not only the Tetragrammaton which naturally stands out by number; for less obvious reasons the concept of the "name", referring to Yahweh, occurs unexpectedly often almost throughout the Biblical<sup>2</sup> literature. We find this concept of the "name" referring to Yahweh either in the form sem Yahweh or in forms of the word sem with possessive suffixes referring to Yahweh, i. e. semi, if Yahweh is the speaker, or simha, if Yahweh is addressed. It is not the Tetragrammaton or any other name of God, nor the word sem in the strict meaning of sem ham<sup>e</sup>poras which shall be the subject of our discussion, but only the term sem Yahweh and its equivalents. The other terms will be taken into consideration if they help our understanding of the term in question. The evolution of this term shall be considered only within the Biblical period, and pre-Biblical or post-Biblical material will be adduced merely for further proof or as suggestions for further studies in the respective directions.



## Method Employed in Solving the Problem

There are close to 400 passages containing the term in the Bible. In order to trace the evolution of the concepts implied in the term, every passage was considered in its setting and classified according to its probable meaning and implications. Some twenty-five shades of meaning were distinguished and arranged in the order of what one would expect to be the logical development of the concepts involved. Following this process, an attempt was made to date the individual passages as exactly as possible, and it was found that the sequence of time arrived at by the process of reasoning generally coincided with the dates of the passages representing the shades of meaning in question. In this way we arrived at the same result using two independent procedures, and we can be reasonably sure that our conclusions - again generally speaking - correspond with the historic reality. It cannot be surprising that a few passages did not seem to fit into the general scheme, and a change of date was suggested in most of the cases because their date was aught but certain in the first place.

From the above it becomes clear that the conclusions of this thesis are based entirely on internal evidence and that a complete sketch of the evolution of the term

could be drawn within the Biblical material. It seems that the Biblical term underwent an evolution of its own. All the Biblical connotations of Sem Yahweh have their own logic and can be explained one through the other.

2. Parallels from non-Biblical literature were mentioned wherever possible; but they seem to have influenced the Biblical development only indirectly. We could not prove any Biblical concept of the term to be the direct out-growth or continuation of a non-Biblical development of a corresponding term, nor do we believe that the Biblical evolution continues uninterrupted into any type of post-Biblical literature.<sup>3</sup> The parallels are in most cases the result of the basic agreement of the psychology of all peoples and of the similarity of primitive folkloristic conceptions in all civilizations. In the parallels we have to look for analogies rather than origins.<sup>4</sup>

In still another point our procedure differs from the method of all the previous discussion of our subject. We do not assume that every passage with the term should be definitely assigned to but one class of connotation. Many, if not most, passages are discussed under more than one heading. There are two reasons for this procedure. In the first place, it is not always possible to establish beyond the shadow of a doubt exactly what the speaker or writer implied in using a certain term. Here we do not

refer to our inability to reconstruct the past in all details, because we do not, as yet, have access to all the facts. We would not be justified in making our own shortcomings a methodological principle. But we maintain that even the contemporaries could not always be sure about the shade of meaning implied in a certain usage of the term.<sup>5</sup> But even more important is the fact that one and the same individual may have used the same term at one time with one connotation in mind and at another time thinking of a different connotation.<sup>6</sup> Moreover, one may use a term and think of its various implications at the same time, and a Biblical author might well have chosen the expression Sem Yahweh just because of its ambiguity, or rather its manifold meanings, just because he wished to create various pictures in the minds of his listeners or readers.

#### Discussion of Previous Treatments of the Subject.

The first comprehensive treatments of our subject centered around the New Testament, especially around the institution of baptism in the ~~Name~~ of Jesus. Brandt,<sup>7</sup> Boehmer,<sup>8</sup> and Heitmüller<sup>9</sup> wrote on this subject. Brandt deserves credit for the undertaking of the first comprehensive study of the problem, and he stresses the influence

lc

of the Aramaic and rabbinic literature on the New Testament expression. Boehmer believes that we have to examine the Old Testament if we want to find the origin of the New Testament formula. For this reason, he presents a rather comprehensive study of the term in the Old Testament and, therefore, his treatment, as the first of its kind, is of great value for our Biblical study. Heitmüller tries to find the explanation of the New Testament formulæ in the Greek language and the common folkloristic background. Even before Heitmüller, an excellent study of the Old Testament usages of the Name of God was made by Giesebrecht.<sup>10</sup> He presents a good summary of the previous treatments of the subject including smaller articles in Biblical dictionaries and histories of theology. His criticisms are objective and, for the most part, agree with our opinion. It is for this reason that a detailed report of all articles was considered superfluous, and we simply refer to the respective passages in Giesebrecht.<sup>11</sup> Likewise, he gives a summary of a considerable amount of folkloristic material known in his days,<sup>12</sup> and we shall mention only discoveries and books that were published after Giesebrecht's book. In 1903, Rabbi Benno Jacob published a book on the same subject<sup>13</sup> attempting to refute all previous opinions. His work, however, is a definite retrogression. Whereas Giesebrecht had recognized that the term Šem Yahweh had come to mean many qualities and aspects of the deity, Jacob reverted to the previous notion that the basic meaning of the term

is the one implied whenever and wherever the term is used. He goes even further in this direction than any one before him. Boehmer had assumed one single meaning for the expression b<sup>e</sup> Sem Yahweh. He believed that in all cases this expression implied a local and real, or quasi-real, contact with the deity. Jacob was not satisfied with establishing one single meaning for a certain phrase; he was sure that the term had but one meaning in whatever connection it occurred. Sem Yahweh is to him the word, the vocable, Yahweh, and there is no other meaning, neither is there an exception to the rule. The absurdity of this opinion will be shown in the main section treating the general meaning of the term.<sup>14</sup>

The authors of most Biblical dictionaries seem to have accepted Giesebrecht's opinion on the subject, and there is no further comprehensive discussion of the matter until 1934. In that year, Grether wrote the most recent book on the Name of God and combined with it an investigation of the term D<sup>e</sup>bar Yahweh. His findings do not add much to those of Giesebrecht. In one respect, however, his method is superior to the procedure of all his predecessors. Distinguishing between pre-Deuteronomic, Deuteronomic, and post-Deuteronomic usages of the term he implied ~~implied~~ an historic development of the meanings of the Name of God. In spite of this feeble effort to treat

the subject historically, it remains our task to trace the evolution of the term Ṣem Yahweh and to coordinate the various periods of its development with the history of Biblical theology.

The Meaning of the Word "Name" and its  
Equivalents in Other Languages

The English dictionary<sup>16</sup> gives the following definitions of the word "name". 1. The title by which any person or thing is known or designated; a distinctive specific appellation, whether of an individual or a class. ... 2. A description or qualifying appellation given to a person or thing, on account of character or acts; epithet. Is. IX. 6 (sic in loc. cit.) ... 7. Anthropol. The appellation of a person as a magic entity, - sometimes confused with the soul or spirit. Many peoples believe that the name of a person contains in itself some essence, a part of the life of the owner, and must not be given or taken away. This definition would fit the equivalents of the word "name" in almost all languages, - Aryan, Semitic, or others, - and it includes all we need for the understanding of the concept "name". Definition one and two are doubtless~~ly~~ correct and self-evident. The validity of definition seven has been challenged by some scholars. It is not quite as obvious and, therefore, we shall proceed to establish its validity once and for all by quoting the outstanding authorities in various fields of scholarship. Mac Culloch may speak for comparative religion: "That the name has

come to be regarded as part if not the whole of the personality in universal folk belief is undoubted." 17 Frazer, the anthropologist states: "Unable to discriminate clearly between words and things, the savage commonly fancies that the link between the name and the person or thing denominated by it is not a mere arbitrary and ideal association, but a real and substantial bond ... " 18 In the field of psychology, Freud explains that the forgetting and distortions of names are the result of one's wish to repress the memories associated with them. Subconsciously one destroys persons or objects or memories by destroying their names in one's mind.<sup>19</sup> Freud, as well as the literature quoted above, cite innumerable cases which illustrate our point. Perhaps, the most interesting and characteristic custom proving the identity of name and essence or name and real being, is the following ceremony mentioned by Frazer. At Eleusis, the names of priests were engraved on tablets and sunk in to the sea to be forgotten for all generations. This one rite illustrates two points. In the first place, the names of the priests had to disappear, lest they become known to evil spirits. Demons knowing the names of the priests would have power over the priests themselves, and this would spell disaster. In the second place, the ceremony gives evidence ~~to~~ the belief that the irrevocable loss of the



corporeal tablets with the names engraved on them would eo ipso guarantee a complete disappearance of all memory of the incorporeal names. Frazer fittingly concludes the report of this custom by emphasizing that it was not a primitive rite of pre-historic times or of savages, but a part of the religion of civilized Greece: "A clearer illustration of the confusion between the incorporeal and the corporeal, between the name and its embodiment, could hardly be found than in this practice of civilized Greece."<sup>20</sup> Judaism, like any other culture, knows this confusion of the name and the essence of a thing. In the Bible the giving of names is done with the utmost care. Names seem to indicate the character of their bearer. Thus, the names are changed if the character changes, as we know from the cases of Abraham and Sarah. The Biblical name Adam is particularly interesting, because it seems to fit all the meanings of the dictionary quoted above. Adam is a title by which the first man was known. It is a distinctive appellation both of an individual and of the species of man. It is a descriptive or qualifying appellation of the being created of earth. It finally describes the essence of the first man, as of man in general, born of dust and destined to return to dust. A comprehensive list of beliefs and superstitions,

based on the identification of the name of a person with his essence or very life, can be found in Dr. Lauterbach's article on the Naming of Children.<sup>21</sup> He shows that such beliefs come from the oldest Biblical times and continue into our days.

Looking for explanations of this phenomenon, common to all human folklore, some scholars - mostly philologists - suggested that proper names originally were adjectives. One would call another person by his outstanding quality and in such a case the name, naturally, would describe some of the person's very essence. Such procedure, however, would not explain how the names given at the birth of a child came to be regarded as part of his essence. Besides, the explanation as such seems to be much too rationalistic, too much of 19th and 20th century thinking, to be the true origin of a folkloristic situation, coming - as it seems - from the very beginning of human consciousness, from the deepest and most irrational stratum of primitive human psychology. Explanations like Freud's and Frazer's probably come much closer to the truth of the matter, although we must admit that it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, for us to reconstruct thinking processes of man in the earliest historic and even pre-historic times.

Most of the above-quoted scholars and branches of scholarly endeavor tend to pronounce the identification

of name and essence of a thing to be a matter of the past. There may be more or less truth in most of their explanations; but we shall never be able to understand the phenomenon, unless we realize how much of it is still alive among us even today. Semantics recently has taught us to rediscover the reality of words and names. A man may be well known in his community and liked for his strivings for social justice. Let him through some strange associations or through libels receive the name "Communist" or "Red" and he will be an outcast in the same community. He does not need to change his life; the change of his name is sufficient to cause almost his death. "Jew" is such a strange and almost magic name. One might wonder - even from a strictly scientific point of view - if there is much of a difference between the destruction of the Jews in Germany and the driving out of the devils in former days. All evil is named "Jewish," and then all evil is expected to disappear, if the name Jew disappears from this world. Again, the destruction of the Jew is accomplished not only by destroying the body of the Jew, but, in many instances, Jews are burned in effigy; whoever witnessed the burning of Jewish books and observed the reaction of the people present must realize that the people experience more than the burning of some dead objects. Such burnings are more than grand shows. The expression

of anger and joy at the same time, the seriousness of the whole affair, made one realize that in the minds of the fanatics the burning of the name Jew and the words written by them was as real and as effective as was the auto-da-fé of living Jews to the Spaniards in the Middle Ages.

From a different angle, Dr. Cronbach suggests the reality of the Name "Jew". He feels and states that the much mentioned persistence of the Jew consists only in the continuance of his name.<sup>32</sup> If this suggestion be true, and there is little one can say in refutation of this view, we must admit that there is reality and essence in a name even today, and the scientists will have to re-examine the border lines between mythology and modern psychology.

#### The Word Sem and its Etymology.

Boehmer emphasizes that there is a fundamental difference between the meaning of the Hebrew Sem and the German word Name,<sup>33</sup> which by the same reasoning would have to apply to a comparison of the Hebrew with the English. Boehmer does very little, however, to substantiate his view. True, translations are never exact. When it comes to the finest nuances, to the last connotations of a word, something of its color must, of necessity, be lost in the translation. For, some shades of meaning have little to do

with philology, but have very much to do with the history and the life of a people. In that sense, the Biblical sem and "Name" are not identical. Neither are the Biblical and the Modern Hebrew sem. The sum total of the implications of a word can be understood only through the life in connection with which the respective word is used. Therefore, the Biblical sem can be understood in its entirety only in the Biblical setting, and the discussions of these various connotations of our term in connection with the reality of Biblical belief and their unfoldment in the light of Biblical history is exactly the task of this paper. But, looking for a general primary meaning of the word sem on which to base our studies, we find that the concept of our word "name" covers the ideas designated by sem very well. As a matter of fact, there are few words in Semitic languages the translations of which are as adequate as is the translation of sem by "name." Even the etymology of sem seems to parallel the development of the Indo-European nama. Both words probably have the original meaning of a distinctive mark branded on animals to establish ownership. These signs, possibly, were marks of tribes rather than marks of individual ownership. Therefore, the next meaning of the words is tribal designation, tribal names, names in general, with all the implications discussed above. It must be noted that there is

*20/1/40  
sem for  
this assertion*

considerable doubt as to the original root of the Semitic word (<sup>v</sup>s.m.) but most scholars agree that the meaning of the word must have developed in the above fashion. This development is mirrored in the dictionary meaning of the word <sup>v</sup>sem. Mandelkern translates: signum, monumentum; nomen; nomen celebre, fama; bonum nomen, bona fama; fama post mortem, memoria.<sup>24</sup> The fact that he gives signum, and not nomen, as first meaning seems to imply some such etymology as we have given with the mark branded on an animal as primary meaning. For a detailed discussion of the etymology of <sup>v</sup>sem we may turn to Boehmer,<sup>25</sup> Heitmüller,<sup>26</sup> Giesebrecht,<sup>27</sup> Jacob,<sup>28</sup> and Brandt,<sup>29</sup> whose conclusions are summarized in the etymology given above. Even Gesenius cannot add anything, but simply refers exactly to these five works which we have already consulted <sup>on</sup>at several occasions.<sup>30</sup> Just as in the case of the definitions of "name" in general, so in the case of <sup>v</sup>sem, there is disagreement only with regard to one point, i. e., the question of whether <sup>v</sup>sem may mean the essence of a thing or not. Mandelkern omits any mentioning of a meaning conveying the idea of essence or similar ideas. But even Jacob, who denies that <sup>v</sup>sem Yahweh may ever mean the Essence of God, must admit that according to Hebrew, and probably general Semitic belief, it is not until a being is named that it has its real existence.<sup>31</sup>

The bulk of the material adduced by the vast majority of the authorities in the field and, particularly, by the authors of the books <sup>v</sup>trating our subject leave<sup>s</sup> little doubt that the Hebrew <sup>v</sup>sem <sup>i</sup>makes<sup>s</sup> no exception <sup>to</sup>from the group of its equivalents in other languages. It, too, comes to mean something of the essence of the thing which carries the name. There may be room for disagreement as to how far the identification of name and essence may go; but, at this point it is sufficient for us to know that, in addition to the meanings given by Mandelkern, <sup>v</sup>sem may also designate something of the essence of a thing.<sup>32</sup>

## THE TERM <sup>✓</sup>SEM YAHWEH IN THE BIBLE

### Definition of the Biblical Term

We have attempted to define the word <sup>✓</sup>sem. The other part of our term, the nomen proprium Yahweh, is generally known. We know that it refers to the God of Israel, and this general knowledge is sufficient for our purpose. All other problems concerning the Tetragrammaton, such as etymology, are among the most involved problems of Biblical scholarship and fall outside the limits of this study.

In the general definition of the term there remains now the question of the grammatical and logical relationship in which the two words stand to each other. This problem, though quite simple, was never completely clarified. In the term <sup>✓</sup>Sem Yahweh the word <sup>✓</sup>sem is in the construct state, or, in other words, Yahweh stands in genitival relationship to <sup>✓</sup>sem. The relation between <sup>✓</sup>sem and Yahweh, consequently, may be any expressed by the genitive. Yahweh may be the genetivus subjectivus or the genetivus objectivus. The logic of the word "name" demands the objective case in most instances. Somebody's name is usually the name given to somebody, and so we have to expect <sup>✓</sup>Sem Yahweh to mean the name by which God is known. But we have to, at least, consider the other possibility.



Yahweh in the term could be in the objective case, i. e., genetivus auctoris. A father and a mother may have a difference of opinion concerning the name they should give their new-born child, and in this case a relative might well say, that he likes the father's name better than the mother's, implying that he likes the name thought of by the father better than the name thought of by the mother. By the same logic, in some instances, we have to consider the possibility that sem Yahweh may mean the name given by God to something rather than the name that is given to God. In any case, the genitive Yahweh states that the term refers to a name or the name that is somehow connected with Yahweh. This concept sometimes may refer to the Tetragrammaton, but to maintain that it always does means to misunderstand the real relationship between the two words of the term. When Jacob in his Im Namen Gottes, though recognizing the genitive of Yahweh, insists that the term means the vocable Yahweh, he makes the logical relationship one of apposition rather than one of a genitive.<sup>33</sup> The Hebrew equivalent for his translation would not permit sem to be in the construct case and should be something like hasem Yahweh, an expression which never occurs in the Bible. All this applies in the same degree to the term in the form of sem with a possessive suffix referring to Yahweh. The possessive suffix, too, may indicate an

objective or a subjective relationship. It, too, signifies some type of connection between the object and its "possessor." Just as little as "my horse" means "the horse I," can His name mean the vocable Yahweh. Only in one case can there be any doubt as to what is meant, and that is the few instances where the Bible uses hasem.<sup>34</sup> "The name" may mean "that famous name of Yahweh," or "the famous name 'Yahweh'." We shall have to consider these cases individually. Now we can consider what implications the Bible had in mind when it spoke of "the name that belongs to Yahweh."

### Nomen Proprium

In as much as "sign" and "mark," the primary etymological meanings of sem, are definitely pre-Biblical, we have to start our historic investigation with the instances where sem has the basic meaning of a nomen proprium. At first thought one should expect to find many examples of this usage in the Bible, showing it to have been used in all periods. One should expect it early, because it is the basic meaning. One should expect it late, because sem always retained its basic meaning in the human sphere. Even speaking from the point of view of logic, there is no reason why this basic meaning should not remain extant in connection with the Deity even if the term had come to assume additional connotations. The facts disprove this preconceived notion of the frequent occurrence of the term in its basic meaning. In the earliest period of Biblical literature, the term is conspicuously absent in all forms and meanings. The six occurrences in the Book of Amos are definitely secondary material .<sup>35</sup> Hosea does not refer to the Name of Yahweh at all. In the first 40 chapters of Isaiah we have only seven instances of the use of this term,<sup>36</sup> and again they occur only in secondary passages. It is only with Jeremiah that we find the term in certain definite meanings.

To judge from the prophetic literature, then, Ṣem Yahweh, or its equivalents, was not used until the first half of the 7th century. The picture in the Hexateuch is similar, though not quite so clear. K, its "Oldest Document," does not contain any reference to the name of God; neither does O, for even the negative reference in Ex. 23. 13b is secondary.<sup>37</sup> In the other sources we find some instances of ṣem referring to God. In the early J<sup>1</sup> or L source we find a reference which - probably more than by coincidence - gives the most typical and perhaps the only typical example of the basic meaning of ṣem referring to Yahweh. In Gen. 16. 13 Sarah calls God's name El R<sup>o</sup>'i. This is the typical construction of naming somebody something,<sup>38</sup> and we have exact equivalents, not referring to Yahweh, in the same source.<sup>39</sup> In the historic books, Ṣem Yahweh occurs in the earliest strata of Judges, Samuel I & II, and Kings I & II; but none of these passages contain the term in its basic meaning, although they imply a concept most closely related to the basic meaning and will have to be discussed in the next two chapters.

Coming from later periods there are a few expressions the meaning of which might be considered basic, but they give the impression that their author intended to do more than just tell us the nomen proprium of Yahweh. When

Ex. 34. 14 states that God's "name is Yahweh Qanna", He is a jealous God," the verse wants to inform us that His name "Jealous" indicates His jealous Nature.<sup>40</sup> If we compare Ex. 3. 13 with this verse, we may conclude with Jacob <sup>41</sup> that in Ex. 3. 13, too, the question <sup>asked</sup> for the Name does not only mean that Israel will ask for God's nomen proprium, but rather for God's Nature which is implied in His nomen proprium. If we interpret the question thus~~ly~~, we naturally have to translate the answer in Ex. 3. 15 <sup>42</sup> in the same manner. " Yahweh is my Name, my Nature described by my Name, and zikri for ever." The parallel between sem and zeker is very interesting. If we translate zeker in the traditional way as "memorial," we have a strong indication that sem is used in the early basic meaning signum and memoria. Even such a translation would not exclude the possibility that God's Nature is implied, but it would only confirm that even in the earliest times, the mark of a thing <sup>indicated</sup> ~~marked~~ its character. In this sense, zeker must be translated as something like "title," <sup>43</sup> and this would be the English equivalent of the entire passage: "Yahweh has sent me to you and it (the word Yahweh) is my characteristic mark and my title for ever." <sup>44</sup> The above explanations of Ex. 3. 13, 15 suggest a similar meaning in Ex. 6. 3b,

2  
 which, then, should be translated: "... , but I did not reveal Myself to them concerning the content and implications of the phrase 'My (characteristic) Name is Yahweh.' " 45  
 Ex. 33. 19 and 34. 5 seem to belong to this group of verses speaking of a revelation of God's name and implying the revelation of God's nature. 46 These passages must belong to a comparatively late time and show how much the expression "Name of Yahweh" has become a stereotyped phrase. If there still be any need of proving that the phrase became a term, something on the order of a terminus technicus, the sentence w<sup>e</sup>cara'ti b<sup>e</sup>sem Yahweh, spoken by God himself, establishes it beyond the shadow of a doubt. God does not say: "I shall call on my name," as one should expect; but the writer is accustomed to the formula b<sup>e</sup>sem Yahweh and puts that same formula into the mouth of Yahweh. The term is used so mechanically that the writer seems to have forgotten its basic meaning. It is used so formalistically that the writer seems to have forgotten that it can be declined.

Another phrase, closely connected with the basic meaning and pointing to Yahweh's proper name as having great significance is nicra' b<sup>e</sup>sem Yahweh. 47 The verb qara' proves that this usage of the term also belongs to the group employing the term as nomen proprium; but its theological implications have outgrown the basic meaning

altogether. The fact that a prophet, Israel, Jerusalem, in fact anything, is called by God's name does not mean very much in itself. It becomes meaningful only when we realize that calling one's name over something implies a close relationship. Since the implication of close relationship is a result of the usage of one's name for indication of ownership, the full meaning of the phrase will be understood only after the discussion of the usage of God's name in this sense and of other secondary meanings.<sup>48</sup> Here it is enough to mention that this phrase grew out of the basic meaning, and its grammatical form betrays this origin. There is another grammatical aspect of this phrase that must be discussed. This phrase is one of the cases which admits both an objective or a subjective *genitive* as in the case of Yahweh. In the first case there would be a close relationship between Yahweh and the thing over which His name is called, because His own name is used to signify the thing. In the second case Yahweh himself would have given a name of His own choice to the thing, which would imply an intimate knowledge, a close relationship. One may be inclined to accept the objective *genitive* rather than the subjective, because it is more common in connection with the word "name;" but often it is very difficult to find a con-

nection between the thing and the name "Yahweh," so that the subjective case may be preferable.

Finally, phrases like Yahweh S<sup>e</sup>ba'ot S<sup>e</sup>mo <sup>49</sup> and similar expressions <sup>50</sup> seem to make use of S<sup>e</sup>m referring to Yahweh in the meaning of a nomen proprium. Naturally, these phrases, too, imply more than a mere statement of the nomen proprium of God. They usually stand at the end of important passages and seem to convey the meaning: "this is absolutely certain, for Yahweh S<sup>e</sup>ba'ot is God's name." <sup>51</sup> These passages are to be classified under the chapter dealing with the nomen proprium only, if we assume that the meaning of certainty and power is not so much the implication of the term (S<sup>e</sup>m Yahweh) as it is the implication of the modifier S<sup>e</sup>ba'ot. Although the term itself, as we shall see, may take on the meaning of power, it is probable that in the cases which have an added S<sup>e</sup>ba'ot the element of power is expressed through addition to the name. We may perhaps assume that the passages which have the added S<sup>e</sup>ba'ot come from a somewhat earlier period, when the simple term had not yet acquired the meaning of power or when, at least, such implication was not quite as common as to make sure that it would be understood without the addition. <sup>52</sup> In any case, the meaning of the phrase is quite clearly "... , for 'Yahweh of hosts' is His nomen proprium," i. e. something like "'Yahweh, the



Strong, the Omnipotent,' is His name."

If we sum up our findings concerning the usage of sem as the nomen proprium of Yahweh, we can say that, with the possible exception of one rather early passage, it does not occur<sup>n</sup> in its purest form, i. e., denoting only the appellative of God. Once the term implies more than the mere nomen proprium, it is difficult to state, with any degree of certainty, if the appellative was the primary concept in the author's mind and the added implication secondary or vice versa. All passages in which the underlying concept of sem seems to be the idea of the proper name of God have been included in this chapter. The possibility of an unjustified exclusion of other passages from this group of verses must be admitted. It is possible that the author of some other vv. thought primarily of the appellative Yahweh when speaking of sem Yahweh, though we believe some other idea to be primary in them. Yet more probably some of the usages of the term enumerated above really do not belong here, because their added implication appears to be emphasized to such a degree, that we must doubt the primacy of the proper name in these phrases. Whatever the decision in a few individual cases, the verdict must be the same: Even counting all the cases in which the nomen proprium seems to be the main concern of the writer, irrespective

Gen. 16  
is not so

of how much of an added connotation may be involved the concept of the appellative, the use of the term as a nomen proprium is rare in the Bible. Attempting to find some reason for this fact which runs contrary to our first expectation, we may point to the general introduction. If the name in the human sphere tends to assume added meaning, how much more must we expect this to happen to the Divine name. Furthermore, since there is really nothing related to the deity which does not have great importance, it is quite natural that the name, too, takes upon itself added significance in almost every case. Finally, once the Divine name has come to have larger implications, it is almost impossible to use it in its basic meaning, because people will think of the secondary meaning anyhow. As the Biblical theology grew, the mere name lost in importance and changed its meaning completely,<sup>53</sup> so that the term could no longer refer to that almost non-existing appellative Yahweh. At the conclusion of this chapter it may be pointed out that, in fact, it is questionable whether an expression containing sem Yahweh merely as nomen proprium, if existing, would belong within the scope of this study; for such an expression could not properly be called "term." We are to study the peculiar usage of the logical unit sem Yahweh, not the two words sem Yahweh.<sup>54</sup> For all

these reasons the usage of sem Yahweh as Yahweh's nomen proprium is for us of merely historic and etymological interest; we can now go on to the problems with which we are more directly concerned.

## Magical Formulae

"To know the proper name of a man, spirit, or god inevitably gave one enormous power over these." <sup>55</sup> The power over a god which one can acquire through his name may be used to force that god to do what one wants him to do. This is magic, the use of the divine name for forcing the deity to act as one wishes. Magic is used in practically all religions, and many scholars see in it the very origin of all religion. It is sufficient to mention the very interesting myth of Isis and Ra and other magical rites connected with the name of gods, described by Frazer. <sup>56</sup> Dr. Morgenstern succinctly defines the importance of the name for magical purposes in this way: "Before the assistance of a deity can be invoked, it is essential that the name of the deity be known and pronounced. The mere utterance of the name binds the deity to one's service, enables one to command the labors of the deity on his behalf." <sup>57</sup> Post-Biblical Judaism knows of all types of magic performed with the Divine name. <sup>58</sup> It would be surprising if the Bible would be free of all traces of magical usages of the name of Yahweh. <sup>59</sup> There is the story of Jacob's struggle with the angel, which is reported by the comparatively old J1 (L) source. According to

this old source, Jacob asks for a blessing and then, more specifically, for the name of the angel. What possible interest in the name of the angel could Jacob have had save the intention to use it for magical purposes? It is precisely because the angel realized this purpose of Jacob's question that he refused to mention his name, although he did bless Jacob.<sup>60</sup> With almost the same words, the angel announcing the birth of Samson refused to tell his name to Manoah,<sup>61</sup> obviously for the same reasons. Another passage which seems to describe the magic of the Divine name is Amos 6. 10. Although the meaning of the v. is extremely uncertain, we are inclined to agree with Giesebrecht,<sup>62</sup> who suggests that the v. lets one silence the inquirer, because any conversation might lead to the pronunciation of the name of the deity. Such pronunciation would immediately summon the enraged deity causing more destruction. Thus we find that some of the oldest Biblical sources include examples of the use of the Divine name for general magical purposes.<sup>63</sup> Yet, one must admit that soon Biblical ideology turned against all crude magic, and consequently the use of the Divine name for primitive magic came to be considered an abuse of the name of God. Already the E source seems to turn against the most primitive use, name-sorcery; for the so-called Second Commandment originally probably had a prohibition of such use of the name

for unauthorized purposes in mind. <sup>64</sup> The implications of the Naaman story, which reflects the same cultural and religious conditions as E, <sup>65</sup> point toward an opposition to magic by means of God's name. II Kings 5. 11 states that it is the non-Israelite who expects the prophets to heal by calling upon the Divine name, by magically employing the name of the deity; but not so the prophet of Israel. His God helps without being forced by magical means. More convincing than these two passages, however, is the fact that no later portion of the Bible reports any use of the sem Yahweh for purposes of crude magic.

On the other hand, the belief in the power of the mere utterance of the Divine name did not disappear at any period of Biblical development. The crude way of forcing the deity to perform a specific act according to one's momentary desire was <sup>outgrown</sup> disdained; but, through the utterance of the name, one could acquire strength, particularly in battle against one's enemies. This usage of the Divine name, too, is current, particularly in the older periods of Biblical history. But, unlike the usage of the Name for the performance of miracles, the utterance of the Name as source of strength never disappeared. From a very early source <sup>66</sup> we have the report that David, fighting against Goliath, boasted

that the source of his strength was not a sword or a spear but the name of Yahweh of the hosts (of Israel). The expression, b<sup>e</sup><sub>y</sub>sem Yahweh, in this v. is quite clear. The name of God is classified in the same category as weapons of war. The early date of the passage excludes the possibility of interpreting the v. figuratively. The author of this passage did not say that piety protects one from defeat; he asserted literally that by force of uttering the name of Yahweh one can defeat an enemy; and the correctness of this interpretation is corroborated by the addition of S<sup>e</sup><sub>b</sub>got to Yahweh. The term, "Lord of hosts," too, must be taken in its original most primitive meaning, i. e., "Yahweh of the armies of Israel," and certainly not in the sense of the Lord of the heavenly hosts. David's weapon, then, is the name of Yahweh, who is the general over the Israelite armies.<sup>57</sup> We have a direct parallel - probably from a later period - in the prayer of Asa.<sup>68</sup> It is the same expression bo' b<sup>e</sup><sub>y</sub>sem Yahweh, i. e., to go to battle against an enemy while uttering the name of Yahweh to secure victory. From a much later age,<sup>69</sup> a similar usage of the name can be found in the refrain to a psalm. B<sup>e</sup><sub>y</sub>sem Yahweh oi' a<sup>a</sup>miylam in this psalm cannot mean anything but that all the surrounding enemies will be beaten off by means of pronouncing the Divine name. It is possible that in the late

period the author conceived this v. in a spiritual sense. In this case, the whole ~~v~~ must be taken figuratively, i. e., both the enemies and the weapons of battle are not real, but spiritual. If this be true, the author took a picture from actual battle to dramatize a spiritual fight, which would bring us to the same conclusion, namely, that as alte as the period in which Ps. 118 was composed the belief was current that enemies can be warded off by the pronouncing of the sem Yahweh. We are inclined to interpret v. 26 of the same psalm exactly like vv. 10-12, although Dr. Bittenwieser assigns v. 26 to a different psalm.<sup>70</sup> The word bo', so typical for this usage of the Name, connects this v. even more strongly with the battlefield than the phrases in vv. 10-12. Since v. 25 speaks of deliverance from an enemy, v. 26 follows quite naturally as an answer. "Yes, he who enters the battle uttering the name of Yahweh, he is blessed; we can give him our (official) blessing from the house of Yahweh." Various phrases in Ps. 20 require a similar interpretation. Following Bittenwieser we translate v. 2b: "May the name of the God of Jacob defend these;" v. 6b: "And in the name of our God we unfurl the banner;" and v. 8b: "But we shall triumph by the name of the Lord our God." All these are expressions of warfare, thus creating a unity in the



conception of sem Yahweh in the psalm. At least vv. 2b and 8b, and probably also v. 6b, must be translated exactly in the same sense as the passages in Ps. 118. The pronouncing of the name of Yahweh will defend the people and make it triumphant, and probably also by the mere utterance of the Name the warriors will be able to unfurl their banner over conquered territory.<sup>71</sup> In two passages the verb halak takes the place of bo'. In Sach. 10, we again find the typical military atmosphere. With Friedrich Horst,<sup>72</sup> we consider vv. 3b-5, 7, 12 a unit and date it as a pre-exilic composition. Then, there is no reason at all to change the vithallaku in v. 12 to vithal-lalu, as is suggested by the Greek text and is almost universally accepted. Only Boehmer<sup>73</sup> retains the Masoretic text but misinterprets it. After all that has been said in this chapter, the meaning of Sach. 10. 12b is quite clear. V. 7 states that "Ephraim shall be like a warrior ... and that their hearts shall exult in the Lord." How naturally is this thought continued in v. 12 ! "They are strong through the help of Yahweh,"<sup>74</sup> because they go to battle uttering His name." This interpretation of v. 12 strengthens Horst's argument for the unity of vv. 3b-5, 7, 12 and its early date. The second passage is Micah 4. 5. It is generally recognized that this v.

does not belong to the Messianic passage preceeding it. Theodore Robinson <sup>75</sup> considers it an early passage, because the author has not yet reached the stage of monotheism. Coming from such an early henotheistic stage the v. fits perfectly our interpretation of halak b<sup>e</sup>sem Yahweh. "Other nations go to battle pronouncing the name of their respective gods, but we go to battle pronouncing the name of Yahweh, Who is our God for ever and ever," and the implication is, of course, that we shall achieve victory because Yahweh is stronger than any of the other gods. We have established, then, that bo' or halak b<sup>e</sup>sem Yahweh and similar expressions mean to go to battle, to fight one's enemies, deriving strength from pronouncing the Divine name, and practically all these usages, particularly if employed in a literal sense, come from pre-exilic times. They are a result of the general belief in magic by means of the name of Yahweh.

The most common and frequent use of the sem Yahweh for magical or at least ritual purposes is its use in blessings, curses, and oaths.

The prototype of the usage of sem Yahweh in blessings is that ancient passage of David's dance and blessing before the ark. The entire problem is discussed by Kennedy, <sup>76</sup> and it is sufficient to quote his excellent commentary on II Sam. 6. 18: "HE BLESSED THE PEOPLE IN THE NAME OF THE LORD OF HOSTS; rather, 'with the name'; the

preposition denotes the means or instrument, the solemn invocation of the name being the channel of the Divine blessing. David "put the Name of Yahweh upon the children of Israel" (Num. 6.27, where verses 24-26 give the later form of the priestly benediction; see Kautzsch in Hastings' DB., extra vol. 64Of., for the full significance of the "name of Yahweh" in the earlier literature ...). To pronounce the benediction is reckoned as the third of the peculiar prerogatives of the priesthood in Deut. 10.8 (cf. Num. 6. 23, Lev. 9.22). Here, however, David, by virtue of his prerogative as "the anointed of Yahweh," combines priestly with royal functions, not merely wearing the priestly dress, but offering sacrifice and blessing the people at the close of the service himself. So, too, Solomon, I Kings 8. 14, 55, which clearly shows that these functions were not yet limited to a special class. ..." This commentary gives a survey of the problem, and we have only to add a few more illustrations and emphasize certain facts. The primary term is barek b<sup>ev</sup> sem Yahweh,<sup>77</sup> and the translation is in all cases "to bless by means of the name of Yahweh." Any thought to the effect that the individual who blesses was a representative of Yahweh was absent in these passages.<sup>78</sup> The term,

šaret be<sup>v</sup>sem Yahweh, <sup>79</sup> is related to the idea of blessing and, probably, should likewise be translated "to minister by employing the Divine name for ritual purposes," although in this case the possibility of a ministry authorized by Yahweh cannot be excluded with the same degree of certainty as in the previous case. The third expression šum et šem Yahweh 'al in Num. 6.27 is of late priestly origin and seems to have originated in a combination of the present term with the Deuteronomic concept of placing the Divine name in or on the Temple, to be discussed in a later chapter. A special form of blessing is greeting. Fundamentally there is no difference between the two, and greeting is nothing but a blessing at the time when one meets somebody else. So it is not surprising that we find corroboration for what we have said about the blessing in the forms of greeting. Ps. 129.8b clearly speaks of greeting, and yet by itself it might just as well speak of blessing. We have the same construction barek by means of the name of Yahweh. And in the form of the greeting we have additional proof for the fact that be<sup>v</sup>sem Yahweh is an instrumentalis and does not speak of any authorization by, or representation of, Yahweh. Ruth 2.4 states explicitly that the name

"Yahweh" was employed in greetings, and even in Rabbinic literature there is an extensive discussion about the question of whether or not one should employ the name of Yahweh in greeting a person. <sup>80</sup>

For cursing, the Bible employs the same expression as for blessing. Again, the sem Yahweh is the instrument through the utterance of which the curse is endowed with efficacy. The early passage in II Kings 2.24 <sup>81</sup> has the typical formula, qallel b<sup>e</sup>sem Yahweh. This is the only Biblical example for a curse by means of the Divine name, and this usage has nothing in common with vv. like Lev. 24. 11, 16, where the Divine name is the object of the curse and we have a typical instance of the hillul ha<sup>v</sup>sem to be discussed in a later chapter.

In modern civilization, there remains one institution which has retained the suggestion of an almost magical power of the Divine name: the oath. Is it not the feeling that the invocation of the Divine name in a false oath might be disastrous, might bring a curse and a destruction upon the one who swears falsely, which fills even the comparatively irreligious person with awe and dread? The institution of the oath is one of the few practices which has survived almost unchanged through the millenia. Two early sources report the exact wording of the oath. Jonathan, saying farewell to David, refers to the oath which

they had sworn by mentioning the Divine name "saying, 'The Lord will be between me and you and between my descendants and your descendants forever.'" <sup>82</sup> By pronouncing the name Yahweh, then, Yahweh Himself becomes a partner in this treaty sealed by an oath. Yahweh is the underwriter of the contract, and He has to see to it that the conditions are kept. If the treaty is broken, He, Who has become the guarantor, must ~~revenge~~ the breaking of the contract. Very much in the same way people must have conceived of the simple oath not connected with a treaty. By pronouncing the Divine name and calling Yahweh as witness for the truth of the statement, one makes Yahweh an active partner in the statement. Two ideas perhaps worked in the minds of the people when taking an oath by pronouncing the name of Yahweh. In the first place, one thought of the magical power connected with the name. The power of the name would destroy the one who swore falsely. In this sense the oath is nothing but a curse becoming automatically effective after a false statement. The oath, then, means something like this: "I shall be cursed and punished by the power that proceeds from the utterance of the name of Yahweh, if I tell a lie." The second idea connected with the oath and the pronouncing of the Divine name as its confirmation is the belief that by mentioning God's name one can

conjure up God's presence. <sup>83</sup> This latter idea agrees more with David's and Jonathan's wording of the oath and the above explanation of these words. Jeremiah reports another formula for an oath, and his was probably the standard form of the oath in later times. <sup>84</sup> Hay-Yahweh, "as Yahweh liveth," emphasizes the first idea. It is a challenge to God's power. If Yahweh is alive, if he has power, he will ~~revenge~~ <sup>21</sup> untrue statements. The one who takes the oath is willing to take all the punishment likely to proceed from the Living God, if he makes a false statement or does not act according to his promise. The second idea, too, is implied. If Yahweh is the Living God, He can be present at this place, and as He is the Living God, He is concerned in the truth of this matter. By calling on His name and emphasizing His attribute of life the one who takes the oath is willing to take the consequences resulting from the presence of the Living God Who has power to punish. We see how closely these two ideas are connected, and it is quite probable that in later times people did not differentiate between them. What remained probably was a general feeling of awe and consciousness of standing in the presence of Yahweh mingled with the dread of the magical power of the name of Yahweh.

All these implications are included in the standardized term, nišba' b'ešsem Yahweh, frequently used in Biblical literature.<sup>85</sup> Jer. 44.26 shows that the oath became so formalized that God swears by His own name. People have come to insist that any oath, any formal promise, must be made by means of Yahweh's name. Thus Yahweh swears by his own name; and yet people were still conscious enough of the implications of the oath not to have Yahweh say: nišba'ti b'ešsem Yahweh, which could have happened, if the formula had come to be used in a completely mechanical way. When Yahweh is credited with the statement: nišba'ti bišemi hašadol, the importance and reality of the Divine name in the oath is still acutely felt and appreciated. The term is used also in the Hiphil in the meaning of adjure, and its meaning parallels the form in the Qal.<sup>86</sup> The false oath is designated by the addition of lašeder<sup>87</sup> or a similar phrase<sup>88</sup> to the term, and such false oaths are considered a hillul hašem.<sup>89</sup> Related terms are nasa' et šem Yahweh and hizkir šem or hizkir be'lohiym.<sup>90</sup>

Let us sum up the results of our investigation in this chapter. In short they are as follows: P'ešsem Yahweh modifying the verbs bo', halak, barek, qallel, nišba', and verbs or phrases of similar character is an instrumentalis expressing that the action is done by means of the magical



or ritual power connected with the pronunciation of the name of Yahweh. All these terms must have been common in early Biblical times and are found most frequently, though not exclusively, in pre-exilic passages.

### Worship and Recognition of Yahweh as God

B<sup>e</sup>sem Yahweh indicates the ritual and magical use of the Divine name in connection with verbs like going into battle, bless, curse, and swear. A similar, if not identical, concept lies at the root of the phrase qara' b<sup>e</sup>sem Yahweh. Through the context of the numerous examples of this usage, it becomes absolutely clear that qara' b<sup>e</sup>sem Yahweh means "to worship Yahweh." It is not absolutely clear how this term came to mean "worship." The close relationship of qara' b<sup>e</sup>sem with some of the above mentioned usages, however, is quite obvious. The usual translation, "to call upon the name of the Lord," is neither correct nor does it make any sense. The word "upon" as English equivalent for the Hebrew preposition b<sup>e</sup> is quite unusual. And what sense does it make to call on the name of somebody? If the translator who uses "to call upon the name of the Lord" is thinking of the expression "to call upon somebody to do something," he is quite a distance from the meaning of the Hebrew idiom. In the first place, what happens to the sem of

the Hebrew idiom ? But even if for argument's sake we would admit that sem Yahweh in this phrase equals Yahweh (although such could never be the case with such consistency in a term used throughout all periods of Biblical literature), qara' b<sup>e</sup>... could never mean "to call on somebody to do something;" nor could it mean "to call somebody that he may do something;" such concepts in the best case could be expressed by the Hebrew qara' 'et, qara' 'el, or qara' l<sup>e</sup>...; in reality any construction with qara' used in this sense would be poor Biblical Hebrew. As has been suggested by several scholars, the preposition b<sup>e</sup> after qara' can only have local or instrumental meaning. I cannot see how a few scholars can possibly maintain that the preposition is local in our term. How can it be that "Abraham called within the word Yahweh." If the scholars advocating this translation think that they are improving on the usual "to call upon the name," they must have a strange concept of improvement. The answer to the problem, of course, is again the instrumental meaning of the term, b<sup>e</sup>sem Yahweh, and considering the preceeding chapter we are able to understand the phrase comparatively well. What all scholars have overlooked is the possibility of a pregnant construction in this phrase. If nitt<sup>e</sup>qu kapot 'el heharabah 91 means "the soles were lifted up and put on dry ground,"

if wayeherdu liqra'to <sup>92</sup> means "they trembled and came to meet him," why should qara' b<sup>e</sup>sem Yahweh not mean "he called, he exclaimed and worshipped by means of pronouncing the name of Yahweh?" If we translate the pregnant construction in a better way by rendering the Hebrew verb adverbially and extracting the English verb from the Hebrew preposition, if we thus translate wayeherdu liqra'to "they came trembling to meet him," a good translation for qara' b<sup>e</sup>sem Yahweh is "to worship aloud by (pronouncing or invoking) the name of Yahweh." This translation both does justice to the Hebrew idiom and makes good sense. There are many terms for worship in the Bible: qara' b<sup>e</sup>sem Yahweh stresses the formality and audibility of the prayer. The phrase, then, is another combination with the term b<sup>e</sup>sem Yahweh on the same order as the combinations of blessing, swearing, and the like with the term. The term again implies the ritual power of the name of Yahweh, which in this case is employed to lend efficacy to the prayer. Qara' b<sup>e</sup>sem Yahweh is "to worship aloud pronouncing the name of Yahweh."

An early passage which still illustrates the basic meaning of the term is part of the story about Elijah on Mount Carmel. <sup>93</sup> When Elijah bids the Baal's priests to appeal to their gods, while he would appeal to Yahweh, and when we are told that the Baal's priests comply with

Elijah's <sup>request</sup> and entreat their gods from morning till night, considerable actual calling, yelling, and shouting must have been involved, and we can imagine that the magical power of the names of the respective deities played an important part in the act of worshipping. For the importance of the divine names in this passage we do not depend on circumstantial evidence. We are told in v. 26 that all the Baal's priests did was to cry haba' al 'anu, from morning to evening nothing but two words one of which was the name of Baal. Elijah, though more eloquent than the Baal's priests, also employs the name of Yahweh quite frequently in his short prayer. <sup>94</sup>

Soon the term qara' b' sem Yahweh became an idiom expressing simply formal and audible worship without any stress on the idea of shouting or the magical power of the name. "To pray aloud" is the implication of the term as it is frequently used in the Abraham story. <sup>95</sup> Another example of this usage is Ex. 34.5, if we follow Dr. Morgenstern in considering Moses the subject of v. 5b. <sup>96</sup> It is important to note - and as far as I could see this has not been mentioned before by any scholar - that all these pre-exilic passages refer to an individual act of worship. In all these instances the Bible speaks of one prayer <sup>at</sup> ~~on~~ a certain place at a given time.

Quite differently is the phrase used in post-exilic

times. In all post-exilic passages qara' b'e<sup>v</sup>sem Yahweh refers to customary action and is used in a frequentative sense.<sup>97</sup> In this category, too, we have an example which still suggests the basic meaning. In Zecharaiah it is said of the remnant that in the future it will become accustomed to worship God aloud and, it continues, He will answer it.<sup>98</sup> In this v. there seems to be a certain emphasis on the call and hearken motif. The other vv. show no such emphasis; the term has come to mean customary formal worship. If any proof still be needed for this fact, we find it in Zeph. 3.9b. The parallelism there suggests that qara' b'e<sup>v</sup>sem Yahweh and 'abad are synonymous. The development of this phrase is a typical example of how the term in many connections becomes more and more mechanical as time progresses. In its early stage, every word was full of meaning and importance; it fitted a certain situation and was consciously used only for that situation. In its latest stage, it is colorless and stereotyped. It fits any situation and is used as the refrain of a psalm.<sup>99</sup>

If the act of prayer is the first instance of worshipping the particular deity, or if people who did not believe in the respective god come to worship that god habitually, the worship has the character of a recognition of the deity. It is an acknowledgement of the power of

the god. Gen. 4.26 <sup>100</sup> reports the first time when man accepted Yahweh as his God and gave expression to that new belief by formal worship. We have a passage which possibly tells us that Cyrus acknowledged the Divinity of Yahweh, <sup>101</sup> and if this is the thought of the v., it is again expressed by the formula for worshipping aloud. Just as in the case of worship in general so in the case of the worship as recognition of the Divinity of Yahweh, the formula which first referred to individual cases came to be used as an expression of universal recognition of Yahweh by a group without limitations of time or place. Joel 3.5 says that whoever will acknowledge God by worshipping Him will be saved. The parallelism in Jer. 10.25 and Ps. 79.6 indicates that the phrase is almost identical with the phrase "to know the Lord." Both phrases imply the consciousness and recognition of the Divinity of Yahweh, and they are so closely connected with each other that they have been interwoven into one expression. <sup>102</sup>

As a recapitulation, let us state that the term cara' b<sup>e</sup>sem Yahweh is a pregnant construction and means "to worship or acknowledge Yahweh publicly by the use of His name." It has been used in all periods of Biblical literature and underwent a definite development in meaning. While it was first used to refer to individual acts of worship, it later came to be applied to collective and frequentative Divine service.

### Indication of Ownership and Intimacy

✓ Giving a name to something, knowing and reciting the name of something, brings the named object into the dominion of the person who gives, knows, or recites the name. <sup>103</sup> Naming a thing means taking possession of a thing. Gen. 2.19f. seems to imply that by the act of naming the creatures man took possession of them; he acquired dominion over them. A newly conquered city is often named or renamed by the conqueror. <sup>104</sup> Later on this concept became weakened, and the giving and knowing of a name indicated merely a very close and intimate relationship. In modern times, the godfather, in Jewish folklore, the Kwater and the Sandik, remain linked to the child they have named throughout life. When the wife assumes the name of her husband, she does this not only for practical reasons; the wife's adoption of the husband's name signifies a close and intimate relationship and - at least in primitive society - symbolizes the wife's submission to the rule of the husband; she is called by his name, i. e., she becomes his property.

In all these customs of naming, we have to make one distinction which is very important to the full understanding of the ✓ sem Yahweh as expression of close relationship or possession. The relationship can be established by the act of naming, irrespective of what name is given, and, on the other hand, it may be established

by the name itself, irrespective of who gives the name. To give examples, a person can say to his godfather: "I have always felt close to you, because I have your name," i. e., the name by which the godfather had named the child. But a wife may say to her husband: "I am proud to be known by your name," i. e., the very identical name of the husband.

There are many clear examples for the first case in the Bible. God calls Bezalel by name and imbues him with the Divine spirit. <sup>105</sup> God calls the 'ebed Yahweh, <sup>106</sup> Cyrus, <sup>107</sup> and Israel <sup>108</sup> by their names. In all these cases it is quite clear that the intimacy with God springs from God's name. In Ex. 33.12b, 17b we find that God knew Moses by name, and it is not expressly stated by whose name God knew him; but the verb "to know" leaves little doubt that it was the name "Moses." <sup>109</sup> With the exception of the passages about Bezalel and Moses, all of the vv. we have mentioned in this chapter thus far are by Deutero-Isaiah. <sup>110</sup> They left no doubt as to which name was involved, because the person of the possessive suffix of sem was different from the person of the verb. If the verb was in the first person, the possessive suffix was in the second person, and vice versa.

Now we must turn to a second group of vv., which, though of entirely different grammatical structure, belong

Mean "to know intimately," as Ho. says and named  
by "to know" or call by the first name, i. e. to  
single out, be intimate.



to this chapter on account of their similar meaning. This group of vv., too, speaks of a close relationship between God and another party, and, exactly as in the first group, the name is the reason for that intimate relationship. The term, however, is not cara' b<sup>e</sup>sem, as in the first case, but this group uses the term nicra' sem 'al. This term designates God's possession of and intimacy with a prophet, <sup>111</sup> a house, <sup>112</sup> a city <sup>113</sup> and a people. <sup>114</sup> Since in the construction, nicra' sem 'al, the possessive suffix of sem always refers to God, we are again faced with our problem as to whether Yahweh is the objective or subjective genitive of sem. If we apply the question to the passages under consideration, the problem is whether these phrases are merely a different wording of the concept found in the Deutero-Isaianic passages or the expression of dependence on Yahweh by virtue of adoption of the name "Yahweh." The fact that all passages with cara' b<sup>e</sup>sem refer to the naming, not to the name, might be interpreted as a proof for either concept to be the foundation of nicra' sem 'al. One could say that it means "the name God gave is called over," because in all cases where we are sure to whose name reference is made it is the object's name that was given by God, it was the act of naming, which was the

reason for the intimacy. This might be good arguing, if those two terms appeared in the writings of one author. Then we could say that one might assume that both terms are expressions of one idea in the author's mind. But in as much as the one term is typically Deutero-Isaianic and the other typically Jeremianic and Deuteronomic, <sup>115</sup> it is quite probable that the two terms express two different, though related, ideas. In addition, the wording, which admittedly leaves some doubt, in the expression nigra' sem Yahweh 'al seems to point toward the objective genitive for Yahweh. It sounds like "the name 'Yahweh' is called over the thing" rather than "a name given by Yahweh is called over the thing." If this be true, and it seems quite certain, we may be fairly justified to conclude from this case to other cases and say that sem Yahweh usually refers to the name by which Yahweh is known rather than to the name which Yahweh gave, although we have to concede the possibility of the latter case in some passages, particularly when we remember the implications of the term Yahweh cara' b<sup>e</sup> sem in Deutero-Isaiah.

We have found, then, that a name may establish a close relationship and the right of ownership. This is true of both the giving of a name and the transfer of one's own name to the object to be possessed. In the Bible, with

exception of one v., in which the term is not yet quite developed, this entire idea of intimacy and possession by virtue of a name does not appear until Jeremiah. Jeremiah conceives of a natural, close relationship between Yahweh and Israel, because Israel bears His name. Deutero-Isaiah, consciously or not, changed the implication of this concept. Deutero-Isaiah, who believed that Israel would be returned from exile "l<sup>e</sup>ma'ani," for God's own sake and by His choice, made this relationship by virtue of the name a more active one. It is not only by the nature of things that God has to be close to Israel, as if it were, because they happen to be known by Yahweh's name; it is, rather, God's act of naming by his free choice and for His own sake that establishes the intimate relationship. God wanted Israel to be His people, so he established His claim by giving the name to the people.

#### To Speak in the Name of Yahweh

To speak or to do something in God's name is usually interpreted to mean action by the authority or as the representative of God. Of the vv. which are usually mentioned in this connection those with the verbs barek and saret have already been discussed, <sup>116</sup> and it has been proven that b<sup>e</sup><sub>v</sub>sem Yahweh in these expressions is

not a delegation of authority, but the means by which the blessing was pronounced or the service performed. All the other passages have dabber or nabbe' b<sup>e</sup>sem Yahweh. With the exception of two vv., <sup>117</sup> all the expressions with dabber obviously are used interchangeably with the phrase nabbe' b<sup>e</sup>sem Yahweh, <sup>118</sup> so that we can consider both phrases together. The expression, "to prophesy in Yahweh's name," occurs in both wordings nineteen times in the Bible. Jeremiah uses the term in both forms twelve times. <sup>119</sup> Three times it occurs in Deuteronomy. <sup>120</sup> The term with dabber occurs in three other passages, <sup>121</sup> and there is one more example with the term nabbe' in Aramaic. <sup>122</sup> What does the term, "to speak," or, "to prophesy in the name of Yahweh," really mean? In the first place, it implies that the prophet introduces his speech by a sentence which includes the name of Yahweh. Ez. 22.28 describes the n<sup>e</sup>biy'ye šeoer as saying "Thus says the Lord," when the Lord has not spoken. To prophesy in the name of Yahweh, then, means to introduce one's prophecy with the words, "Thus says Yahweh." This is the obvious implication, and it can be applied to all vv. There may be, however, a second implication. It is interesting to note that the term was not used before Jeremiah and that it was used preferably by Jeremiah. Jeremiah first used the term, niqra' šem Yahweh 'al; Jeremiah applied this term

to the prophet and by it designated the prophet as the servant of Yahweh. <sup>123</sup> Jeremiah might perhaps have thought of this situation, when he uses "to prophesy b<sup>e</sup><sub>v</sub>sem Yahweh." Maybe he and those who heard the term associated with the first implication the idea that he who is called by the name of Yahweh is speaking. In this case the prophet would speak not so much with authority as with submission. The prophet would say: "Thus says Yahweh," and would imply the statement: "I know this, for I am called by Yahweh's name, I am in His possession, I am His instrument, I am His servant." It is doubtful if the last idea could have been Jeremiah's idea. It sounds more modern and would fit better into the mentality of Deutero-Isaiah. But possibly even Jeremiah could have had such an idea in mind, particularly if we think of Jer. 15.16. Thus we come to the conclusion that nabbe' or dabber b<sup>e</sup><sub>v</sub>sem Yahweh means "to speak with the introductory statement, 'Thus says Yahweh,'" with the possible implication that the speaker himself is called by the name Yahweh and, therefore, is his instrument and his servant. <sup>124</sup>

#### Reputation

A man is known by his name. If his name is heard of in the world, he is well known. If his name brings

pleasant associations, he has a good reputation; if his name is connected with negative traits, he has a bad reputation. Thus "name" and "reputation" have become synonyms in most languages. Innumerable examples could be cited from English usage. "A person with a bad name is already half-hanged," says an old English proverb, and Shakespeare states: "Good name, in man or woman, is the immediate jewel of their souls." Already in the 17th century Rober South used the two words as synonyms in this statement: "A good name is properly that reputation of virtue which every man may challenge as his right and due in the opinion of others, till he has made forfeit of it by the viciousness of his actions."

A good example for the Biblical use of the word "name" is the end of the Book of Zephaniah.<sup>125</sup> The words sem and t<sup>e</sup>hillah are used as synonyms and possibly as hendiadys. The American Translation correctly renders both lithillah ul<sup>e</sup>sem and l<sup>e</sup>sem w<sup>e</sup>lithillah: "renowned and praised."<sup>126</sup> Ps. 45.18, addressed to a king, suggests that the mentioning of the name will be the cause of eternal praise by all nations.

There is no difference between man and God in the Bible's use of sem for "reputation." Yahweh's name is identical with His fame, glory, and honor. In some vv. this is evident through the terms used in connection

with sem. With reference to Yahweh, too, t<sup>e</sup>hillah is the preferred synonym of sem and its partner in the hendiadys. <sup>127</sup> Ps. 48.11 states explicitly: "k<sup>e</sup>sim<sup>e</sup>ka 'elohim ken t<sup>e</sup>hillatka." Dr. Battenwieser, remarking that k ..... ken signifies "the completeness of the correspondence of two objects or the identity of the two," translates this v.: "May thy name, yea, thy glory be told unto the ends of the earth." <sup>128</sup> Dr. Morgenstern translates: "Even as Thy name, so also Thy praise (doeth reach) to the ends of the earth." <sup>129</sup> In spite of the obvious similarity of the two translations they reflect a slight difference of opinion as to the concept underlying this v. Dr. Battenwieser considers the two words synonymous, and uses one as in apposition to the other. Dr. Morgenstern holds that the author consciously compares the two terms. According to Dr. Morgenstern "the v. says unmistakably that not only Yahweh's name, i. e., His reputation, but likewise the praise of Him reaches to the very ends of the earth." <sup>130</sup> The emphatic k ... ken in this v. certainly must have a meaning, and, therefore, Dr. Morgenstern's interpretation of the v. is the only plausible one. In other passages, however, coming from a later date, <sup>131</sup> the two words are used indiscriminately in a stereotyped

way, and there is no conscious distinction between name, reputation, and praise. sem and t<sup>e</sup>hillah are used together and interchangeably, and other synonyms like tip'eret <sup>132</sup> and kabod <sup>133</sup> are indiscriminately added to their company.

In other passages, the implications, "reputation" and "honor," in sem are evident through the context. The American Translation renders l<sup>e</sup>sem Yahweh in Is. 50.9 "in honor of the Lord, your God." As in this v., so in many other passages the term may be translated "honor" or "reputation." <sup>134</sup> In some cases, the sem Yahweh as God's reputation has the additional connotation of a memorial, of a reputation that is rehearsed over and over again. <sup>135</sup> In this sense, sem is often associated with the noun zeker or the verb of the same root. <sup>136</sup> All the passages mentioned thus far employing the term as an expression of Yahweh's reputation, fame, honor, or glory are Deuteronomic or of a later period. <sup>137</sup>

The term in the sense of reputation is part of an expression which has become a technical term in itself. We are here referring to the phrase, "for His name's sake." The implication and history of this idea has been recently discussed by Dr. Morgenstern in a special chapter of his study on Psalm 48. The results of the investigation fit so perfectly into the findings of this



paper that it is sufficient for us to give a short summary of Dr. Morgenstern's treatment, to list all the passages involved, and to refer to Dr. Morgenstern's article for all further details. <sup>138</sup> Dr. Morgenstern succeeds in proving that the idea of "for His name's sake" and the term l<sup>e</sup>ma'an s<sup>e</sup>mo have been conceived by Ezekiel. It is the answer Ezekiel gives to the question: Why should a just God redeem a sinful nation which refuses to amend its ways even in the face of punishment? The answer is: not for the nation's sake, but for Yahweh's own name's sake <sup>139</sup> Israel will be saved; for otherwise the nations might think that Yahweh is powerless and inferior to the gods of Israel's enemies. "When the Canaanites and all the inhabitants of the land hear of it, they will surround us and wipe us off the earth; and what wilt thou do then for thy great name?" <sup>140</sup> As a term this idea occurs in three forms. Once we find the form b<sup>a</sup>bur s<sup>e</sup>mo. <sup>141</sup> The second form is l<sup>e</sup>sim<sup>e</sup>ka in a sentence addressed to Yahweh, <sup>142</sup> or l<sup>e</sup>sem ood<sup>e</sup>siy in a sentence spoken by Yahweh. <sup>143</sup> The regular and most frequent form of the term is l<sup>e</sup>ma'an s<sup>e</sup>mo in all persons. <sup>144</sup> Sometimes the concept is only expressed implicitly as in Numbers 14.15-19. In all cases where the concept occurs either implicitly or explicitly, we recognize the idea which originated in Ezekiel, and we must assume that such a passage cannot

come from a date previous to Ezekiel. <sup>145</sup>

A correlate to the idea of "for His name's sake" is the idea of the sanctification and desecration of the Divine name. It is hard to say which one preceeds the other. Probably, they were developed together as one unit; for it is again Ezekiel who seems to be the originator of the concept. In the Book of Ezekiel we can trace all the forms of the doctrine. God acts "for His name's sake," because His name is holy, he acts "for the sake of the name of his holiness." <sup>146</sup> Acting in behalf of His holy name, then, is sanctifying His name; <sup>147</sup> it is preventing or checking the desecration and profanation of the Holy name. <sup>148</sup> Not only did God Himself cause the desecration of His name by His punishment of Israel and His sending it into exile, but Israel, too, indirectly desecrated His name by causing punishment. <sup>149</sup> Nor was the sin leading to the exile the only misdeed by which Israel caused the desecration of the holy name; the people desecrated God's holy name directly by such crimes as idol worship. <sup>150</sup> Probably, some conception of the holiness and desecration of God's name was primary, and, as Ezekiel developed the concept further, he included the idea of "for His name's sake" in his doctrine of Qiddus hašem and Hillul hašem. In

any case, the two ideas belong together, and since we can trace the development of the entire doctrine fairly well within the Book of Ezekiel, there can be little doubt that Ezekiel is the originator of the concept. We might possibly conceive that some general notion of the Holiness of the Divine name and the contingency of its desecration by causing God's reputation to suffer could have existed before Ezekiel. But we do not expect the fully developed term in its final form to appear before Ezekiel. We are surprised, therefore, to find the expression wat<sup>e</sup> hallelu 'et s<sup>ve</sup> miy in a passage generally considered original with Jeremiah.<sup>151</sup> Although we have no absolute proof, yet we are inclined to believe that the phrase is secondary in Jeremiah, and this belief is corroborated first by the fact that the entire passage appears to be somewhat in disorder,<sup>152</sup> but more so by the fact that the term with the verb hallel occurs only in two related sources, namely Ezekiel and the Holiness Code. In these two sources together, it occurs some fifteen times, so that the only occurrence in the Book of Jeremiah is suspicious, to say the least. After having disposed of the v. in Jeremiah let us finish the discussion of the development of the term. The Holiness Code considers children's sacrifices to Molech,<sup>153</sup> improper

offering of sacrifices by the koh<sup>a</sup>niym, <sup>154</sup> and false swearing <sup>155</sup> a hillul ha<sup>v</sup>sem. At this point we are not far from the rabbinic point of view that almost any crime, if committed in public, is a hillul ha<sup>v</sup>sem and almost any good deed, if done openly, and particularly the death of a martyr, is a ciddus<sup>v</sup> ha<sup>v</sup>sem. In addition to the term connected with the verb hallel, the term occurs once in Ezekiel and several times in later books of the Bible connected with other verbs. Such synonyms of hallel are tamme', <sup>156</sup> naqab, <sup>157</sup> na'as, <sup>158</sup> buz, <sup>159</sup> and tapas. <sup>160</sup> In all these expressions, we have the same idea developed by Ezekiel, namely that God's name, i. e., His reputation, suffers if the gentiles see a negative trait in the situation or the actions of Israel, the people that is called by Yshweh's name.

At the end of this entire chapter, we want to mention that Deutero-Isaiah's concept of "and they shall know" <sup>161</sup> is closely connected with the various ideas of God's reputation and the holiness of His name, <sup>162</sup> and that Ezekiel must be considered the immediate forerunner of Deutero-Isaiah's concept, even though we credit Deutero-Isaiah rather than Ezekiel with the formulation of it.

## Power

There is an early passage which links the idea of Yahweh's reputation with the manifestation of His power. Pharaoh was saved for a while to show him Yahweh's power and to have Yahweh's fame recounted throughout all earth. 163 Naturally, one's reputation and fame rests on one's power to perform great deeds. Thus sem, reputation, comes to imply power. However, the meaning "power" for sem originates not only in the idea of God's reputation; the magical use of sem, too, resulted in the concept of power. In Ps. 118.10-12, e. g., b<sup>e</sup>sem Yahweh, originally the power derived from the magical use of the Name, later on, probably, was understood to signify merely the help to come through the power of Yahweh. The idea of the power invested in man by means of the Name came to mean the power of God hypostatized in His name. The two ideas together, the Name as depository of God's power and the reputation based on God's powerful deeds, were united in the later use of sem to mean God's power as such. Sem Yahweh in later times refers to God's might.

In some cases, sem is associated with g<sup>e</sup>burah, thus 164 clearly indicating the connotation of strength. In other cases the same connotation is evident on account of the parallelism of sem gadol with typical expressions of powerful agents of action such as "the strong hand"

and "the outstretched arm."<sup>165</sup> Adjectives like niscab have the same force as gadol, modifying sem in the sense of power.<sup>166</sup> Verbs, too, may indicate that sem as their direct object implies power. To trust in,<sup>167</sup> to fear the name of, Yahweh<sup>168</sup> cannot mean anything but to trust in, or to be afraid of the power of, Yahweh. In these cases, however, sem is not merely power as an attribute of God. After all, one does not trust in an attribute of God, neither did the people of the Bible fear an attribute of Yahweh. It is God Himself Whom one fears, it is Yahweh or rather the Deity revealing Itself in a certain aspect in Which people trust. Thus, sem, which in earlier periods signified Yahweh's attribute of power, finally came to mean God in the aspect of His power. It was probably not until the time of Trito-Isaiah, certainly not until post-exilic times, that sem progressed from from the meaning of power, as an attribute of Yahweh, to the meaning of the Deity Himself revealed in His aspect of power.

#### Earthly Manifestation, Revelation, and Immanence.

As Biblical theology progressed and Yahweh became ever greater in the eyes of the people, of necessity He was removed more and more from every-day life. He was the great universal God Who had created the world and

directed the fate of nations; He sometimes appeared too great to be concerned with the details of a single man's life. His seat was the Heaven, from where He had a view over the totality of the world; a small place on earth seemed too tiny for His majesty. Yahweh became the great transcendent God. But human needs cry for a God who is close to man, whose help in the unimportant details of every life can be appealed to. Man needs a God Who lives on earth and in the heart of man, a God to Whom one can speak and Who answers, an immanent God. When Yahweh somehow appeared too great to be concerned with the details of human life, the people probably felt the need for an intermediary between man and God. This is a usual phenomenon in religion, and, no doubt, in the centuries after the exile the yearning for an intermediary was felt also in Israel. Indeed, at this time angels make their appearance in Jewish religion, though their position is not an outstanding one. It was the religious genius of Israel which preserved the purest form of monotheism at this time of religious crisis. Intermediaries between God and man were ruled out, but the gap between the insignificance of the needs of man and the great transcendent God had to be bridged. The difficulty was solved not by creating new divine beings, but by attributing to God a special aspect directed toward the details

of life on earth, interested in bringing help to man in the vicissitudes of his personal life. By what word or term could this aspect of God be called ? His name was the best possible bearer of the Divine aspect of immanence. His name was the instrument of His revelation and manifestation on earth. His name had already come to signify God's power and His acts of power, His name was also the instrument by which one could cause God to be present at a certain place; now the name assumed the additional meaning of that Divine presence itself, the aspect of God directed toward the performance of mighty deeds on earth and the aspect that would answer the petition of him who called by means of the sem Yahweh. The Name became the term which meant the Deity as far as was manifested in the life on earth, and in this all-inclusive term one can sense all the connotations that were implied in the term in earlier times. <sup>169</sup>

Thus "my name is in the angel" really means "my presence is in him," or as the American Translation renders correctly: "For I will manifest myself in him." <sup>170</sup>

The contrast between the transcendent and immanent God is clearly expressed in Ps. 8.2,10, where the hod Yahweh is in Heaven, but the sem is on earth. <sup>171</sup> The same idea appears to me to be expressed in Is. 57.15. The usual translation is this: "For thus says the high and exalted One, Who dwells enthroned for ever, and whose name is



Holy: 'I dwell enthroned on high as the Holy One, but with him also that is contrite and humble in spirit.' " Although the meaning of this v. is clear, it is very inadequately expressed if we follow the usual translation. Now, it is true that gados<sup>✓</sup> may be used as a proper name for Yahweh; <sup>172</sup> but more regularly gados<sup>✓</sup> is an adjective. <sup>173</sup> If we translate sem<sup>✓</sup> as Presence, we can retain the preferred and primary adjectival meaning of gados<sup>✓</sup>. Translating the phrase in this way and reading v. 15 a<sup>β</sup> with the Greek marom bagodes<sup>✓</sup> 'e<sup>✓</sup>skon we have a perfectly balanced pronouncement:

(For thus says) the high and lofty One

(enthroned for ever)

Whose earthly presence, too, is holy:

"I dwell on high in holiness,

But with him, also, that is of contrite  
and humble spirit,

... ."

This interpretation gives a beautiful parallelism of the introduction to God's statement with God's words proper, stressing the dual aspect in the nature of God in both cases. Is. 30.27 is another instance of sem<sup>✓</sup> Yahweh meaning God's revelation. A name cannot come from afar, but the appearance of the Lord may well come and inspire awe. George Adam Smith correctly comments <sup>on</sup> ~~to~~ the passage:

"The Name of Jehovah is the phrase the prophets use when they wish to tell us of the personal presence of God. When we hear a name cried out, we understand immediately that a person is there. So when the prophet calls, Behold, the Name of Jehovah, in face of the prodigious advance of Assy<sup>ria</sup>, we understand that he has caught some intuition of God's presence ... . In that movement God is personally present. " <sup>174</sup> The last sentence of Smith's commentary is quite correct. This passage in Isaiah is the only place where sem appears to be the visual revelation of God. The introduction "behold" and much of the description seems to suggest a vision. Such visual revelation, however, contradicts the primary meaning of sem. One cannot see a name, and in all other passages sem refers to the revelation by words or more often to the revelation implied in history and the actions of God. Very often sem stands in opposition to the visual revelation usually expressed by kabod or paniym. Therefore, this passage in Isaiah is to be interpreted in such a way that the prophet sees the advance of the enemy visually and in this visual apperception he recognizes the presence of God, not visually, but as revealed by His mighty acts. Is. 29.23 states explicitly that God's mighty act will lead to a reverence for His name, for that aspect of the Deity which is concerned with history and life

175  
on earth. The famous passage in Job 1.31 probably has the same implication: "Whatever God does, be it advantageous to man or to his disadvantage, the sem of God be blessed, i. e., we have to accept the acts of God, for all of them are manifestations of Divinity. This is the most advanced step. sem is originally God's reputation, then such manifestations of the Divine power as are likely to enhance Yahweh's reputation, finally it comes to mean all manifestations of the Divine will. At this last stage Israel can no longer appeal to the sem for favors "for His name's sake," <sup>176</sup> the sem outgrew this stage, too, and became as universal as Yahweh Himself. There are many other passages which appear to employ the term with the intention to stress the Divine manifestation on earth and the immanent aspect of the Deity, but many of them use the term so mechanically that one can no longer distinguish between sem, referring to an aspect of Yahweh, and sem referring to Yahweh Himself. <sup>177</sup>  
The final development of this concept of the name, being an aspect of God, leads to sem as the hypostasis of God, since sem is almost a synonym for Yahweh. To this phenomenon we shall devote our last chapter. Before we consider this last problem, however, we have to discuss some further shades of meaning of sem growing out of earlier stages of the concept of the Name as the manifestation of God.

In note 177, we mentioned already a few vv. which connect sem Yahweh, God's presence, with Jerusalem or the Temple. Indeed, without much investigation we can tell that there is a close relationship between the Temple and the Name. How is this association to be understood ? In I Kings 8.13, an ancient source, we read: " 'Build my house of habitation for me, that I may dwell therein forever.' " The Temple was to substitute for the cloud or the thick darkness in which Yahweh used to dwell. Yahweh was thought to move into the Temple and live in it. Ezekiel believed that Yahweh dwelt in the Temple and complains in Ez. 43.8 that the kings built their palace too close to Yahweh's habitation.<sup>178</sup> But, later on, religious thought progresses, and the people begin to ask themselves: "But can God really dwell with men of the earth ? Behold the heavens and the highest heaven cannot contain thee,<sup>179</sup> how much less this house which I have built ! " So God does not live in the Temple, according to later religious thought. What, then, is God's relationship to the Temple ? The Deuteronomic school traditionally was interested in keeping up the reputation of the Temple. Somehow or other the Temple had to have some concrete connection with God. So the answer to this problem is given in the next v. . No, God cannot dwell in the Temple. "Yet turn thou to the prayer of thy servant and to his

supplication, O Lord, my God, to listen to the cry and to the prayer which thy servant offers before thee this day, that thine eyes may be open toward this house night and day, even toward the place of which thou hast said,  
180  
'My name shall be there,' ..." According to the later Deuteronomists it is not God any longer that dwells in the House, it is His name; and after all that has been said before there can remain little doubt that His name signifies His presence, the immanent aspect of His Divinity. When II Chron. 20.8 f. says: "So they have dwelt in it and built for thee a sanctuary in it for thy name, saying, 'If evil come upon us, the sword in judgment, pestilence, or famine, we will stand before this house and before thee (for thy name is in this house), and cry out to thee in our affliction, and thou wilt hear and save.' " The clear implication is that some real aspect of God is in the Temple. It is clearly stated that if we stand before the Temple, we stand before God Himself, because His name is in the House. We do not stand before somebody, because we stand before his nomen proprium, if such a thing were possible. The people coming to the Temple came to God Himself, because His sem, the  
181  
reality of His earthly presence, was in the Temple.

The immanent God ruled the affairs of the earth from the  
182  
Temple as a king rules from his throne room. At this point we may pause for a moment, to explain in what sense we use terms like immanence and transcendence. It is

obvious that the people of the 6th, 5th, and 4th centuries did not philosophize as did the Greeks of a (much) later age or the theologians of modern religion. When using such terms we do not mean to imply that the people were conscious of the fact that God Himself was too great to be found in the Temple, but that there was an aspect of Him which could fit in the Temple. The people probably did not reason out these problems. Subconsciously, however, they had a feeling that it would be sacrilegious to limit Yahweh, Whom they had come to revere as the greatest Being, the ruler of all worlds, to a comparatively small house. On the other hand, they had a deep yearning, common to all religious people in all ages, for nearness to the Deity. They had a need to present their problems to the Divine presence, and they came to feel that they could find this nearness of God in the Temple, which their fathers had believed to be the dwelling place of the Deity. Trying to find a fitting name for that nearness when the need of expression of this thought arose, people naturally thought of the term sem which through a long development had come to be associated with similar ideas, as we tried to trace in the previous chapters. In this sense, then, Yahweh made His presence dwell in the Temple.

183

He made His presence to be in the Temple, <sup>184</sup> i. e.,  
 He placed His presence on or in the Temple. <sup>185</sup> In this  
 sense, Israel built a house lesem Yahweh, i. e., it built  
 the Temple to belong to and to be inhabited by the earthly  
 manifestation of Yahweh. <sup>186</sup> This thought <sup>187</sup> particularly  
 well expressed in I Chron. 29.16, where we have an addi-  
 tional leka. The Temple is built for God, in His honor  
 and in submission to Him, but not for Him to dwell in.  
 It is only a dwelling place for His sem.

It is not surprising that soon the city of the  
 Temple assumed the same position as the Temple itself.  
 Jerusalem became the city in which the Divine presence  
 dwelt. It became the chosen city, often mentioned to-  
 gether with the Temple itself. <sup>187</sup> As the Temple is the  
 court room of God's presence, so Jerusalem is the resi-  
 dential city, the "city of our God" and "the city of  
 the great king. " <sup>188</sup> As a matter of fact it seems that  
 at some time the relationship between sem Yahweh, God's  
 presence, and Jerusalem was associated in the minds of  
 the people with the relationship between the kebod Yahweh  
 and the aroon. Jerusalem was the seat of His Name. <sup>189</sup>

We do well to recall, at this point, that there was  
 another connection between the Temple and the name of  
 Yahweh. In our chapter on Possession, we mentioned that  
 the Temple was called "the house over which my name is

190  
called." This concept did not disappear. The Temple remained the possession of Yahweh for all times. Later on, however, after the sem as the Presence had come to be associated with the Temple, the two concepts probably became confused in the minds of the people, and their implications supplemented each other. When one expression with sem was used, the other was associated by way of implication. At the latest period the Temple was both the possession of Yahweh and the dwelling place of God's manifestation. It is due to this confusion that Jerusalem the residential city of the sem Yahweh, the Divine presence, came to be known as "the city over which Yahweh's name is called."  
191

Let us attempt to date this usage of sem as God's earthly manifestation. Grether and other scholars make the mistake to date certain passages as coming from a time immediately before the exile or from the early exilic period, only because the passage occurs in Deuteronomy. However, we must think of a Deuteronomic school extending over several centuries, and the fact that our term occurs in Deuteronomy does not date it exactly. We must attempt to date it in accordance with the development of Biblical theology. Dr. Morgenstern in his Book of the Covenant demonstrates that the concept of Yahweh residing in the Temple did not gain general recognition until



approximately the time of Ezekiel. It is quite conceivable, then, that a Jeremiah who was not so sure as yet if Yahweh resided permanently in the Temple or would come only on the New Year day, would call the Temple preferably "the house over which Yahweh's name is called." Wherever Yahweh dwelt, the Temple was His possession. The early Deuteronomists did not have to worry over a proper terminology for the relationship between Yahweh and the Temple, and that the Temple was the house of Yahweh or the house in which Yahweh had residence. A century or two later, however, probably at the time when the P writer described Yahweh as the great transcendental Deity of Whom nothing but His empty throne could be seen in the Temple, the Deuteronomic school was in a difficult situation. They wanted to uphold the tradition of the authority of the Temple and for that reason felt that some concrete tie between Temple and Yahweh had to be retained. The influence of the Priestly school, however, had become too strong for the Deuteronomists still to maintain that Yahweh Himself dwelt in the Temple. They themselves probably could not believe in such a crude concept any more. It was then that they took recourse to the concept of Yahweh's sem, His immanent aspect, His earthly manifestation, His presence, dwelling in the Temple and residing in the city of Jerusalem. The correctness of this development is corroborated by the fact that all the Deuteronomic vv.

speaking of <sup>✓</sup>sem Yahweh dwelling in the Temple occur in later strata of Deuteronomy, as becomes evident from Dr. Morgenstern's unpublished notes and studies of the Book of Deuteronomy which he kindly put at my disposal.

### Israel and the Covenant

Just as Yahweh is the transcendant God and His <sup>✓</sup>sem represents the aspect of His immanence, so is Yahweh the God of the nations, and His <sup>✓</sup>sem represents the aspect of His interest in Israel. These two developments go together and supplement each other. The transcendant God is the universal God. The God whose earthly manifestation dwells in the Temple in Jerusalem is Yahweh, the God of Israel. When henotheism was the religion of Israel, everything was simple. Yahweh Himself was the God of Israel, and He was nothing but the God of Israel. Even in the later, pre-exilic times Yahweh was still primarily the God of Israel, though He came to extend his rule over the other nations, too. But after the exile, many people recognized in Yahweh primarily the universal God of all nations. And yet, Israel had a special relation to that God, Who was ruler of the universe. Israel was particularly chosen as His messenger unto the nations, and again, this national nearness had to find expression just as the personal nearness found expression in the theology of the people. And again,

the sem expressed that aspect of immanence, this time of national immanence. The very fact that the sem resided in Jerusalem vouchsafed an intimate relationship between the sem and the nation whose center was Jerusalem. We have many passages which, though not explicitly, combine the idea of sem with the idea of Yahweh, the God of Israel, of the Savior and Protector of His chosen people. Most of these passages suggest that the victory of Israel over its enemies is somehow connected with the sem Yahweh, and the well known motifs of the sem as a help in the battle and "for His name's sake" reoccur in this connection. Again, we have a case where many implications may possibly be associated with the term at the same time. Yahweh became the God of Israel by virtue of a covenant. sem, the aspect of the Deity close to Israel, thus is associated with the covenant. This, however, is not the only reason for an association of sem with the covenant. First of all the name of Yahweh must be invoked, before a covenant can be concluded with him. Thus a reference to sem is always a reminder to the Urerlebnis of the entering into the covenant relationship. For this reason we find many connections with zeker. Already Orelli stated that the sem and zeker are synonyms, although he considered them particularly descriptive of Divine revelation, whereas we suggest that zeker points toward the covenant relationship rather than to the revelation. Thus the combination

of sem with either the noun or the verb of the root zkr<sup>195</sup> seems to me to imply the idea of the covenant.

'azkiyr 'et semiy, then, implies the same as zakartiy 'et b'riytiy; and, as we shall see in a moment, zakar 'et sem is the same as zakar 'et hesed Yahweh.<sup>196</sup>

Dr. Nelson Glueck has shown conclusively that the word hesed also refers to the covenant between God and Israel. In later usage hesed is almost a synonym with b'riyt, and 'emet and 'emunah are usually associated with hesed.<sup>197</sup>

Often two of these terms are used as a hendiadys.

Martin Buber independently ~~from~~<sup>of</sup> Dr. Glueck came to the same conclusion.<sup>198</sup>

Now, we understand the frequent association of sem with hesed and 'emunah, all of them referring to the covenant of God with Israel.<sup>199</sup> Which part does sem play in the covenant? It is not the covenant itself, as is hesed; it is rather the Divine element present in the covenant. Calling on the sem in this sense means to appeal to the Divine presence which has a part in the covenant. In addition, one may think of sem as of a seal or signature. These two ideas are related; For the signature on a document, the name affixed to it, testifies that the person represented by the name is a party of and to the agreement.<sup>200</sup> This covenant relationship is perhaps the most fundamental concept of Biblical theology, and the fact that sem is in some way

connected with it may explain the frequency and importance of the term. In some places this covenant is conceived of as a marriage between God and Israel. The term qados<sup>v</sup> signifies a marriage relationship, as it is included in the traditional formula of betrothal at a Jewish wedding ceremony. We cannot trace all the ramifications of this problem; but perhaps Q<sup>e</sup>dos Yisra<sup>e</sup>l may mean God, Who is, as if it were, married to Israel. The marriage, then, is another form of the covenant relationship, and from here we find more associations with sem<sup>v</sup> as an element of the covenant. The first is the connection of sem<sup>v</sup> with qados<sup>v</sup>, the second adds a new meaning to the idea of "being called by the name of Yahweh." As a wife is called by the name of her husband, so is Israel called by Yahweh's name. All these concepts are basic, and it would be well worthwhile to devote an entire study to the problem of the covenant and marriage relationship as reflected in the terms sem<sup>v</sup>, zeker, hesed, and qados<sup>v</sup>. 201

In attempting to date the period in which the sem<sup>v</sup> as element of the covenant was important in the minds of the people, I would venture the following guess: As long as the ark was thought to contain some symbol of the covenant, as long as the ark was the 'aron Habrit, there was little room for the sem<sup>v</sup> to play an important part in the concept of the covenant. But, when the ark became

the throne of the k<sup>e</sup>bod Yahweh, and this was the time when the sem was made to fill the emptiness of the Temple, the sem also assumed the task of the ark with reference to the covenant. <sup>202</sup> The "new covenant" at that time was thought to be an irrevocable one, and the only symbolism that might have meaning in such a setup is an abstract, yet in the minds of the people ever present, reminder of the covenant, and the sem was just that. Thus we see that when the sem came to be considered to dwell in the Temple, He took His residence there in more than one capacity, and not the least among them was the zeker habrit.

### Hypostasis

After all that has been said thus far, it becomes clear that as time went on the sem assumed an ever increasing number of implications and associations connected with Yahweh and the most fundamental concepts of God. The last stage of the development is that stage when all these implications become confused and merge, and the sem finally is almost identical with Yahweh. There are *so very many* innumerable passages which use sem Yahweh in such a parallelism with Yahweh Himself that it becomes clear that only metrical reasons or the need for a synonym <sup>suggested</sup> ~~made~~ the

use <sup>✓</sup>sem Yahweh instead of Yahweh <sup>203</sup> This development toward an identification of Yahweh with His name is, in the first place, as was stated, a result of mechanical usage of the term <sup>✓</sup>sem. In the second place, we have to remember that Biblical theology is primarily interested in God, as He manifests Himself on earth. The prophets hardly ever spoke about <sup>✓</sup>Who God was, but almost exclusively of what God did and what He intended to do. <sup>204</sup> God, as such, was of little concern to the ancient Hebrew; God, as revealed in history, fascinated the thinking of Israel. For this reason, a writer or speaker covered all of God that his audience was interested in, when he spoke of His <sup>✓</sup>sem, His earthly manifestation. Thus <sup>✓</sup>sem Yahweh became Yahweh in loose reasoning and speech. In exact usage, however, and by implication a difference always remained between God and His name, and it would be incorrect to say Yahweh give His name. The <sup>✓</sup>sem was never thought of as something that could be seen, as was the k<sup>e</sup>bod Yahweh, and very seldom as something that could be heard, like the dybar Yahweh, but almost exclusively as something that was manifest in history, something that could be experienced in life. The <sup>✓</sup>sem never lost the implication of an aspect of God rather than God Himself; <sup>✓</sup>Sem Yahweh attained much of the glory of God but never all His glory.

## OUTLOOK INTO POST-BIBLICAL TIMES

Dr. Morgenstern expresses the opinion that in the development of sem Yahweh we can trace the origin of the concept of the Son in Christianity, or, at least, that sem came to be connected with the Gnostic concept of the lofos, and thus entered into Christianity.<sup>205</sup> From my investigation of the problem, I could not find any corroboration of this idea. In no place in Biblical literature do we find so much as a hint of a trinity. In no place is the sem an independent or co-ordinated unit at the side of God. In no place do we find any intimation of sem being a product of Yahweh and then living an independent life. The only common feature is the fact that both sem and the son are directed toward life on earth. But more significant, toward the close, the sem seems to become less important. Marmorstein shows in his study that sem is only seldom used as a name of God in the Mishnah or other early Rabbinic literature.<sup>206</sup> It is only in the Middle Ages that hasem becomes a synonym for God, and then in quite a different meaning from that of the Bible. At that time, hasem simply refers to the ineffable Tetregrammaton. It is a linguistic device to avoid the use of Yahweh or <sup>A</sup>donay. We can only guess why sem Yahweh lost its importance in Rabbinic literature. It seems to me that it was the extreme monotheism and universalism of the early Rabbinic times that forbade the use of such a term as sem Yahweh. This preceded, at least by



a short time, the rise of Christianity, so that it appears to us impossible that the Son concept in Christianity had any connection with the Biblical concept of <sup>Y</sup>sem Yahweh, except, possibly, that a vague recollection of the Biblical idea was associated with the Christian concept, the origin of which must be sought entirely on non-Biblical grounds.

## SUMMARY

In ancient times <sup>✓</sup>sem Yahweh referred to Yahweh's proper name and was used in magic. Later on the magical power of the name was employed more formally in blessings, curses, oaths, and as an omen of victory at the beginning of a battle. It finally played an important part in prayer worship of the more formal type, and "to call by means of the name Yahweh" came to mean "to worship aloud." From the time of Jeremiah on, the name came to play an increasingly more important <sup>^</sup>role in prophetic religion of the more advanced type. Jeremiah considered himself speaking in the name of Yahweh. This fact was expressed by the introductory formula "Thus saith Yahweh." At about the same time the name was associated with Yahweh's reputation, and Ezekiel <sup>formulated</sup> ~~created~~ the concept of "for His name's sake." During the same period, the Temple was known as the possession of Yahweh, the house over which His name was called. Deutero-Isaiah changed the concept of "for His name's sake" into the idea that Yahweh would save the people, because by His own free choice He had made Israel His people. This idea is expressed by: "I have called you by name." As Deutero-Isaiah is largely responsible for the concept of Yahweh being a universal God, he also ushered in the later period of the development of the Name. This period, However, grows to full unfoldment only at the time of the priestly writers.

At that time Yahweh no longer dwells in the Temple, and the sem takes His place. The sem Yahweh in the Temple is the immanent aspect of God, the earthly manifestation of His being, the Guardian of Israel, and the Reminder of the covenant. Toward the close of the Biblical period, sem becomes almost identical with Yahweh, although it never reaches complete identity. As extreme rabbinic monotheism sets in, the sem is suppressed and becomes almost forgotten.

At the conclusion of this study, I want to say that the field is extremely intricate and copious. I feel that the foregoing study must of necessity be incomplete by reason of time limitations. Many a statement needs checking, re-checking, and further investigation. I believe, however, that generally the field was covered, and the development described in this study is accurate in its larger aspects.

## NOTES

1. "Name ist Schall und Rauch,  
Umnebelnd Himmelsglut."

Goethe, Johann Wolfgang,  
Faust, I, Marthens Garten.

2. The terms Bible and Biblical in this paper refer to the Biblia Hebraica (OT).
3. Grether suggests that the term in the New Testament had to start exactly where it started in the oldest Biblical period, which view agrees with my findings.  
( "Es ist, als ob der Name ähnlich wie das *λόγος* in der neutestamentlichen Offenbarungsperiode erst einmal am gleichen Punkt habe einsetzen müssen wie in der alttestamentlichen." Grether, Oskar. Name und Wort Gottes im Alten Testament; page 183 ).
4. Because of the frequent confusion with regard to the relationship of parallels in various types of literature - a confusion which is particularly common in the previous discussions of our subject - it may be worthwhile to discuss all possible connections which such parallels may have with each other. Let us take a case which is taken from the main discussion of our subject. We shall see that the term sem Yahweh in the Bible often implies power. In an old Babylonian text

we find that the name of the god Marduk likewise implies power. This congruity in the two texts may be the result of any of the following possible relationships:

- a. The Biblical term has its origin in the Babylonian term.
- b. The usage of the words meaning "name of god" as "power of god" is a peculiarity common to all Semitic languages.
- c. This usage of the term grows out of ancient West-Asiatic folklore and primitive religion, thus being pre-Semitic.
- d. This and similar usages of the name of a god spring from a basic concept of primitive man and can be found in the folklore of almost all peoples.

Relationship a. does not seem to exist in any parallels to the Biblical usages, because - as we shall see - most of the secondary meanings of the term occur only comparatively late in Biblical literature. If they were but extensions of pre-Biblical usages we should expect to find them in the earliest part of the Bible just as in later periods, unless they were imported in periods of particularly close cultural ties with those peoples in which they continued to be extant.

Such does not seem to be the case, because we do not find a sudden intrusion of previously unknown implications of the term into the Biblical literature.

All usages seem rather to be the outcome of logical growth and development. In addition, we shall find that the Biblical usages develop certain aspects which can not be found in any parallels, while the Semitic and pre-Semitic parallels of the West-Asiatic cultures show no more affinity to the Biblical term than do the numerous parallels from non-Asiatic religion and folklore. Furthermore, the frequency of occurrence of the term in Biblical literature is incomparably higher than in any other type of literature. For all these reasons we are forced to assume a unique development of the term in the Bible, which must be understood by internal evidence; and parallels show analogous usages.

5. In order to understand this fact it is well to compare it with our modern way of expression. Are we able to say definitely which concept of God a certain man has while addressing himself to God? Can we know whether that man prays to an anthropomorphic God or to a personal God void of any human features or to a pantheistic God; can we know whether his term God is applicable only to the powers of nature or to the

ideals of beauty or goodness ? The content of his prayer may exclude some of these possibilities; but, in all probability, some doubt will be left.

6. This phenomenon, too, can be understood from present-day usages. An orator may use the word "pilgrim fathers" on Thanksgiving and suggest the picture of Plymouth Rock or of the first Thanksgiving meal. In a house of worship the same phrase will call to mind the people who sacrificed everything so that they could live according to the dictates of their religion. On the Fourth of July, again, the same orator may employ the same phrase, and everybody will think of people who hold freedom in higher esteem than possessions. Perhaps even a closer comparison could be drawn with the term Union. The dictionary simply tells us that Union (capitalized) means the United States of America. Still, one would not speak of "England, France, and the Union." But, strangely enough, one thinks of the unity of the states and yet, at the same time, of their individuality, when speaking of the Union. Both, the federation and the autonomy of states is emphasized in the term. In addition, it has a historic connotation. The most important fact for our comparison, however, is the possibility of using the term Union in order to emphasize the necessity of unity among its citizens. Historically

speaking, the term referring to the U.S. never had anything to do with the unity of individuals, but referred only to the federation of states. The orator goes back beyond the birth of the term to obtain an additional connotation from the basic meaning of the word previous to its usage as a term. It is this possibility which we have to keep in mind in the further discussion of our subject.

7. Brandt, W. 'ONOMA en de Doopsformule in get Nieuwe Testament, in Theologisch Tijdschrift, vol. 25. 1891; pp. 565-610.
8. Boehmer, Julius. Das Biblische "Im Namen," 1898.
9. Heitmüller, Wilhelm. Im Namen Jesu, 1903.
10. Giesebrecht. Die Alttestamentliche Schätzung des Gottesnamens und ihre Religionsgeschichtliche Grundlage, 1901.
11. ibid., pp. 45-66.
12. ibid., pp. 68-144.
13. Jacob, Benno. Im Namen Gottes, 1903.
14. cf. pp. 29 ff.
15. Grether, op. cit.
16. Webster's New International Dictionary of the English Language. Second Edition. Unabridged. 1939. p. 1625.
17. Hastings Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics. 1917. vol. 9, p. 180.



18. Frazer, James George. The Golden Bough. I volume.  
Abridged edition. 1940; p. 244.
19. Freud, Sigmund. The Basic Writings of. Translated and  
edited by Dr. A. A. Brill; pp. 35-40; 47-61.
20. Frazer, op. cit.; p. 259.
21. Lauterbach, Jacob Z. The Naming of Children in Jewish  
Folklore, Ritual, and Practice, in CCAR Yearbook, vol. XVII,  
pp. 316-360.
22. "There is but one entity for whose persistence we can  
vouch. And that entity is a word, a word which came  
into vogue about the time of Jeremiah and has, like  
other words, spread from signification to significa-  
tion and which still suffices to designate certain  
contemporary groups and to voice some contemporary  
attitudes. The persistence of the word Jew is not  
little mysterious." Cronbach, Abraham. The Semantics  
of it, in The Hebrew Union College Monthly, vol. 27,  
no. 2, p. 15; cf. also the entire article, pp. 5-6;  
14-15.
23. "Diese Worte ... zeigen aufs deutlichste, dass Wittichen  
sich von dem deutschen Begriff Namen in keiner Weise  
hat losmachen koennen: denn nur unter der Voraussetzung,  
dass der Umfang und Inhalt des Begriffs "Namen" sich  
mit dem Umfang und Inhalt des hebraeischen שם decken  
(was doch nimmermehr der Fall ist), sind seine Aus-

- fuehrungen verständig und einleuchtend." Boehmer,  
op. cit., p.32.
24. Mandelkern, Solomon. Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae  
Hebraicae atque Chaldaicae, Sumptibus Schocken, 1937;  
 p. 1190.
25. op. cit., pp. 20-26.
26. op. cit., pp. 26-43.
27. op. cit., pp. 7-9.
28. op. cit., pp. 6-24.
29. op. cit., pp. 566-573.
30. Gesenius, Wilhelm. Hebräisches und Aramäisches Hand-  
wörterbuch über das Alte Testament. Leipzig 1921;  
 pp. 839-840.
31. op. cit., pp. 6-7.
32. An additional proof of the fact that śem<sup>v</sup> implies some  
 of the essence of the thing may be found in the Modern  
 Hebrew usage. When it is said that a thing must be  
 done lišmo, it can hardly mean that it shall be done  
 for its appellation; nor can it mean for its reputation,  
 as we might infer from the translation of leśem<sup>v</sup> in the  
 Modern Hebrew phrase leśem śamayim. lišmo can be  
 translated only by "for its own sake," "for itself,"  
 "for something inherent in it," "for its essence."  
Cf. B. Pesahim 50 b.
33. In order to justify his view logically, he never

attempts to justify it grammatically. Jacob goes as far as to translate Judges 18. 28<sup>9</sup>: "Des Nennen des Namens der Stadt, welches er vollzog, befand sich, erfolgte innerhalb des Wortes Dan." (sic) I must confess that my knowledge of the German language does not suffice to grasp the meaning of this mysterious sentence. Does Jacob mean to say that the name is some entity within which something may happen or be done ? In that case he has assumed that the name has some reality, even extension, in order to prove that the name does not have reality and existence of its own !!! He also tries to make one believe that people may become exultant over a vocable (p. 36). Jacob's book has to be discussed so thoroughly only because it is still quoted extensively as an authority on the subject. In the meantime, however, Jacob changed his mind and views completely. In his article Mose am Dornbusch in the Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums, vo. 66, 1922, he discusses the same subject for a second time and comes to almost opposite conclusions. He states concerning the name of God: "Immer in dem Sinne, dass YH bedeutet, wie man Gott kennt und was man von ihm zu sagen weiss, von seinem Wirken in Natur und Geschichte als allmächtiger Schöpfer und Retter; niemals aber ist YH die pure Vokabel, die man abergläubisch und abgöttig verehrt." (p. 123)

In 1922, Jacob is sure that Šem Yahweh in no case means the vocable "Yahweh" and, more particularly, that it is never used for magic purposes. He now insists that Šem Yahweh always means something like praise and glory ( t<sup>e</sup>hilla ). In the intervening twenty years, it seems to me that Jacob has come closer to the truth; but he is still far from the real truth. His mistake lies in his method. Because of his well-known antagonism to Biblical criticism this otherwise liberal and brilliant scholar again and again attempts to reduce the many usages of a term throughout the Biblical literature to one narrow and well-defined meaning. If šem cannot always mean "vocable," it can never mean "vocable" and must always mean one other thing. This procedure he seems to deem necessary in order to prove the single authorship of the Bible. We, of course, do not agree with this premise. But even if we were to believe in the single authorship theory, we would still have to admit that it is highly possible for one author to use the same term with different meanings or shades of meanings (cf. note 6) . The recognition of this fact, it appears to me, would make the research of many conservative scholars more fruitful than it would ordinarily be with the point of view held by Jacob.

34. Lev. 24. 11; Dt. 28. 58;
35. Amos 2. 7; 4. 13; 6. 10; 9. 6, 12
36. Is. 12. 4; 18. 7; 24. 15; 25. 1; 26. 8, 13; 29. 23;  
30. 27.
37. Morgenstern, Julian, The Oldest Document of the Hexateuch, pp. 70 f.
38. Cf. the Latin nominare with the double accusative.
39. Ex. 17. 15: "And he called its (the altar's) name Yahweh Nissi."
40. The meaning here corresponds to the meaning of Ex. 3. 14, which Dr. Morgenstern translates " 'Ehyeh, that is, I am." ( Morgenstern, Julian. The Elohist Narrative in Exodus 3: 1-15, p. 256.
41. " ..., sondern sie ( the question 'mah s<sup>e</sup>mo' ) fragt nach Sinn und Bedeutung des Namens." ( Jacob, Benno. Mose am Dornbusch, p. 33 ). As is so often found in his works, Jacob has the correct interpretation of a verse, but, because of his strong bias, he uses these good interpretations to prove a wrong theory. Often his theories are a perfect non sequitur of the material he adduces in his attempt to prove them. In our case, Jacob maintains that his - from our point of view correct - interpretation of Ex. 3. 13 is another proof against the multiple source hypothesis. He argues that the people ask "what is His nature?" and not "what is His

name?" They had already known the Name. This disproves the theory that there were various sources: one source, according to which the Name was first revealed to Moses and another source which assumes that the Name was known to the people prior to Moses. Using such logic, the conservative Jacob goes to the extreme of disregarding the literal meaning. Mah s<sup>e</sup>mo can not mean "we know God's name; what is His nature?" This would give sem a meaning negating its basic meaning - an impossible situation! We maintain that Jacob is right when he remarks that the question includes the question as to the true nature of God. This very question, however, indicates that the people, according to this E source, did not know the name Yahweh; for, if they had known the Name, they would have known just as much about His nature as they could have learned from the answer to the question mah s<sup>e</sup>mo. The real interpretation of this E passage is that the people wanted to know the Name (literally), because it had not been revealed as yet, and they hoped that they would learn something of His nature from the revelation of the Name. This is the reason why the passages are discussed under the heading "nomen proprium in spite of the fact that Ex. 3. 13, 15; 6. 3 use sem in a meaning which implies more than just "name."

These passages do speak of the nomen proprium of God, it being understood that the nomen tells something of the nature of the thing.

42. Only Ex. 3. 15 - not v. 14 - gives the answer to v. 13. Cf. Morgenstern, The Elohist Narrative, pp. 255 ff. We discuss the verse as ~~amended~~ by Dr. Morgenstern (ibid.). —
43. Cf. Smith and Goodspeed, The Bible, An American Translation, p. 53: "... This has always been my name, and this shall remain my title throughout the ages."
44. Cf. Ps. 135. 13, a parallel to our verse. We shall have to discuss a further implication of sem w<sup>e</sup>zeker in connection with the consideration of the idea of the covenant.
45. Again, Jacob interprets the verse correctly. "Aber was es heisst: 'mein Name ist Jhvh !' darin habe ich mich ihnen noch nicht offenbart." Mose am Dornbusch, p. 200. Both our English and Jacob's German translation are very complicated and sound artificial. It is the result of the attempt to express all the implications of a pregnant phrase. Basically, it was still the Name which had not yet been revealed; but we must realize that the revelation of the Name had deeper implications.
46. It is very difficult to say why the expression gara' b<sup>e</sup>sem Yahweh is used instead of the simple expression

qara' <sup>v</sup>sem. Dr. Morgenstern believes that the simple form was the original and emends Ex. 33. 19b to w<sup>e</sup>qara'ti <sup>v</sup>s<sup>e</sup>mi l<sup>e</sup>paneyka (Oldest Document, p. 16). On the other hand, he considers Ex. 34. 5b the original of a J2 source and takes Moses as the subject. The meaning of the phrase, then, is the usual meaning of qara' b<sup>e</sup><sup>v</sup>sem Yahweh, namely "to worship Yahweh," as we shall see in a later chapter. (Oldest Document, p. 18). If we accept Dr. Morgenstern's interpretation of the two vv., - and there is no reason for not following Dr. Morgenstern's solution, - only Ex. 33. 19b is to be classified with the usage of the term as nomen proprium. However, even if we emend 33. 19b, it still proves the formalistic and stereotyped use of the term; for J2 left the verse in the present shape and he, consequently, must have been accustomed to so mechanical a use of the term that he saw nothing wrong with an expression which lets Yahweh say that He will call on the name of Yahweh.

47. Cf. Is. 43. 7; Jer. 14. 9; 15. 16; 25. 29; Dan. 9. 18f. and various passages in which the phrase refers to the Temple. These latter passages of Deuteronomic character will be discussed in the chapter on the Temple as the place of Yahweh's presence.

48. Particularly the meaning of <sup>v</sup>sem Yahweh suggesting



Yahweh's presence in the Temple.

49. Cf. Is. 47. 4; 48.2; 51. 15; 54. 5; Jer. 10. 16; 31. 35  
32. 18; 46. 18; 48. 15; 50. 34; 51. 19, 57. Amos 4. 13  
5. 27. All Jeremiah passages and Amos 4. 13 and 5. 27b $\beta$   
are secondary.
50. Cf. Is. 57. 15: w<sup>e</sup>qados s<sup>e</sup>mo, if we accept Qados in this  
passage as nomen proprium. A more probable interpre-  
tation of this v. will be offered in the chapter on  
God's manifestation.
51. It seems to have much the same meaning as the phrase  
'ani Yahweh .
52. The simple expression Yahweh s<sup>e</sup>mo occurs in Jer. 33. 2  
and in Amos 5. 8; 9. 6 in the same sense as the formula  
with the added s<sup>e</sup>ba'ot. It is impossible to prove that  
these passages are later than the passages with the  
longer formula; for both formulae occur in very much  
the same material. The matter becomes even more com-  
plicated, if we consider Ex. 15. 3b. The Song of the  
Sea does not belong to any of the major sources but is  
usually assigned to a rather early age of Biblical  
development, probably to an earlier period than any  
of the secondary passages mentioned above. We cannot  
be too sure, therefore, of the chronological relation  
of the two formulae, but, logically, the longer one  
appears to be primary. Another question in this connec-  
tion, which - though outside of the field of this study -  
would be rather interesting, is the logical and chrono-

so far as  
sources.

logical relationship of our two formulae to the phrases 'ani Yahweh and w<sup>e</sup>yad<sup>ec</sup>u ki 'ani Yahweh, discussed by Dr. Blank in his recent Studies in Deutero-Isaiah.

53. Dr. Blank (ibid.) shows how Yahweh came to mean God in Deutero-Isaiah, certainly a most fundamental change in the character of the name "Yahweh."
54. Speaking about the scope of this study, one might argue as to whether phrases in which sem is the predicate noun to Yahweh should be included in this study. Such phrases certainly can not be designated as "the term sem Yahweh." We included such passages, realizing that they - though not germane to our subject - may throw some light on our term and that, in this case, too much is better than too little.
55. J.A. Mac Culloch in Hasting's Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, vol. 9, p. 180.
56. Frazer, op. cit., pp. 260-261.
57. Morgenstern, Julian, Biblical Theophanies, part III, p. 51, note 1, and Doctrine of Sin in the Babylonian Religion, pp. 35 ff.
58. Cf. Heitmüller, op. cit., pp. 132-176, which adduces much material for superstitions and magic connected with the Divine Name. Cf. also Talmud B. Qiddu<sup>v</sup>sin 71 a and Mishna Sota 7.6.

59. We cannot quite agree with Benno Jacob, who says (Mose am Dornbusch, p. 15): "Im Alten Testament aber ist nirgends die Spur davon, dass ein unbekannter Name, besonders der 'grosse' Name Gottes eine magische Kraft habe."
60. Gen. 32.29.
61. Jud. 13.17f.
62. op. cit., pp. 128 f.
63. Jud. 13.17f. belongs to the old source in Judges (Cf. Moore, Judges, pp. XV - XXXVII). Amos 6.10, though assigned to the secondary material by Dr. Morgenstern, seems to reflect very early conditions and to come from early times.
64. Ex. 20.7 and Deut. 5.11, doubtlessly, soon came to mean a prohibition of a false oath only, and the wording admits such interpretation; for, lasaw<sup>v</sup> is almost identical with laseger<sup>v</sup>, which is proven by the fact that the two words are used interchangeably in the two versions of the Decalogue (cf. Ex. 20.16 with Deut. 5.20). The usage of the expression lo' tissa<sup>v</sup>, which is an elliptic lo' tissa<sup>v</sup> 'al piy, however, suggests a more general original meaning, something like a general prohibition against the misuse of the 'sem Yahweh, though by no means a prohibition of the use of the Name for all purposes.

65. Skinner assigns this story to his Es source.
66. Kennedy assigns I Sam. 17.45 to his M source, which he dates as early as the tenth century (cf. Kennedy, Samuel, p. 21).
67. The conception of Yahweh S<sup>e</sup>baot in these early times is the same as Yahweh iys milhamah in Ex. 15.3. Cf. Kennedy, op. cit., p. 128, note to v. 45.
68. II Chron. 14.10
69. Dr. Morgenstern (in his unpublished notes as reported by Soloff in his rabbinical thesis) dates Ps. 118 between 486 and 479. Dr. Bittenwieser in his Psalms assigns Ps. 118 to the period of Alexander, the Great, in 330.
70. Bittenwieser, op. cit., p. 844. Dr. Bittenwieser admits that he can adduce only internal evidence for assigning Ps. 118.26 to Ps. 134, and this internal evidence appears to me to be utterly unconvincing.
71. Bittenwieser, op. cit., p. 92. It is very difficult to say definitely which was the original wording of the three vv. in question, because various versions disagree. The Massoretic wording of v. 2b seems to be the original one, because <sup>4</sup>these is no disagreement in the versions. We retain the Massoretic text also in 6b, as does Bittenwieser, because of the military implications of the term b<sup>e</sup>sem 'eloheynu, although we must admit that an emendation from nidgol to something

like nogiy would result in a good parallelism and agree better with the Greek μεγαλυθησόμεθα. In v. 8b we emend the meaningless nazkiyr to nagbiyr, which agrees with the Syriac "fortes sumus." The Greek again has μεγαλυθησόμεθα, which in this case is certainly inferior to the Syriac. Rejecting μεγαλυθησόμεθα as unreliable in v. 8b we feel more justified to reject the Greek in v. 6b, too, and the unity of the military terminology in the psalm according to the translation of Bittenwieser seems to be established. (Dr. Bittenwieser does not state his reasons for translating as he does). - We believe that the concreteness of the use of the Name as weapon of war in the literal meaning points to an early composition and that our investigation of this problem strengthens Dr. Bittenwieser's argument for a pre-exilic dating of Ps. 20, which, consequently, is preferable to Dr. Morgenstern's late date (500 - 485). As to Dr. Bittenwieser's arguments, cf. op. cit., pp. 94 - 96.

72. In Theodore H. Robinson and Friedrich Horst, Die Zwölf Kleinen Propheten, pp. 241-243, Horst distinguishes between a pre-exilic prophetic speech consisting of Sach. 10.3b-5, 7, 12; 11.1-3 and a post-exilic word of God consisting of Sach. 3.3a, 6, 8-11.

73. Boehmer, op. cit., p. 62, shows how easily LXX could mistake the yithallaku for a yithallalu.
74. An emendation of w<sup>e</sup>gibbartiyim to ug<sup>e</sup>buratam is necessary and justified.
75. Op. cit., p. 141. Cf. also Boehmer, op. cit., p. 61.
76. Kennedy, Samuel, pp. 221-222. He assigns the passage to his M source, which he dates in the 10th century.
77. Cf. Deut. 21.5; Ps. 63.5; I Chron. 16.2 (the same wording as the typical passage in II Sam. 6.18, only lacking the word s<sup>e</sup>ba'ot); I Chron. 23.13.
78. Practically all translators mistranslate these passages. Even the usually reliable American Translation (by Smith and Goodspeed) uses "pronounce blessings in the name of the Lord." Cf. Deut. 21.5, p. 177. The translators probably imagine that they translate quite literally and forget that the implications of the English "in the name of" are the result of a Hebraism based on a misunderstood Biblical phrase.
79. Deut. 18.5, 7. There is a definite connection between saret and barek, as those two terms are used in juxtaposition. Cf. Deut. 10.8; 21.5; I Chron. 23.13.
80. b. Maccoth 23 b; Ruth rabba 4.5; Cf. the extensive discussions on this subject in Marmostein, A., The Old Rabbinic Doctrine of God, A. The Names & Attributes of God, pp. 22-40.

81. Skinner assigns this passage to the early Es source.
82. I Sam. 20.42. M source according to Kennedy.
83. When we have the one who takes an oath place his hands on a Bible, we, too, symbolize something like the presence of the Lord in this act.
84. Jer. 12.16.
85. Lev. 19.12; Deut. 6.13; 10.20; I Kings 22.16 and the identical phrase in II Chron. 18.15; Is. 48.1; and Sach. 5.4.
86. I Kings 22.16 and II Chron. 18.15.
87. Lev. 19.12; Sach. 5.4.
88. Is. 48.1 uses lo' be'e'met w'lo' bisdaqah.
89. Lev. 19.12. The implications of the concept hillul hasem will be considered in a later chapter. In this connection it may be enough to mention that calling the Living God as Guarantor of a certain promise causes a decrease in God's reputation.
90. Ex. 20.7 and Deut. 5.11 Is. 48.1 These terms are less specific and may, therefore, be interpreted in a more general way, as we have done when we stated that the so-called Second Commandment might speak against abusing the magical power of the Name in general. Cf. also the term hizkir sem in connection with deities other than Yahweh in Ex. 23.13, to which Dr. Morgenstern remarks: "It says, or seems to say, that in addition to not worshipping other gods, Israel must not even

mention their names, presumably in taking an oath."

(The Oldest Document of the Hexateuch, p. 70).

91. Jos. 4.18.
92. I Sam. 16.4; 21.2.
93. I Kings 18.24-26. Skinner assigns this passage to his Ej source.
94. I Kings 18.36b-37 contains the name of Yahweh three times. In this connection it is worthwhile to note that having been convinced that Elijah was right, the people acknowledge and worship Yahweh again in a short formula, which contains the name "Yahweh" as main element (I Kings 18.39b). Although this formula is primarily a statement, an affirmation, it has also the character of an adoration, of worship. The utterance of this formula, too, could be defined by qara' b<sup>e</sup><sub>v</sub>sem Yahweh.
95. Gen. 12.8 (J1 or L); 13.4 (RJ1); 26.25 (J2); Gen. 21.33 has an added 'el 'olam. The passage belongs to E, so that we have two reasons to doubt the originality of Yahweh in 21.33. The original v. probably had vayiqra' <sup>y</sup>am b<sup>e</sup><sub>v</sub>sem 'el 'olam, and the insertion of Yahweh is the work of either J2 or RE.
96. "The subject of אֱלֹהֵי in v. 5b can be only Moses, ... and the present reading ... in 34.5b is the result of J2 redaction." (The Oldest Document of the Hexateuch, p. 18).



97. Is. 12.4; 64.6; 65.1; Zeph. 3.9; Ps. 80.19; 105.1;  
I Chron. 16.8; Ps. 75.2 belongs to this group after  
having been emended in agreement with almost all  
authorities. Instead of the senseless w<sup>e</sup>qarob s<sup>e</sup>meka,  
we must read w<sup>e</sup>qor<sup>e</sup>'ey b<sup>e</sup>'sim<sup>e</sup>ka.
98. Sach. 13.9
99. Ps. 116.4, 13, 17. Dr. Morgenstern dates this psalm  
late, between 400 and 200, and the colorless refrain  
of our term supports a late date.
100. This refers both to the Massoretic text and to the  
common emendation zeh hehel. (Greek: ὅτις ἡλπίσει  
Vulgate: iste coepit).
101. Is. 41.25. In this connection we consider the Mas-  
soretic text only. The text as commonly emended will  
be discussed in the next chapter.
102. Ps. 9.11 uses yod<sup>e</sup>'ey s<sup>e</sup>meka. While it must be said  
that this expression probably was influenced by later  
developments which almost identifies, as we shall see,  
the s<sup>e</sup>m with Yahweh Himself, so that the expression  
may be considered as an equivalent of the expression  
a<sup>s</sup>er y<sup>e</sup>da'uka, yet it can be assumed that, consciously  
or subconsciously, those who used the phrase thought  
also of gor<sup>e</sup>'im b<sup>e</sup>'sim<sup>e</sup>ka.
103. Here we are considering only the term with b<sup>e</sup>'sem, not  
qara' s<sup>e</sup>m, which is an altogether different usage. If  
s<sup>e</sup>m is the accusative object of qara', it is used in

the sense of reputation as in Deut. 32.3. (cf. chapter on reputation). In Ps. 99.6 the qor<sup>e</sup>'ey s<sup>e</sup>mo naturally are the qor<sup>e</sup>'iym 'el Yahweh in the same v., and these two expressions could be translated "those who call on the Lord." Cf. also Lamentations 3.55.

104. In international relations, one stakes a claim by planting a flag; in other words, one takes possession of a piece of land on behalf of one's country by attaching the country's name (symbolized by the flag) to the newly discovered land. - For other examples of acquisition by naming, both Biblical and otherwise, cf. Jacob, Benno, Im Namen Gottes, p. 7.
105. Ex. 31.2; 35.30. P code. The perfects, qara'ti and qara', leave some doubt as to whether God chose Bezalel at birth by naming him or chose him just at this moment by calling on him. In the first case we have, God would have chosen him by giving the name, in the second case by reciting the name. On second thought, however, it becomes clear that only a choice by giving a name at birth can be meant; for, as we mentioned in the last chapter, "to call somebody for a special purpose" cannot <sup>y</sup> be expressed by the Hebrew idiom qara' b<sup>e</sup>'sem. Qara' b<sup>e</sup>'sem means "to call somebody by means of a name, particularly in a formal way," and with reference to a man that can only mean

"to name him at or shortly after birth."

106. Is.49.1. Deutero-Isaiah.
107. Is. 45.3f and Is. 41.25, if yikra' bis<sup>e</sup>mi be amended to 'ekro' bis<sup>e</sup>mo. All three passages belong to Deutero- Isaiah.
108. Is. 43.1. Deutero-Isaiah. This passage shows the implications of naming somebody particularly well by the addition of the words liy 'atah.
109. Dr. Morgenstern, too, takes this implication for granted when he states: "Moreover, the statement in v. 12b that Yahweh has become so well disposed toward and familiar with Moses as to know him by his own name, ..." (The Oldest Document, p.6.). Vv. 12b and 17b are assigned to J2, the earliest source using the term cara' b<sup>e</sup>sem in this sense of intimate relationship. This fact, perhaps, explains the divergence from the phrase usually employed in later periods. Yada' b<sup>e</sup>sem reminds one more of an expression like the one in Amos 3.2.
110. There is one more v. in Deutero-Isaiah which should be discussed in this connection. Is. 43.7 closes that paragraph which begins with the significant words "... I have called you by your name, - you are mine," the most typical phrase indicating possession by virtue of naming something. Therefore, one might be inclined to translate kol hanicra' bis<sup>e</sup>mi as the passive of the phrase in 43.1: "all that have been named by the name

which I have given them." V. 43.7a<sup>β</sup>b, however, makes it perfectly clear that this is not the implication of 43.7a<sup>α</sup>. This phrase must be translated: "everyone who is known in the world as one connected with my name." Not possession or intimacy is involved in this v., but reputation. Cf. chapter on reputation.

111. Jer. 15.16.

112. Referring to the Temple: Jer. 7.10, 11, 14, 30; 32.34;

34.15. Peake in his commentary to 7.10 says: "Heb.

'whereupon my name is called,' implying His possession."

113. Jer. 25.29; Dan. 9.18f.

114. Is. 63.19; Jer. 14.9; II Chron. 7.14; Deut. 28. 10;

and Amos 9. 12, a passage which shows how this phrase,

too, was used mechanically without reference to its

basic meanings. The foreign nations are certainly

not called by Yahweh's name, nor did Yahweh give them

their names. The author of this v. wanted to say that

all nations are in God's possession and used the hackneyed

phrase, the original meaning of which must have been

forgotten in the author's time. (The v. is secondary).

115. I cannot agree with Dr. Morgenstern's statement: " ...

Similarly, the concept implicit in the clause, וְשֵׁם יְהוָה

אֲנִי, of v. 9 seems to be post-exilic. The expression

occurs in eight other passages in Jer. (7.10,11,14,30;

15.16; 25.29; 32.34; 34.15), but in every instance

seems to be editorial. The idea underlying the clause

is more readily comprehensible after Ezekiel's formu-

lation of the doctrine of 'for His name's sake' than if it preceded the formulation of this doctrine (cf. Isa. 63.19; Dan. 9.18-19)." (Psalm 48, note 105, page 30). None of these passages says definitely that God should save Israel for His name's sake, nor can it be proven or assumed that this concept is implied. These passages simply seem to remind Yāhweh of the matter of fact relationship existing by virtue of the name. It seems to me that this concept forms a natural link between Amos' concept of "raḳ ,etkem yade'tiy" and the Deutero-Isaianic "carē'tiy b'e<sup>v</sup>sim'e<sup>ka</sup>." The fact that the term also occurs in such late passages as Trito-Isaiah and the Book of Daniel does not influence the argument very much. They may have adopted this term just as well from Jeremiah as from a post-exilic redactor of Jeremiah. On the other hand, we consider the consistency of Jeremiah's redactor introducing eight times the same formula highly improbable. Dr. Morgenstern himself appears to be not too sure of the correctness of his statement, if we may judge from the careful and indefinite wording in the statement quoted above. All these considerations force us to assume that the term is really Jeremiah's and preceded Ezekiel's "l'e<sup>a</sup>ma'an s'e<sup>mo</sup>."

116. Cf. pp. 35 ff.

117. Ex. 5.23 and I Chron. 21.19.
118. Passages like Deut. 18.20,22; II Chron. 33.18 which have nabiy' or hozeh as subject of dabber prove the identity of the two expressions beyond the shadow of a doubt.
119. Jer. 11.21; 14.14,15; 23.25; 26.9,16,20; 27.15; 29.9,21,23; 44.16.
120. Deut. 18.19,20,22.
121. Sach. 13.3; Dan. 9.6; II Chron. 33.18.
122. Ezra 5.1
123. Jer. 15.16.
124. There remains for us the discussion of the two vv. which we excluded from the general group because they do not refer to prophecy (cf. note 117). The meaning of dibber b<sup>e</sup><sub>sem</sub> Yahweh in I Chron. 21.19 is explained by the parallel in II Sam. 24.19. "To speak in the name of God" is "to speak as God had commanded;" it is again "to speak with the introduction: 'Thus said the Lord.'" The term is a late version for the earlier expression in Samuel, and it is not surprising that in such a late period the term was used mechanically, naturally without any implication to prophecy or the idea of service to Yahweh. In this connection, we have to consider I Kings 18.32. We are told that Elijah built an altar b<sup>e</sup><sub>sem</sub> Yahweh. The entire v. is a P insertion, and the "b<sup>e</sup><sub>sem</sub> Yahweh" is an even later insertion; for neither the LXX nor the Vulgate include it. In such a
-

late period, the term may have been used even without the verbs dabber and nabbe, merely as an equivalent of "as God commanded," as we observed in I Chron. 21.19. The last v. to be considered is Ex. 5.23. Again the meaning of the term is "as Yahweh commanded." Since this meaning of the term is late, and dabber b<sup>e</sup><sub>sem</sub> quite obviously seems to be a term introduced by Jeremiah, I would suggest that bismeka is not original in Ex. 5.23 which Eissfeldt assigns to E. The v. gives perfect sense without the sem. Possibly even l<sup>e</sup>dabber is superfluous, and thus it appears probable that the entire term is secondary. - It is quite possible that in later times, when the term was used mechanically, even barek and saret b<sup>e</sup><sub>sem</sub> Yahweh were understood to mean "to bless" and "to serve, as God commanded;" but this is by no means the original meaning of those terms. Cf. also I Sam. 25.4,9; I Kings 21.8; Jer. 29.25; Esther 2.2; 3.12; 8.8-10. In these vv. somebody speaks, greets, or writes a letter in the name of another man, and the implications are naturally those of the basic meaning, i. e., the speaker starts his message, and the writer of the letter starts his letter with the words: "Thus says ... ."

125. Zeph. 3.19f.

126. Smith and Goodspeed, The Bible, p. 867.

127. Deut. 26.19; Jer. 13.11; 33.9.

128. Battenwieser, Moses, Psalms, pp. 102, 108-9.

129. Morgenstern, Julian, Psalm 48., p. 22.

130. ibid., p. 26.

131. We follow Dr. Morgenstern's dating of Ps. 48, i.e., 480.

In this connection I would like to note that I find the following remark on my card to Ps. 48: "Buttewieser dates 701. Based on vv. 5,8,6. However very doubtful. I doubt unity of psalm. V. 11 certainly later than 701." This card was written three months previous to the publication of Dr. Morgenstern's study in the HUC Annual (1941). Though I did not attempt to define the two divisions of the psalm nor to give an exact date, I happened to come independently to the same main conclusion, i. e., I had the feeling that this psalm could not come from as early a period as most scholars suggested.

132. Deut. 26.19; Jer. 3.11; 33.9.

133. Ps. 115.1; also Is. 43.7, in which "all those who are called by my name" are considered as people who carry Yahweh's name into all parts of the world, who establish His reputation. This interpretation of the v. contradicts Skinner who defines kol hanigra' bis<sup>e</sup>miy as people "who belong to the community in which Jehovah is worshipped." (Skinner, Isaiah, p. 37).

134. II Sam. 7.26 and I Chron. 17.24; Is. 64.1; Neh. 9.10; and Sach. 10.12, if we follow LXX by emending yithall<sup>e</sup>ku



to y<sup>e</sup>hall<sup>e</sup>lu, which is not necessary, however. Cf. p.34.

135. Is. 55.13. In this v. sem seems to be a synonym of 'ot, thus reminding one of the ancient basic meaning of sem, i. e., signum.

136. Is. 26. 13. The b<sup>e</sup>ka in this v. may either be deleted with LXX, or translated "it is through thy help only (that we can now celebrate thy name)," as does Skinner ( Isaiah, I. - XXXIX, p. 195). Orelli (Die Propheten Jesaja und Jeremia, p. 94) considers sim<sup>e</sup>ka an apposition to b<sup>e</sup>ka, which he interprets as an accusative object of nazkir. Although we do not agree with this interpretation of the v. under discussion, we find his general remarks about zeker and sem in connection with the commentary to this v. very good and shall quote them in their place.

Is. 26.8. Whitehouse (Isaiah, vol. I, p. 282) suggests "praise" as a better translation for zeker than "memorial" and thus implicitly agrees with Skinner (op. cit., p. 193), who says: "'Name' and 'memorial' are synonymous, as in Ex. III.15; Ps. CXXXV. 13; Jehovah's memorial is that by which he makes Himself to be remembered."

The same affinity between sem and zeker can be observed with reference to a man. Cf. Ps. 45.18.

137. As to the passages which are not obviously Deuteronomic or otherwise exilic or post-exilic, Is. 26.8,13 are

generally considered secondary, and II Sam. 7.26 and I Chron. 17.24 are Deuteronomic according to Kennedy (Samuel, p. 228).

138. Morgenstern, Julian, Psalm 48, pp. 26-38.

139. Ps. 115.1

140. Jos. 7.9. Eissfeldt assigns this passage to J. From Dr. Morgenstern's article, however, it becomes clear that this v. could not have been written before Ezekiel. I suggest that this v. belongs to P.

141. I Sam. 13.22. This v. belongs to a late Deuteronomic stratum.

142. Jos. 7.9 and Ps. 115.1.

143. Ez. 36.22; 39.25.

144. I Kings 8.41f. and II Chron. 6.32; Is. 48.9; 66.5; Jer. 14.7, 21; Ez. 20.9, 14, 22, 44; Ps. 23.3; 25.11; 31.4; 79.9; 106.8; 109.21; 143.11.

145. In the appendix Eissfeldt has a note to the effect that the date of the passage in Numbers is doubtful: " (vv.) 11-25 ... - Der Abschnitt wird meistens als nicht-quellenhafte Zutat betrachtet; indes ist jedenfalls eine JE Grundlage anzunehmen." There may be a JE foundation, but the concept of the passage certainly originates from a time later than Ezekiel, and I do not know how there could be a JE foundation.

146. Ez. 36.22; 39.25.

147. Ez. 36.23.

148. Ez. 20.9,14,22; 36.23; 39.7.
149. Ez. 36.20,21,22.
150. Ez. 20.39.
151. Jer. 34.16.
152. LXX has l<sup>e</sup>hasi<sup>v</sup>ybu instead of wata<sup>v</sup>siybu, and a part of the v. is missing in one Greek manuscript. In the previous v., the Greek versions have the third instead of the second person.
153. Lev. 18.21; 20.3.
154. Lev. 21.6; 22.2; 22.32.
155. Lev. 19.12.
156. Ez. 43.7f.
157. In Lev. 24.11,16, the Holiness Code uses naqab to express the direct desecration of the name of God. This does not refer to an indirect profanation of Yahweh's name by an act which may lower Yahweh's reputation in the eyes of the nations, but to the cursing of the name Yahweh. Incidentally, these vv. use s<sup>v</sup>em and has<sup>v</sup>em elliptically for s<sup>v</sup>em Yahweh, but not for Yahweh Himself.
158. Is. 52.5 (amend to: m<sup>e</sup>no<sup>v</sup>as); Ps. 74.10,18.
159. Mal. 1.6.
160. Prov. 30.9. Luther translates this expression aptly "sich am Namen Gottes vergreifen." Giesebrecht (op. Cit., p. 70f.) has a similar concept in mind, when he describes a kind of hillul has<sup>v</sup>em as follows: "Durch das unbefugte Nennen des Gottesnamens vergreift man sich

an dem göttlichen Wesen, ... ."

161. Cf. Blank, Sheldon H., Studies in Deutero-Isaiah, particularly, pp. 13 f. Also: Herrmann, Johannes, Die Gottesnamen im Ezechieltexte, particularly, pp. 82 f.
162. Ez. 20.4; 36.23; I Kings 8.43 and II Chron. 6.33; Jer. 16.31; Ps. 83.17, 19. However, since v. 17 is to follow v. 18, I would reconstruct the two vv. as follows:

יְבִקְשׁוּ שִׁמְךָ יְהוָה  
וְיִדְעוּ כִּי אַתָּה יְהוָה  
שִׁמְךָ לְבָדֶךָ עַל־יוֹן  
עַל כָּל הָאָרֶץ

In these expressions w<sup>e</sup>yad<sup>e</sup>'u kiy s<sup>e</sup>miy Yahweh, s<sup>e</sup>mi is identical with 'ani, a phenomenon which will be explained in a later chapter.

In Is. 52.6 it is the people of Israel which shall know the name of Yahweh, which thought, though related with the ideas presented in our chapter, can be understood only, when we consider the force of s<sup>e</sup>m as a hypostatic expression for Yahweh Himself.

Also somewhat connected with the idea of "w<sup>e</sup>yod<sup>e</sup>'u," is the formula "Yahweh s<sup>e</sup>mo." It is a ritual declaration to the fact that the reputation behind the name of Yahweh is guarantor for the truth of the word or for the certainty of his action. Cf. Ex. 15.3; Is. 42.8; Jer. 32.2; Amos 5.8; 9.6. Cf. also Giesebrecht, op. cit., p. 127.

- 2
163. Ex. 9.16. J source.
  164. Jer. 10.6 (secondary); Ps. 54.3.
  165. I Kings 8.42; II Chron. 6.32. Cf. also Ps. 89.25 as continuation of v. 22.
  166. Is. 12.4b.
  167. Is. 50.10; Zeph. 3.12. These vv., coming from the period of Jeremiah and Deutero-Isaiah using the term b<sup>e</sup>sem, do not yet show the full development of sem to the meaning of an <sup>active</sup> aspect of the Deity. They are still close to the idea of an attribute.
  168. Is. 59.19; 64.1f.; Ps. 61.6; Ps. 86.11; Neh. 1.11; and Micah 6.9, if we amend to ut<sup>e</sup>su<sup>h</sup>ah leyor<sup>ey</sup> s<sup>e</sup>mo with the Greek. - Is. 64.1f. shows very clearly how far the concept had developed by the time of Trito-Isaiah. At his time, the term paniym already was used as Yahweh's hypostatsis, or at least His revelation, as we can see in v. 2. They tremble before His paniym. The term sem, however, was still felt to be more appropriate for the designation of God's attribute of power. V. 1 could be translated best by "to make known Thy power to Thine enemies."
  169. Cf. Hehn, Johannes, Die Biblische und die Babylonische Gottesidee, p. 239.
  170. Ex. 23.21. Cf. Morgenstern, Julian, Biblical Theophanies, pp. 51-52. This passage is assigned to E<sup>1</sup>. It is the only passage of such an early period which has sem in

Probably  
to J<sup>2</sup>

the meaning of Divine presence. In this passage, sem<sup>✓</sup> is not yet the acting Presence itself but only the Divine element endowing the angel to act with power and authority. Perhaps, one should not yet consider this v. as an example for sem<sup>✓</sup> as the expression of the immanent God but rather as a case where sem<sup>✓</sup> is the expression of ownership and authority. The Name in the angel entitles the angel to speak and act in the name of God. In any case, Ex. 23.21 shows a transitional stage. The term does not attain its full meaning of the immanent aspect of the deity until much later, not until after the exile.

171. We agree with Dr. Morgenstern's date of the psalm, i. e., 516-500. We feel that there is no good reason for Dr. Battenwieser's assumption that the psalm is pre-exilic. However, even if we were forced to admit that the psalm comes from a pre-exilic period, it would be quite possible that vv. 2 and 10 are secondary. The identity of these vv., which do not impress one as a refrain, points toward the possibility of their being an insertion of a later redactor. The passages in question are of a post-exilic age in either case.

172. Cf. Is. 40.25.

173. Cf. Is. 6.3.

174. Smith, George Adam, The Book of Isaiah, vol. I., p. 234.

Many scholars consider this passage to be originally

Isaianic. But we agree with Dr. Blank who considers it a late eschatological passage. The mistake comes from a literal translation of 'Asur<sup>✓</sup> in v. 31 of the in v. 31 of the chapter. This, however, is to be interpreted to refer to the Seleucid empire.

175. Is.29.23 is secondary according to the opinion of most scholars.
176. We are now discussing a stage of the development which dates later than the subject of the next two chapters. These chapters are devoted exclusively to the relation of sem<sup>✓</sup> to Israel.

177. Cf. Ps.29.2; 96.8. These vv. speak of the glory due to His name and suggest that it should be rendered by worship in the holy courts (amend hadrat to hasrat with Greek ἐν ἁγίᾳ ἀρχῇ ἀδρᾶν). Strictly speaking there is not much glory to a name; it is the Divine Presence which should be honored.

As to the date of these two vv., we cannot agree with Dr. Battenwieser who holds them to be pre-exilic. His reasoning for a pre-exilic date is not cogent, and we chose<sup>o</sup> to accept Dr. Morgenstern's dating (516-486). Again the identical vv., Ps. 29.1-2 and Ps. 96.7-9, may well be a later addition in both cases, even if Dr. Battenwieser's early date of Ps. 29 were correct. Cf. also Ps. 96.8 and I Chron. 16.29. These vv. have the term k<sup>e</sup>bod<sup>✓</sup> sem which must be understood in the same

sense as the previous vv., namely the honor due to His presence. This term should not be confused with sem <sup>✓</sup> k<sup>e</sup>bod Yahweh which is the product of a later development when all these terms had lost their individual meanings and come to mean Yahweh Himself without much differentiation. The meaning of k<sup>e</sup>bod <sup>✓</sup> sem, however, is further illustrated by Ps. 86.9,12, where we have the same expression "to honor the Presence of God." The 1<sup>e</sup> in v. 9 does not cause a change of meaning; it has a parallel in Dan. 11.38. In v. 9 the meaning is particularly clear: The nations come they bow down before God, i. e., probably in His temple, and honor His presence. The same idea of k<sup>e</sup>bod <sup>✓</sup> sem is expressed in Mal. 2.2, which is addressed to the priests who are to give honor to the Divine presence in the Temple. Another passage, in which sem <sup>✓</sup> refers to the Divine presence that is in Jerusalem, is Ps. 122.4. Finally, we should mention I Kings 18.32, which we attempted to interpret in a previous chapter. In later times this v., too, probably came to mean that Elijah built an altar in the presence of Yahweh, and since this phrase is a late insertion in the text, one cannot determine whether or not this is the original meaning of the v.

178. Cf. Cooke, George Albert, The Book of Ezekiel, vol. II, pp. 464-465, commentaries on XLIII. 6 and 8.



179. I Kings 8.28; II Chron. 6.18.
180. I Kings 8.29; II Chron. 6.19 f.
181. We have a very striking parallel to this phenomenon in the Egyptian religion. Referring to the cult of Isis and Ra, Frazer states: "From this story it appears that the real name of the god, with which his power was inextricably bound up, was supposed to be lodged, in an almost physical sense, somewhere in his breast, from which Isis extracted it by a sort of surgical operation and transferred it with all its supernatural power to herself." (Frazer, op. cit., p. 261). The name of the god dwelled some place in a physical sense, just as the name of Yahweh in later times must have been thought to have originally dwelled in the cloud and then been transferred to the Temple.
182. Cf. II Chron. 1.18.
183. Deut. 12.11; 14.23; 16.2,6,11; 26.2; Jer. 7.12; Ps. 74.7; Neh. 1.9. The phrase in Jeremiah appears to me to be secondary.
184. I Kings 8.16; II Kings 23.27; II Chron. 6.5,6; 7.16.  
Cf. also Is. 18.7.
185. Deut. 12.5,21; 14.24; I Kings 9.3; 11.36; 14.21; II Kings 21.7; II Chron. 12.13; 33.7. The phrase, lasum <sup>✓</sup>sem, is a synonym to lih<sup>e</sup>yot <sup>✓</sup>sem <sup>✓</sup>sam, as becomes evident by a comparison of the parallel vv. in II Kings 21.4

and II Chron. 33.4, where the otherwise identical text uses sum in the first passage and hayah in the other. Another similar expression is qadaš l<sup>e</sup>sem as in I Kings 9.7 and II Chron. 7.20, in which we have the implication: "I have reserved this house, I have set it aside for special use by My manifestation."

186. I Kings 3.2; 5.17,19; 8.19 and II Chron. 6.9; I Kings 8.17,20 and II Chron. 6.7,10; I Kings 8.18 and II Chron. 6.8; I Kings 8.44,48 and II Chron. 6.38; I Chron. 22.7,8; 28.3; 22.10; II Chron. 2.3; 20.8. Cf. also II Sam. 7.13, which is another example for the fact that the Temple was considered the court room of the Divine presence. I Kings 10.1 also belongs to this group if we ~~amend~~ with Klosterman as quoted by Skinner (Skinner, Kings, pp. 166 - 167): w<sup>et</sup> s<sup>e</sup>ma<sup>c</sup> habayit 'a<sup>v</sup>ser banah l<sup>e</sup>sem Yahweh; more probably, however, the term should be deleted in this passage since it does not occur in the parallel passage in II Chron. 9.1. Cf. also I Kings 8.33,35; II Chron. 6.24,26, which prove that God's presence was worshipped in the Temple.

187. I Kings 8.44,48; II Chron. 6.38; I Kings 14.21 and II Chron. 12.13; II Kings 12.4 and II Chron. 33.4.

188. Cf. Ps. 48.2,3,9. Cf. also New Testament, Matt. 5.35.

189. Jer. 3.17.

190. Cf. note 112.

191. Cf. Dan. 9.18,19.

192. Cf. II Sam. 7.26; and I Chron. 17.24; Is. 63.14,16; 64.1; Jer. 10.25 and Ps. 79.6; Jer. 13.11; Sach. 14.9 (possible meaning: On that day it will be not only some general God concept that will be recognized by all nations as the only God, but it will also be the particular God of Israel Whom the nations will recognize, thus giving glory to Israel); Ps. 20.8; 79.9; 106.47; I Chron. 16.35.
193. Cf. Is. 56.6; Jer. 34.15-16; Mal. 2.5.
194. Orelli, Konrad, op. cit., p. 94, commentary on 26.8:  
 " עֲשֵׂה und יָדַע sind synonyma für die Offenbarung des göttlichen Wesens, welches den Menschen dadurch zum Bewusstsein kommt, kennbar und nennbar wird."
195. Cf. Ex. 20.24b (which does not belong to C according to Morgenstern, The Oldest Document, p. 93); Ex. 3.15; Ps. 11.9; 119.55; 135.13. The same idea, negatively stated, occurs in Ex. 23.13, where the mentioning of the name of other gods implies, besides other ideas previously discussed, the possible covenant relationship with other gods, which is prohibited. Similarly, the forgetting of the name of Yahweh in Jer. 23.27 implies a forgetting of the duties incumbent on Israel by virtue of the covenant.
196. Cf. Gen. 9.15; Lev. 26.42,45; Jer. 2.2; Ez. 16.60; Ps. 93.3; 105.8.
197. Glueck, Nelson, Das Wort Hesed, particularly p. 66:  
 "Gottes יְהוָה ist die Folge seines Bundes," and Gottes יְהוָה וְיֵשׁוּעַ ist als Hendiadys zu betrachten, worin יְהוָה

den Wert eines erklärenden Adjektivs trägt. Cf. also Morgenstern, Psalm 48, p. 37, note 118.

198. Cf. Buber, Martin; und Rosenzweig, Franz, Die Schrift und ihre Verdeutschung, p. 174.

199. Cf. Ps. 52.11; 86.11; 89.25; 92.2; 115.1; 138.2.

200. Cf. Heitmüller, op. cit., p. 333 ff.; cf. also the Prayer of Menasseh, v. 3. (Kautzsch, Apokryphen, vol. I, p. 168).

201. Cf. Is. 29.23; also Is. 4.1.

202. In this connection cf. I Chron. 22.19. - II Sam. 6.2 and I Chron. 13.6. The last two vv. are not identical, and a comparison tells the history of the vv.:

Sam.:            את ארון האלהים אשר נקרא שם שם יהוה צבאות

Chron.:        ..... יהוה ..... האלהים

Sam.:            ישב הכרובים עליו .....

Chron.:        ישב הכרובים עליו אשר נקרא שם.

The original text had only: the ark of God. At about the time of the priestly writers the idea of the cherubim was added. Later on somebody must have made a marginal note to the effect that one worshipped at the place of the ark, as we find in the Sam. version. The scribe who wrote the manuscript which became the basis for the Chron. version inserted the note in the wrong place.

203. Cf. Deut. 28.58 which explains the term (in this passage with the definite article) by the apposition "the Lord your God." The parallelism of the term and an expression of the Deity or an objective pronominal suffix referring



In Is. 24.15 sem Yahweh is used as parallel to Yahweh for variation's sake, although the rhythm suffers. In Joel 2.26 and Ps. 142.8 the meaning of sem comes closer to the idea of reputation than to a hypostasis, although the term has been used in these vv. primarily for metrical reasons.

Often context rather than parallelism or metrical and stylistic usage suggest that the term is conceived of as a hypostasis of God or as God Himself. Cf. Mal. 3.20; Ps. 44.21; 69.37; I Chron. 22.18f (connected with the idea of the Divine presence). The verbs used in these passages are those which are generally preferred as verbs governing sem in its hypostatic meaning, such as yara', 'ahab, habab, and šakah. In the chapter on sem as reputation and the notes thereto we already mentioned the expressions connected with yada<sup>c</sup> sem Yahweh (cf. note 162). To know the name of God implies both the realization of His reputation and power (cf. p. 61) and the knowledge of God Himself. If we stress the latter aspect the sem Yahweh as object of yada<sup>c</sup> becomes more of an equivalent for the Deity. Cf. Is. 52.6 and Jer. 16.21. As we mentioned before, yod<sup>c</sup>ey sem is simply the worshippers of God. In Is. 59.19 sem doubtlessly is a hypostasis of God, as is evident from the context. In this v. we may observe two interesting facts. In the first place, one can detect something like a trinity, consisting of the three hypostatic designations

of the Deity: sem, kabod, and ruah. Second, a comparison of the use of the terms sem and kabod suggests a possible difference of associations connected with the two terms. Sem is connected with the West, and kabod is connected with the East and the sun. Is it not conceivable that the author of this v. felt that sem, the word connected with the covenant and the Divine aspect directed toward Israel, would be more appropriate as a designation of the Western Yahweh of Mt. Sinai, Mt. Horeb, and the wilderness; while kabod, the idea of the fiery appearance, would better fit the Eastern sun god of the Phoenician and Mesopotamian type, who had become identified with Yahweh. Both these suggestions are only hinted at in the v., and it would be wrong to draw any definite conclusions from it. According to my own feeling, the second idea may well correspond to the facts; the concept of a trinity, however, is very improbable and cannot be traced any other place in the Bible.

We have already mentioned that the term in Deut. 32.3; Joel 2.26; Ps. 142.8 implies both Yahweh's reputation and a hypostasis of God. There are many other passages the content of which makes it clear that the term in the respective vv. denotes a Divine hypostasis with the aspect of fame, reputation and power: Micah 5.3; Mal. 1.11,14; Ps. 69.31; 74.21 (cf. v. 20 for connection with the covenant idea); 99.3; 148.5,13 (rhythm!); 149.3; Neh. 9.5 (as amended by Kittel). Neh. 9.5 brings up the question of the phrase sem kabod. It is to be assumed that in this expression

*imaginations and needs more  
in the text. How is actually  
there. Also your point, the relation  
of the text makes me fear that you  
have misunderstood the verse.*

sem has more of the meaning of power, whereas kabod designates more of the person of the Deity. Thus we should translate: "Bless the power of His glorious appearance." It is quite evident that such an expression was not used with the consciousness of its full implication, but merely as an extremely reverential reference to the workings in our spheres of a great and transcendent Deity. There are a few verbs which occur again and again in connection with the term in the double meaning of power and hypostasis. It is naturally the verba dicendi which more than any other verbs govern the term in the implication of powerful hypostasis. Zammer, hallel, sanner, barek, hodah are some of the most common verbs in this classification.

sem as a hypostasis of the deity is exemplified perhaps more clearly than in any other passage in the text of the LXX of Numb. 14.21. Eγω is identified with τὸ ὄνομα μου, and the name of God, too, is ἔγω, a living being.

No matter how close the meaning of the term comes to the idea of God himself, there seems to remain one differentiation in practically all cases. There seems to be a difference in the degree of holiness of Yahweh himself and His name. Ps. 99.3 seems to suggest that God's name may be great, even awe-inspiring, but only God himself is holy. Therefore, statements which would be considered objectionable for their anthropomorphism if referring to God himself are accepted as perfectly proper, if referring to God's name.



The editor of II Chron. felt that the hithann<sup>e</sup>nu' eleyka in I Kings 8.33 was too direct and substituted l<sup>e</sup>paneyka for 'eleyka; but he felt that the hodu' et s<sup>e</sup>meka in the same v. and in I Kings 8.35 was not objectionable and retained it in II Chron. 6.24,26. Generally speaking, sem had come to denote the presence of God in the same sense as paniym, as becomes evident from the parallelism of these two terms in Ps. 140.14. Thus we have three expressions of the Divine presence: sem, paniym, and kabod. sem is preferably used as object of verba dicendi, thus being associated with its basic meaning, while the other two terms have more visual implications. Furthermore, it seems that there is something like a scale of degrees of holiness invested in these terms. Starting from the most holy and proceeding to the lesser degrees of holiness, the scale would be: God himself, kabod, panim, sem. Ruah cannot be included in this group, because it always implies a product, an issue, of the Deity rather than the Deity itself or the Divine presence.

204. Cf. Heschel, Abraham, Die Prophetie, particularly pp. 127 - 182.
205. Cf. Morgenstern, Julian, Biblical Theophanies, pp. 51 ff.
206. Cf. Marmorstein, The Old Rabbinic Doctrine of God, vol. I. Cf. also Landau, E., Die dem Raume entnommenen Synonyma für Gott.

# INDEX OF BIBLICAL PASSAGES

(Plain numbers refer to the pages of the text; numbers preceded by the letter n refer to the numbers of the notes.)

|               |                |                |               |
|---------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|
| Gen. 2. 19 f. | 48             | Lev. 22. 32    | n154          |
| 4. 26         | 47             | 24. 11         | 38, n34, n157 |
| 9. 15         | n196           | 24. 16         | 38, n157      |
| 12. 8         | n95            | 26. 42         | n196          |
| 13. 4         | n95            | 26. 45         | n196          |
| 16. 13        | 21             |                |               |
| 21. 33        | n95            | Num. 6. 23     | 36            |
| 26. 25        | n95            | 6. 24-26       | 36            |
| 32. 29        | n60            | 6. 27          | 36            |
|               |                | 6. 37          | 37            |
| Ex. 3. 13     | 22, n41, n42   | 14. 11-25      | n145          |
| 3. 14         | n40, n42       | 14. 15-19      | 58            |
| 3. 15         | 22, n41, n42,  | 14. 21         | n203          |
|               | n136, n195     |                |               |
| 5. 23         | n117, n124     | Deut. 5. 11    | n64, n90      |
| 6. 3          | n41            | 5. 20          | n64           |
| 6. 3 b        | 22             | 6. 13          | n85           |
| 9. 16         | n163           | 10. 8          | 36, n79       |
| 15. 3         | n67, n162      | 10. 20         | n85           |
| 15. 3 b       | n52            | 12. 5          | n185          |
| 17. 15        | n39            | 12. 11         | n183          |
| 20. 7         | n64, n90       | 12. 21         | n185          |
| 20. 16        | n64            | 14. 23         | n183          |
| 20. 24 b      | n195           | 14. 24         | n185          |
| 23. 13        | n90, n195      | 16. 2          | n183          |
| 23. 13 b      | 21             | 16. 6          | n183          |
| 23. 21        | n170           | 16. 11         | n183          |
| 31. 2         | n105           | 18. 5          | n79           |
| 33. 12 b      | 49, n109       | 18. 7          | n79           |
| 33. 17 b      | 49, n109       | 18. 19         | n120          |
| 33. 19        | 23             | 18. 20         | n118, n120    |
| 33. 19 b      | n46            | 18. 22         | n118, n120    |
| 34. 5         | 23, 45         | 21. 5          | n77, n78, n79 |
| 34. 5 b       | 45, n46, n96   | 26. 2          | n183          |
| 34. 14        | 22             | 26. 19         | n127, n132    |
| 35. 30        | n105           | 28. 10         | n114          |
|               |                | 28. 58         | n34, n203     |
| Lev. 9. 22    | 36             | 32. 3          | n103, n203    |
| 18. 21        | n153           |                |               |
| 19. 12        | n85, n87, n89, | Jos. 4. 18     | n91           |
|               | n155           | 7. 9           | n140, n142    |
| 20. 3         | n153           |                |               |
| 21. 6         | n154           | Jud. 13. 17 f. | n61, n63      |
| 22. 2         | n154           | 18. 26         | n33           |

|         |            |            |
|---------|------------|------------|
| I Sam.  | 12. 22     | nl41       |
|         | 16. 4      | n92        |
|         | 17. 45     | n66        |
|         | 20. 42     | n82        |
|         | 21. 2      | n92        |
|         | 25. 4      | nl24       |
|         | 25. 9      | nl24       |
| II Sam. | 6. 2       | n202       |
|         | 6. 13      | 35, n77    |
|         | 7. 13      | nl86       |
|         | 7. 26      | nl34, nl37 |
|         |            | nl92       |
|         | 22. 50     | n203       |
|         | 24. 19     | nl24       |
| I Kings | 3. 2       | nl86       |
|         | 5. 17      | nl86       |
|         | 5. 19      | nl86       |
|         | 8. 13      | 69         |
|         | 8. 14      | 36         |
|         | 8. 16      | nl34       |
|         | 8. 17      | nl86       |
|         | 8. 13      | nl86       |
|         | 8. 19      | nl86       |
|         | 8. 20      | nl86       |
|         | 8. 28      | nl79       |
|         | 8. 29      | nl80       |
|         | 8. 33      | nl86, n203 |
|         | 8. 35      | nl86, n203 |
|         | 8. 42      | nl65       |
|         | 8. 43      | nl62       |
|         | 8. 44      | nl86, nl87 |
|         | 8. 48      | nl86, nl87 |
|         | 8. 55      | 36         |
|         | 9. 3       | nl85       |
|         | 9. 7       | nl85       |
|         | 9. 41 f.   | nl44       |
|         | 10. 1      | nl36       |
|         | 11. 36     | nl85       |
|         | 14. 21     | nl85, nl87 |
|         | 18. 24-26  | n93        |
|         | 18. 26     | 45         |
|         | 18. 32     | nl24, nl77 |
|         | 18. 36b-37 | n94        |
|         | 18. 39b    | n94        |
|         | 21. 8      | nl24       |
|         | 22. 16     | n85, n86   |

|          |            |                  |
|----------|------------|------------------|
| II Kings | 2. 24      | 38               |
|          | 5. 11      | 31               |
|          | 12. 4      | nl87             |
|          | 21. 4      | nl85             |
|          | 21. 7      | nl85             |
|          | 23. 27     | nl84             |
|          | 4. 4       |                  |
| Isa.     | 4. 1       | n201             |
|          | 6. 3       | nl73             |
|          | 12. 4      | n36, n97         |
|          | 12. 4 b    | nl66             |
|          | 18. 7      | n36, nl84        |
|          | 24. 15     | n36, n203        |
|          | 25. 1      | n36, n203        |
|          | 26. 8      | n36, nl36, nl37, |
|          |            | nl94             |
|          | 26. 13     | n36, nl36, nl37  |
|          | 29. 23     | 67, n36, nl75,   |
|          |            | n201             |
|          | 30. 27     | 66, n36          |
|          | 30. 31     | nl74             |
|          | 40. 25     | nl72             |
|          | 41. 25     | nl01, nl07       |
|          | 42. 8      | nl62             |
|          | 43. 1      | nl08, nl10       |
|          | 43. 7      | n47, nl10, nl33  |
|          | 43. 7a, 8b | nl10             |
|          | 43. 7a, c  | nl10             |
|          | 45. 3 f.   | nl07             |
|          | 47. 4      | n49              |
|          | 48. 1      | n85, n88, n90    |
|          | 48. 2      | n49              |
|          | 48. 9      | nl44             |
|          | 49. 1      | nl06             |
|          | 50. 10     | nl67             |
|          | 51. 15     | n49              |
|          | 52. 5      | nl58             |
|          | 52. 6      | nl62, n203       |
|          | 54. 5      | n49              |
|          | 55. 13     | nl35             |
|          | 56. 6      | nl93             |
|          | 57. 15     | 65, n50          |
|          | 57. 15 b   | 66               |
|          | 59. 19     | nl68, n203       |
|          | 60. 9      | 57               |
|          | 63. 14     | nl92             |
|          | 63. 16     | nl92             |

|      |     |       |   |
|------|-----|-------|---|
| Isa. | 63. | 19    | nl14, nl15                                |
|      | 64. | 1     | nl34, nl92                                |
|      | 64. | 1 f.  | nl68                                      |
|      | 64. | 6     | n97                                       |
|      | 65. | 1     | n97                                       |
|      | 66. | 5     | nl44                                      |
| Jer. | 2.  | 2     | nl96                                      |
|      | 3.  | 11    | nl32                                      |
|      | 3.  | 17    | nl89                                      |
|      | 7.  | 10    | nl12, nl15                                |
|      | 7.  | 11    | nl12, nl15                                |
|      | 7.  | 12    | nl83                                      |
|      | 7.  | 14    | nl12, nl15                                |
|      | 7.  | 30    | nl12, nl15                                |
|      | 10. | 6     | nl64                                      |
|      | 10. | 16    | n49                                       |
|      | 10. | 25    | 47, nl92                                  |
|      | 11. | 21    | nl19                                      |
|      | 12. | 16    | n84                                       |
|      | 13. | 11    | nl27, nl92                                |
|      | 14. | 7     | nl44                                      |
|      | 14. | 9     | n47, nl14,<br>nl15                        |
|      | 14. | 14    | nl19                                      |
|      | 14. | 21    | nl44                                      |
|      | 15. | 16    | 54, n47, nl11<br>nl15, nl23<br>nl62, n203 |
|      | 16. | 21    | nl19                                      |
|      | 23. | 25    | nl95                                      |
|      | 23. | 27    | nl95                                      |
|      | 25. | 29    | n47, nl13,<br>nl15                        |
|      | 26. | 9     | nl19                                      |
|      | 26. | 16    | nl19                                      |
|      | 26. | 20    | nl19                                      |
|      | 27. | 15    | nl19                                      |
|      | 29. | 9     | nl19                                      |
|      | 29. | 21    | nl19                                      |
|      | 29. | 23    | nl19                                      |
|      | 29. | 25    | nl24                                      |
|      | 31. | 35    | n49                                       |
|      | 32. | 2     | l62                                       |
|      | 32. | 18    | n49                                       |
|      | 32. | 34    | nl15                                      |
|      | 33. | 2     | n52                                       |
|      | 33. | 9     | nl27, nl32                                |
|      | 34. | 15    | n52                                       |
|      | 34. | 15-16 | nl93                                      |
|      | 34. | 16    | nl51                                      |
|      | 44. | 16    | nl19                                      |
|      | 44. | 26    | 41  |
|      | 46. | 18    | n49                                       |

|       |     |                  |                  |
|-------|-----|------------------|------------------|
| Jer.  | 48. | 15               | n49              |
|       | 50. | 34               | n49              |
|       | 51. | 19               | n49              |
|       | 51. | 57               | n49              |
| Eze.  | 16. | 60               | nl96             |
|       | 20. | 4                | nl62             |
|       | 20. | 9                | nl44, nl48       |
|       | 20. | 14               | nl44, nl48       |
|       | 20. | 22               | nl44, nl48       |
|       | 20. | 39               | nl50             |
|       | 20. | 44               | nl44             |
|       | 22. | 28               | 53               |
|       | 36. | 20               | nl49             |
|       | 36. | 21               | nl49             |
|       | 36. | 22               | nl43, nl46, nl49 |
|       | 36. | 23               | nl47, nl48, nl62 |
|       | 39. | 7                | nl48             |
|       | 39. | 25               | nl43, nl46       |
|       | 43. | 7 f.             | nl56             |
|       | 43. | 8                | 69               |
| Joel  | 2.  | 26               | n203             |
|       | 3.  | 5                | 47               |
| Amos  | 2.  | 7                | n35              |
|       | 3.  | 2                | nl09             |
|       | 4.  | 13               | n35, n49         |
|       | 5.  | 8                | n52, nl62        |
|       | 5.  | 27               | n49              |
|       | 5.  | 27b <sup>p</sup> | n49              |
|       | 6.  | 10               | 30, n35, n63     |
|       | 9.  | 6                | n35, n52, nl62   |
|       | 9.  | 12               | n35, nl14        |
| Micah | 4.  | 5                | 34, 35           |
|       | 5.  | 3                | n203             |
|       | 6.  | 9                | nl68             |
| Zeph. | 3.  | 9                | n97              |
|       | 3.  | 9 b              | 46               |
|       | 3.  | 12               | nl67             |
|       | 3.  | 19 f.            | nl25             |
| Zech. | 3.  | 3a               | n72              |
|       | 3.  | 6                | n72              |
|       | 3.  | 8-11             | n72              |
|       | 5.  | 4                | n85, n87         |
|       | 10. | 3b-5             | 34, n72          |
|       | 10. | 7                | 34, n72          |
|       | 10. | 12               | 34, n72, nl34    |
|       | 10. | 12 b             | 34               |
|       | 11. | 1-3              | n72              |

Zech. 13. 3  
 13. 9  
 14. 9

Mal. 1. 6  
 1. 11  
 1. 14  
 2. 2  
 2. 5  
 3. 16  
 3. 20

Psalms 5. 12  
 7. 18  
 8. 2  
 8. 10  
 9. 3  
 9. 11  
 18. 50  
 20. 2  
 20. 2 b  
 20. 6 b  
 20. 8  
 20. 8 b  
 22. 23  
 23. 3  
 25. 11  
 29. 1-2  
 29. 2  
 31. 4  
 33. 21  
 34. 4  
 44. 6  
 44. 9  
 44. 21  
 45. 18  
 48  
 48. 2  
 48. 3  
 48. 5  
 48. 6  
 48. 8  
 48. 9  
 48. 11  
 52. 11  
 54. 3  
 54. 8  
 61. 6  
 61. 9  
 63. 5  
 66. 2  
 66. 4  
 68. 5

nl21  
 n98  
 nl92

nl59  
 n203  
 n203  
 nl77  
 nl93  
 n203  
 n203

n203  
 n203  
 65, nl71  
 65, nl71  
 n203  
 nl02, nl95  
 n203  
 n203  
 33, 34, n71  
 33, 34, n71  
 nl92  
 33, n71  
 n203  
 nl44  
 nl44  
 nl77  
 nl77  
 nl44  
 n203  
 n203  
 n203  
 n203  
 n203  
 55, nl36  
 57  
 nl88  
 nl88  
 nl31  
 nl31  
 nl31  
 nl88  
 56, nl31  
 nl99  
 nl64  
 n203  
 nl68  
 n203  
 n77  
 n203  
 n203  
 n203

Psalms 69. 31  
 69. 37  
 74. 7  
 74. 10  
 74. 18  
 74. 20  
 74. 21  
 75. 2  
 76. 2  
 79. 6  
 79. 9  
 80. 19  
 83. 17  
 83. 18  
 83. 19  
 86. 9  
 86. 11  
 86. 12  
 89. 13  
 89. 17  
 89. 22  
 89. 25  
 91. 14  
 92. 2  
 96. 2  
 96. 7-9  
 96. 8  
 98. 3  
 99. 3  
 99. 6  
 100. 4  
 102. 16  
 102. 22  
 103. 1  
 105. 1  
 105. 3  
 105. 8  
 106. 8  
 106. 47  
 109. 21  
 113. 1  
 113. 2  
 113. 3  
 115. 1  
 116. 4  
 116. 13  
 116. 17  
 118  
 118. 10-12  
 118. 25  
 118. 26  
 119. 55

n203  
 n203  
 nl83  
 nl58  
 nl58  
 n203  
 n203  
 n97  
 n203  
 47, nl92  
 nl44, nl92  
 n97  
 nl62, n203  
 nl62  
 nl62  
 nl77  
 nl68, nl99  
 nl77  
 n203  
 n203  
 nl65  
 nl65, nl99  
 n203  
 nl99  
 n203  
 nl77  
 nl77  
 nl96  
 n203  
 nl03  
 n203  
 n203  
 n203  
 n203  
 n97  
 n203  
 nl96  
 nl44  
 nl92  
 nl44  
 n203  
 n203  
 n203  
 nl33, nl39,  
 nl42, nl99  
 n99  
 n99  
 n99  
 n69  
 33, 62  
 33  
 33, n70  
 nl95

|        |          |            |
|--------|----------|------------|
| Psalms | 119. 132 | n203       |
|        | 122. 4   | nl77       |
|        | 124. 8   | n203       |
|        | 129. 8 b | 37         |
|        | 134      | n70        |
|        | 135. 1   | n203       |
|        | 135. 3   | n203       |
|        | 135. 13  | n44, nl36, |
|        |          | nl95       |
|        | 138. 2   | nl99       |
|        | 140. 14  | n203       |
|        | 142. 8   | n203       |
|        | 143. 11  | nl44       |
|        | 145. 1   | n203       |
|        | 145. 2   | n203       |
|        | 145. 21  | n203       |
|        | 148. 5   | n203       |
|        | 148. 13  | n203       |
|        | 149. 3   | n203       |
| Prov.  | 18. 10   | n203       |
|        | 30. 9    | nl60       |
| Job    | 1. 21    | 68         |
| Ruth   | 2. 4     | 37         |
| Lam,   | 3. 55    | nl03       |
| Esther | 2. 2     | nl24       |
|        | 3. 12    | nl24       |
|        | 8. 8-10  | nl24       |
| Daniel | 9. 6     | nl21       |
|        | 9. 18 f. | n47, nl13  |
|        | 9. 18-19 | nl15, nl91 |
|        | 11. 9    | nl77       |
|        | 11. 38   | nl77       |
| Ezra   | 5. 1     | nl22       |
| Neh.   | 1. 9     | nl83       |
|        | 1. 11    | nl68       |
|        | 9. 5     | n203       |
|        | 9. 10    | nl34       |

|           |           |             |
|-----------|-----------|-------------|
| I Chron.  | 13. 6     | n202        |
|           | 16. 2     | n77         |
|           | 16. 8     | n97         |
|           | 16. 10    | n203        |
|           | 16. 29    | nl77        |
|           | 16. 35    | nl92        |
|           | 17. 24    | nl34, nl37, |
|           |           | nl92        |
|           | 21. 19    | nl17, nl24, |
|           |           | n202        |
|           | 22. 7     | nl86        |
|           | 22. 10    | nl86        |
|           | 22. 18 f. | n203        |
|           | 23. 13    | n77, n79    |
|           | 28. 3     | nl86        |
|           | 29. 13    | n203        |
|           | 29. 16    | 72          |
| II Chron. | 1. 18     | nl82        |
|           | 2. 3      | nl86        |
|           | 6. 5      | nl84        |
|           | 6. 6      | nl84        |
|           | 6. 7      | nl86        |
|           | 6. 8      | nl86        |
|           | 6. 9      | nl86        |
|           | 6. 10     | nl86        |
|           | 6. 18     | nl79        |
|           | 6. 19 f.  | nl80        |
|           | 6. 20     | nl85        |
|           | 6. 24     | nl86, n203  |
|           | 6. 26     | nl86, n203  |
|           | 6. 32     | nl44, nl65  |
|           | 6. 33     | nl62        |
|           | 6. 38     | nl86, nl87  |
|           | 7. 14     | nl14        |
|           | 7. 16     | nl84        |
|           | 9. 1      | nl86        |
|           | 12. 13    | nl85        |
|           | 14. 10    | n68         |
|           | 18. 15    | n95, n86    |
|           | 20. 8     | nl86        |
|           | 20. 8 f.  | nl86        |
|           | 33. 4     | nl85, nl87  |
|           | 33. 7     | nl85        |
|           | 33. 18    | nl18, nl21  |

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Baudissin, Wolf Wilhelm Graf, Kyrios als Gottesname in Judentum und seine Stelle in der Religionsgeschichte, Teil I - IV (4 vls.), Giessen 1929.
- Baur, G., sub Namen, Riehm, Eduard C. August, Handwörterbuch des Biblischen Altertums, Bielefeld & Leipzig 1884, II. Band, pp. 1053 - 1055.
- Bennet, W.H., The Books of Chronicles, Hodder & Staughton, New York
- Blank, Sheldon H., Studies in Deutero-Isaiah, in Hebrew Union College Annual, vol. XV, Cincinnati 1940, pp. 1 - 46.
- Boehmer, Julius, Das Biblische "Im Namen", Giessen 1898.
- Brandt, W., "Ovrou" en de doopsformule in het Nieuwe Testament, in Theologisch Tijdschrift, vol. 25, Leiden 1891, pp. 565 - 610.
- Buber, Martin, and Rosenzweig, Franz, Die Schrift und ihre Verdeutschung, Berlin 1936.
- Buttenwieser, Moses, The Psalms, The University of Chicago Press.
- Cooke, George A., The Book of Ezekiel, vol. I - II, New York 1937.
- Cornill, Carl Heinrich, Das Buch Jeremia, Leipzig 1905.
- Cronbach, Abraham, The Semantics of It, in The Hebrew Union College Monthly, vol. 27, No. 2, Cincinnati, February 1940, pp. 5 - 6, 14 - 15.
- Davies, T. Witton, The Psalms LXXIII to End, Edinburgh: T.O. & E. C. Jack, Ltd.
- Dillmann, August, Die Bücher Exodus und Leviticus, Leipzig 1897.
- Dillmann, August, Die Bücher Numeri, Deuteronomium und Josua, Leipzig 1886.
- Driver, S.R., The Minor Prophets, New York: Henry Frowde.
- Eissfeldt, Otto, Hexateuch - Synopse, Leipzig 1922.
- Frazer, James George, The Golden Bough, I Volume Abridged Edition, New York 1940.
- Freud, Sigmund, The Basic Writings of, The Modern Library, New York.

- Giesebrecht, Fr., Die Alttestamentliche Schätzung des Gottesnamens und ihre religionsgeschichtliche Grundlage, Königsberg i. Pr. 1901.
- Glueck, Nelson, Das Wort Heseb im alttestamentlichen Sprachgebrauche als menschliche und göttliche gemeinschaftgemässe Verhaltungsweise, Giessen 1927.
- Grether, Oskar, Name und Wort Gottes im Alten Testament, Giessen 1934.
- Harvey-Jellie, W.R., Chronicles, New York: Henry Frowde 1906.
- Hehn, Johannes, Die biblische und die babylonische Gottesidee, Leipzig 1913.
- Hehn, Johannes, Hymnen und Gebete an Marduk, Leipzig 1903.
- Heitmüller, Wilhelm, "Im Namen Jesu," Göttingen 1903.
- Herrmann, Johannes, Die Gottesnamen im Ezechieltexte., in Alttestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Kittel, Leipzig 1913.
- Heschel, Abraham, Die Prophetie, Krakow 1936.
- Jacob, Benno, Im Namen Gottes, Berlin 1903.
- Jacob, Benno, Mose am Dornbusch, in Monatsschrift fuer Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums vol. 66, 1923, pp. 11-33, 116-138, 180-200.
- Kautsch, Emil, Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments, Band I - II, Tübingen 1900.
- Kennedy, A.R.S., Samuel, New York: Henry Frowde.
- Landau, Eliseus, Die dem Raume entnommenen Synonyma fuer Gott in der neu-hebraischen Litteratur, Zurich 1888.
- Langdon, Stephen, Sumerian and Babylonian Psalms, Paris 1909.
- Leuterbach, Jacob Z., The Naming of Children in Jewish Folklore, Ritual, and Practice, in OCAR Yearbook, vol. XLII Cincinnati 1932.
- Lofthouse, W.F., Ezekiel, New York: Henry Frowde.
- Mandelkern, Solomon, Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae, Sumptibus Schocken, 1937.
- Marcus, Ralph, Divine Names and Attributes in Hellenistic Jewish Literature, in Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research, vol. 3, New York 1932.



Marmorstein, Abraham, *The Old Rabbinic Doctrine of God*, London 1927.

Moore, George Foote, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Judges*, New York 1910.

Morgenstern, Julian, "Biblical Theophanies," Zeitschrift für Assyriologie, XXV (1911), pp. 130-193, and XXVIII (1913), pp. 15-60.

Morgenstern, Julian, "The Doctrine of Sin in the Babylonian Religion," Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft (1905), 158 p.

"The Elohist Narrative in Exodus 3.1-15," American Journal of Semitic Languages, XXXVII (1921), pp. 242-262.

"The Oldest Document of the Hexateuch," Hebrew Union College Annual, IV (1927), pp. 1-138.

"The Book of the Covenant," Hebrew Union College Annual, V (1928), pp. 1-151; VII (1930), pp. 18-258, and VIII-IX (1931-1932), pp. 1-150.

"Psalm 48," Hebrew Union College Annual, XVI (1941), pp. 1-95.

Noeldecke, Theodor, *Elohim, El*, 1882.

Orelli, Konrad, *Die Propheten Jesaja und Jeremia*, München 1891.

Peake, A. S., *Jeremiah and Lamentations*, vol. I - II. New York: Henry Frowde.

Robinson, Theodore H. and Horst, Friedrich, *Die Zwölf Kleinen Propheten*, Tübingen 1938.

Skinner, John, *Kings*, New York: Henry Frowde.

Skinner, John, *The Book of the Prophet Isaiah*, chapters I-XXXIX, Cambridge 1897.

Skinner, John, *The Book of the Prophet Isaiah*, chapters XL-LXVI, Cambridge 1902.

Smend, Rudolf, *Lehrbuch der Alttestamentlichen Religionsgeschichte*, Freiburg i. B. and Leipzig, 1893.

Smith, George Adam, *The Book of Isaiah*, vol. I-II, Cincinnati: Jennings & Graham.

- Smith, George Adam, The Book of the Twelve Prophets, vol. I-II,  
New York, Hodder & Stoughton.
- Soloff, Mordecai I., The Term <sup>H</sup>asidim, its Synonyms and  
Antonyms in the Book of Psalms, Rabbinical Thesis,  
Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, 1940.
- Stade, Bernhard, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, Zweiter Band,  
Berlin 1888.
- Thureau-Daugin, F., Un Comotoir de Laine Poudre a Ugarit  
d'après une Tablette de Ras-Shamra, in Syria,  
vol. 15, Paris 1934.
- Whitehouse, Owen C., Isaiah, vol. I-II, New York: Henry Frowde.
- Wittichen, sub Name in Schenkel, Daniel, Bibel-Lexikon,  
Vierter Band, Leipzig 1872, pp. 283 -285.