

The men of the first class have implicit faith in God's word; and, assuming the strictly literal as the only possible interpretation of the word *day*, to the exclusion alike of the figurative and the symbolic principle, they have rejected all other views as infidel in their character, or, at least, as tending to infidelity. These men treat geology very much as the Hindoo ascetic, who rejected with abhorrence all animal food, did the microscope which revealed to him the unwelcome fact that his boasted vegetable diet was plentifully stocked with animal life:—they dash it to the ground with indignation. The other class of men are unbelievers; and, assuming with the former the strictly literal as the only possible interpretation, and unreasonably rejecting every plan for reconciling science with Scripture, they exalt the former to the discredit of the latter. Thus, between these two classes, God's truth is placed very much in the situation of the famous General Putnam, when tied to a tree between the opposing fire of his friends and his enemies.

ARTICLE IV.

JEHOVAH CONSIDERED AS A MEMORIAL NAME.¹

By Alexander MacWhorter, New Haven, Ct.

It is of great moment to man, that any term in which the Creator reveals either his character, or his relation to the race, should be clearly understood. If there is any one word, which He has adopted, and declared to be his memorial to all generations, that word should be the theme of earnest inquiry. If any uncertainty hang over the true significance of its ancient forms, the uncertainty should be dispelled by

¹ A more popular exhibition of this subject will be found in a volume entitled "Yahveh Christ, or the memorial name," with Introductory Letter by N. W. Taylor, D. D., Dwight Professor of Theology, Yale College. Gould and Lincoln, Boston. London, 1857.

diligent research. The whole Christian world, God's children, each one of whom has a personal concern in the meaning of this term, should compel the research, being assured that God would not commit the solemn act of mockery, of giving to man as a revelation and memorial, a word either uncertain or unmeaning. Now God has given us a name and a memorial.

When Moses entreated the Lord for a name by which he might justify to the children of Israel his mission as deliverer, God answered: "Go tell them 'I AM' hath sent you — this is my name forever, and this is my memorial to all generations." So at least we are told in Ex. 3: 14, where we find the phrase "I AM" given as the interpreting synonym for "Jehovah." The circumstances in which this name was given are well known. It was an occasion of great distress among the suffering Israelites. Moses had come, with a message of Deliverance from God, who had declared that with a strong arm he would free his people from bondage. But Pharaoh hardened his heart, and would not let them go. Moses and Aaron, day by day, besought the Lord for the promised deliverance. But it was delayed. Burden after burden was added, till the heart of the people was sick. They accused Aaron and Moses of being the instigators of this additional cruelty. They refused to believe in the promised deliverance. The faith of Moses himself began to waver, or at least to wonder at the delay. Hear his almost reproachful language: "Lord, wherefore hast thou so evil entreated this people; why is it that thou hast sent me? — for since I came to Pharaoh, to speak in thy name, he hath done evil unto this people, neither hast thou delivered thy people at all!"

Now let us consider the answer made to Moses in these circumstances. Let us remember that these were God's own people, in deep affliction, so deep that they hearkened not to Moses, for anguish of spirit and cruel bondage. Let us substitute the phrase "I AM," carrying with it the meaning of self-existence, for the term *Lord* or *Jehovah*, wherever it occurs in the answering declaration, and see how much of meaning or of comfort it carries with it.

“ And God spake unto Moses, and said unto him, I am the ‘ I AM,’ and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name of God Almighty (Heb. *El Shaddai*), but by my name ‘ I AM,’ was I not known unto them. . . And I have also heard the groanings of the children of Israel whom the Egyptians keep in bondage, and I have remembered my covenant. Wherefore say unto the children of Israel, I am the ‘ I AM,’ and I will bring you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians, and I will rid you out of their bondage, and I will redeem you with a stretched out arm and with great judgments; and I will take you to me for a people, and I will be to you a God; and ye shall know that I am the ‘ I AM,’ your God, which bringeth you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians.”

Upon the assumption that this is a proclamation of the majesty of God’s immutable existence, or of the natural attributes of the Creator inseparable from him in that relation, one or two questions may be asked which it is not easy to answer.

Does not such a proclamation seem out of place *in the circumstances?*

If the fact of the *power* of God to accomplish what he had promised, was the fact he wished to impress upon the Israelites, why was not the name EL SHADDAI (God Almighty) sufficient? Is there not, on the face of the narrative, an implication of a greater difference in the significance of these names, than appears in our translation? Is it not probable, also, that a name adopted under such circumstances, to be perpetuated as a memorial to all generations, would contain some fact revealed or relation assumed by God, fitted to be remembered in the connection in which it was declared? Should we not naturally expect that a *memorial* name would express a relation in which God is brought *near* to His people? that it would represent those promises by which He was remembered with hope through all the troubled times in which Zion was tossed with the tempest, and not comforted, save with the comfort of this memorial? finally, that it would be the name, or would *represent the relation*, by which in these last days, *we* should

remember Him? There ought surely to be, in our hearts, some response to the exulting exclamation of David: "Ex-tol him by the name of YAH!" Yet who, to-day, remembers God by that name? It is not his name now. It is not his memorial to this generation. What, then, has become of that ancient name, revealed *for all time*, and why is it not our memorial?

Out of these questions arise others: Have we the true rendering of this word? What is its history? what its significance? In seeking to answer these questions, we would invite attention to some facts in the exegesis of this name, brought to light by modern scholarship.

It came to our translators simply as an "ineffable" name; a name in the superstition of the Jews unlawful to be uttered, or even written with its *true vowel-points*; and this name, thus unpronounced, and now falsely written, had a traditional rendering made out under the shadow of the Septuagint. The Platonizing school of Alexandria gave, in the Septuagint, God's declaration in Ex. 3: 14, the rendering *Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὢν*, which the Vulgate follows with its "Ego sum qui sum." — So our translators give us: "I am that I am," and "I AM" as the interpreting synonym for "Jehovah." But with respect to the *proper* pointing and *literal* rendering of the term *Jehovah*, there is now, among scholars, no difference of opinion. Let us look at the facts in the case, and then consider their bearing upon its true meaning.

The Hebrew, as all now know, had originally no vowel-points. These were supplied by the Masorites, who, in accordance with the Jewish superstition, gave the name יהוה the vowel-points taken from another name of God (אֲדֹנָי) *Adonai*. These vowel-points have given us the pronunciation יהוה (*Jehovah*.)

Two questions therefore arise: first, What is the derivation? second, What is the true pointing and consequent pronunciation of the term rendered *Jehovah* in our Bibles? The derivation was formerly a matter of contention. Many critics have striven to give it a source foreign to the Hebrew. It is useless, at this day, to record their futile labors. It is

sufficient upon this point to cite a remarkable change of opinion in Gesenius, the acknowledgment of which, is a fact creditable alike to the candor and scholarship of the great philologist. By comparing his former Manuals with the last edition of his Thesaurus, or more easily perhaps, Dr. Robinson's translation (ed. 1836 and ed. 1850), it will be seen that while in the former he holds to an Egyptian or Greek derivation of this term; in the latter, he says, "they lose their time and labor, who endeavor to refer this name to a foreign origin." Its true derivation is from הָוָה (HAVAH), the old root of the Hebrew verb "to be;" a root-form so ancient as to have been dropped entirely from the *prose* of the Pentateuch, and retained only in the *poetic* form of the imperative, as in Gen. 27: 29 in the prophetic benediction of Isaac, הָוֵהָ (HEVEH), "'be,' lord over thy brethren;" HAVAH although superseded in the Hebrew except in set phrases and proper names, being still retained abundantly in the kindred dialects. This old root הָוָה (HAVAH) found its equivalent in הָיָה (HAYAH), the ordinary form of the Hebrew verb "to be;" and it is, in the third person singular, future, of this later verb הָיָה (HAYAH), "to be," viz. in the form of its old future יִהְיֶה (YAHVEH,) that we find the TRUE PLACE and *pointing* of the word rendered "Jehovah" by our translators. It is this form, *yahveh*, lit. *he will be*, turned into the noun or name YAHVEH, lit. *he who will be*, which God adopts as his name and *memorial* to all generations.

With respect to this exegesis of the true pointing and grammatical position of the term YAHVEH or "Jehovah," there is no longer a difference of opinion; Gesenius and Ewald for the philologists; Hengstenberg, Tholuck, Lutz, etc., on the side of the theologians, are united for once; however widely they may differ in their use of the fact, they all agree in giving the word the form יִהְיֶה (YAHVEH), as its true form and pointing, and the future tense as its *literal* rendering. Let us see how the passage in Ex. 3: 14 bears the test of a literal rendering.

"And God said unto Moses, *I will be, who I will be*: and he said, thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel;

I who will be hath sent me unto you. And God said moreover unto Moses; thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel; *He who will be*, the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you; this is my name forever, and this is my memorial unto all generations."

This word, YAHVEH , first appears in history, in the mouth of Eve, Gen. 4: 1, in her exclamation upon the birth of Cain, which stands literally thus: $\text{קָנִיתִי אִישׁ אֶת־יְהוָה}$, "I have gotten a man, even YAHVEH ."

This use of אֶת (ETH), before יְהוָה (YAHVEH), marks the case to be one of *emphatic apposition*; and is a striking instance of the designating and emphatic power of the particle, as is abundantly shown, by *Gerhard of Jena*—Comment. Gen. 1637.—in numerous and decisive examples. In fact, the use of אֶת (ETH), in any sense other than that of a defining and emphatic particle, is utterly foreign to any document belonging to the age in question. To cite in support of any other rendering of the exclamation of Eve, the controverted case in Gen. 5: 24, "Enoch walked with God," is not in point. For this latter is an instance, not of apposition, but of government. Moreover, the verb "to walk" used here, as elsewhere in parallel instances, governs its object, directly and actively, requiring no preposition; this very case being often urged as a remarkable instance of the designating and defining power of this emphatic particle. A citation on which such opposite views are entertained, can hardly be considered as establishing an idiom otherwise foreign to the usage of the age in question, and entirely anomalous in the life of Eve. It will not do to make a journey of two or three thousand years, to establish by examples from Jeremiah, a critical point in Genesis. No sober critic can allow weight to such an argument. In fact, to depart in this single case from the ordinary rendering of this particle in Genesis, is an attempt to establish a point "sui generis," and substantially alone among the eight thousand one hundred and thirty enumerated instances of its use. No simply grammatical question, is

capable of a more thorough exegetical demonstration, or is sustained by better external testimony. [Vid. Nold. ed. Tymp. et Michael. et Koerb. Gesen. Thesaur. Ewald. Nord. etc. Syriac version, Chald. Targ., Pseud. Jno., Luther, etc.]

The Syriac version sustains the literal rendering. Adopting Dr. Davidson's view, that the Syriac version was strongly influenced by the Septuagint, the fact that the version opposes the Septuagint in this instance, gives additional weight to its testimony.

The Chaldee paraphrase of Pseud. Jno. Ben Uz., by its explanation, does the same. Among the Reformers, we have Luther, and others whose critical acumen was beyond that of Luther.

Luther, in his first and quaint edition of the Pentateuch and New Testament, A. D. 1523, Wittenburg, reads: "den man des Herrn," and explains this in the margin by saying, "whom Eve thought was the very same Seed the Lord had declared would crush the Serpent's head." In later editions substituting the more emphatic phrase, "den Man, den Herrn."

Those curious to ascertain the opinions of English critics on this point, will find the view here taken, maintained at length in *Scrip. Test. to Messiah*, 4th ed., by Dr. J. Pye Smith, and tacitly assumed by the distinguished scholar who writes in *Kitto's Journ. Sac. Lit.*, over the signature T. T. Antedil. Theoc. Jan. 1854. But were the grammatical construction even doubtful, the historical position of this remark made by Eve, settles the question, and demands the literal rendering. The question concerning the historical position of the remark of Eve, opens the whole subject of the "Mosaic documents" in Genesis. To expand upon this point would be irrelevant. No scholar can reasonably dispute their existence in Genesis. A critical exhibition of their divisions appears in the papers of Dr. Hermann Hupfeld, *Deutsche Zeitschrift*, Berlin, Jan. 1853. "Die Urschrift der Genesis in ihrer wahren Gestalt." The philological acumen shown in this analysis of the documents, needs no commendation. Of course, theological inferences form no necessary part of the analysis.

The subject of documents, looked at historically, appears very simple. We have two narratives of creation, and two of the deluge; together with various genealogical lists, and attending historical facts. Certain narratives and statements use אֱלֹהִים (ELOHIM) and others יְהוָה (YAHVEH) as the name of God. These two sets of narratives and statements wear the appearance of having been WRITTEN TOGETHER, or formed into a connected narrative by a later "Yahvistic" writer, whom, since there is no shadow of critical authority for setting him aside, we suppose to be Moses.

The use we would make of this point here, is to direct attention to the fact that Eve never, under any circumstances, uses other than אֱלֹהִים (ELOHIM,) as the name of God, either in the narrative document of the third chapter, or in her remarks as adduced by the compiler in the fourth; and also to the unqualified statement, in the fourth chapter, that יְהוָה (YAHVEH) began to be used as the name of God in the days of Enos; Gen. 4: 26, אָז הִתְחַל לִקְרָא בְשֵׁם יְהוָה, literally, "then was begun the calling *with* the name YAHVEH," i. e. the invocation of God under this name (vid. Gesen.).

Commentators ignorant or careless of the true composition of this chapter, and others looking upon it as the consecutive narrative of a single writer, have felt themselves compelled to explain this as a statement of "the origin of *public* worship," from the simple fact that they knew not how else to dispose of the passage. How the proposition, "then began invocation with the name YAHVEH," can be defended as meaning "then began the worship of God," or "then began public worship," it is difficult to see. It cannot mean merely "the worship of God," for we know that Abel worshipped, and that Seth was in the line of the faithful. The supposition, that any particular formalities of *public* worship were then and there established, has nothing to recommend it except ingenuity. We thus see, that to place יְהוָה (YAHVEH) in the mouth of Eve, as the name of God, is not warranted by the construction; is counter to the documents containing the narrative of her life, and contrary to an express historical statement.

On the other hand, for the common rendering of Gen. 4: 1, we have the Septuagint, Vulgate, and English version, all reducible, of course, to the *Septuagint*, and all alike ignorant of the true origin and meaning of the term יְהוָה (YAHVEH), as its position and pointing have been settled by the unanimous verdict of later and more thorough scholars.

It may be mentioned, in passing, that other indications exist in the documents recording the life of Eve, in addition to her use of ELOHIM as the name of God, which show that her words are of the highest antiquity. Vid. Gesen. on obsolete use of כִּי (KI) as RELATIVE, Gen. 4: 25, in her remark on Shem.

We have shown, historically, that Eve's use of the term YAHVEH is not *as the name of God*; and critically, that the word as a noun means, literally, "he who will be." From this starting point we will trace its history and its significance.

It will be seen that the name YAHVEH, or "Jehovah," represented the Expectation of the World; that this expectation began in the promise made to Eve, and received a name, YAHVEH, "He who will be;" that this name was applied by Eve to her first-born; was transferred to God; invoked by the Patriarchs; affirmed to Moses; proclaimed by the Prophets; complete in CHRIST.

I. *Begun in the Promise.*

The expectation of a Deliverer, to which the records of every ancient people bear abundant testimony, finds its source in the first great promise or prediction that the Seed of the woman should bruise the Serpent's head: "He shall crush thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." It was natural that Eve should expect in her lifetime the realization of this prophecy. Filled with this expectation, it was natural that, looking upon her first-born, she should exclaim: "I have received Him, even YAHVEH (even He who will be)!" and that she should have believed him the promised Deliverer.

It is necessary to state here, that our abstract English "to be," is utterly inadequate as a translation of the old Heb. verb הָיָה (HAYAH), and the later HAYAH; these meaning, primarily, rather the old English *to become*, that is, "to come about, to begin to be or appear" (either in time or space), as in Gen. 1: 3, "let light *be!*" (i. e. spring forth! appear!)" being used, also, in the sense of "to come," as Gen 17: 16, "Kings of nations shall be (or *come*) of her."

The exclamation of Eve at the birth of Cain, may be expressed with more faithfulness to the *old* and obsolete form of the verb, therefore, by the rendering: "I have received him; even HE WHO IS TO COME!" The propriety of applying a primary "*sense*" *idea* to a root of this class and character, will be understood at once by philologists. The physical or "*sense*" *idea*, and the only *idea* of this word, in these historical relations, is "the Coming One — He who will come." The term here used, connects itself with, and explains itself by, the foregoing promise; and only in this light can it be explained at all. To translate it as the name of God, in any sense as used by Eve, is an anachronism. It must be looked at simply as a term expressing the joyful hope of Eve, that she had received the Promise.

II. *It was transferred to God.*

Proceeding with the narrative, we have in connection with the birth of Enos, the record, to which we have already alluded: "Then began men to call upon the name of YAHVEH;" or, more literally: "then was begun invocation with the name YAHVEH."

The question here arises: Why this reference to the first invocation of YAHVEH? The writer has given, in the form of a genealogical table, a record of nearly two thousand years, with here and there, only, an isolated way-mark in the shape of a fact. Thus the whole life, mission, and translation of Enoch, is given in a single line. We simply find, therefore, a brief statement, that, at some time in the interval, this name, with its promise, and its hope, was transferred to God.

Apart from this statement, however, does not the fact that Cain was called YAHVEH, and supposed to be the Deliverer, and afterwards that God was invoked as YAHVEH, show that men had transferred their hope of a Deliverer from man to God himself? Does not the fact also that this transfer was recorded at all, show it to be a point of great historical interest?

That the original name of God, ELOHIM, should have been superseded by a second name, YAHVEH, is a change in itself extraordinary, and could not have taken place except for some grand historical reason. Yet to this hour, the change remains unaccounted for, save in the light of the narrative here given.

III. *Invoked by the Patriarchs.*

We find the name YAHVEH upon every page of the history of the patriarchs. He who had taken upon himself the name of the Promise to the antediluvian world, was worshipped by the descendants of Noah, and by the patriarchs, as the God of their fathers, and as a Deliverer from the Flood which had buried the earth beneath its waves. But the hope of a restoration to an earthly paradise must have departed, in the great change which blotted out all traces of its former existence. The original prophetic meaning of this term, therefore, and its associated idea, Deliverance, must have been but vaguely retained by the world after the flood. In the history of the name YAHVEH, the period of the patriarchs intervenes as a kind of transition-era between its association with the first general promise and its assumption by God under a more specific relation to the race. The name YAHVEH bore no such immediate relation to the exigencies of the patriarchs as to make that name comprehended by them from the circumstances of their own experience. God appeared to them rather as EL SHADDAI, a mighty promiser of blessings, the name EL SHADDAI, God Almighty, being a pledge of their fulfilment. In this view is seen the explanation of Ex. 6: 3, where God declares to

Moses, that by his name **YAHVEH**, or Jehovah, he was not "known" to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, i. e. not "comprehended" by them under that name, or under the relation involved in the name; the word יָדַע, here translated "to know," having the sense of "to see with the mind, to comprehend by means of explanatory circumstances." Thus this instance of apparent contradiction becomes not only perfectly consistent with the rest of the narrative, but a testimony in itself to the significance of the name **YAHVEH**, or Jehovah, in its historical relation to the race.

IV. *Affirmed to Moses.*

The promise contained in the name **YAHVEH**, or Jehovah, is now, in a subordinate sense, to be fulfilled. He who had been invoked in the Adamic dispensation as the author of an undeveloped hope, originating in the promise to Eve; by the patriarchs, as a mighty promiser of blessings, more specific yet still remote, enters upon the work of fulfilment. He is now to become the actual Deliverer and Theocratic Head of the nation of Israel. In this deliverance also, being inaugurated that greater deliverance to be wrought in the world, He now affirms his ancient name **YAHVEH** (Jehovah), "He who will be," and, by the connection in which it is proclaimed, takes upon himself forever, under this memorial name, the character of Deliverer. He sets forth this name with the most solemn and emphatic formality, under three Divine affirmations, and adopts it as his own, his great and standing memorial, from generation to generation.

What are these affirmations? They are recorded in Ex. 3: 14, in reply to the question by Moses: What shall I say to Israel's children? And God said: אֲהֵיָה אֲשֶׁר אֲהֵיָה, "I will be who I will be." Here the Hebrew verb, יָהָה (**HAYAH**), "to be," answering primarily to the old English "to become," to "come about," to "begin to be, or appear," (either in time or space) is taken and used in the first person singular future, twice; and so we have the proposition just cited, "I will be who I will be." This is the first

affirmation. Next; The first person singular future, of this same verb, הָיָה (HAYAH), "to be," viz: "I will be," is taken and used as a noun, and so becomes אֲהִיָּהּ, "I who will be." We have then this proposition: "Thus shalt thou say to Israel's children, 'I who will be' hath sent me unto you." This is the second affirmation.

Finally; after this explanatory and emphatic introduction, we have the third person singular future, of the *old* form of this same verb, הָיָה (HAYAH), "to be," that *old form*, filled with historic memories, recalling the last uttered longing of the dying Israel, for the Deliverer yet to come; "I have waited for thy deliverance, Oh YAHVEH!" viz: הָיָהּ, "He who will be," reaffirmed in the instruction to Moses; "Thus shalt thou say unto Israel's children, YAHVEH, He who will be, The Coming One, God of your Fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you; this is my name forever, and this is my memorial unto all generations." In these propositions, the unqualified, or absolute future form of the Hebrew verb "to be" is employed throughout. The first affirmation, therefore, "I will be who I will be," which introduces and lends significance to the two succeeding statements, has the form of a prophecy; a prophecy uttered by no subordinate, or delegated authority. The expression אֲהִיָּהּ, here translated "I will be," is found in the first person singular future of the Hebrew verb "to be," and signifies a "future relation" of the speaker, in distinction from the present or past. This first person singular future of the verb "to be," viz. אֲהִיָּהּ, occurs *forty times* in the Hebrew Scriptures, and in every instance, whether in prose or poetry, exhibits a *future* relation, or movement forward, from the speaker's point of view, in action or conception. It is repeated several times in this same chapter; we find it in history, poetry, prophecy; yet it is ever the same, the element of *futurity* is wrought into its very structure.

That our English translation of this passage is not a literal rendering of the original, is of course well known to scholars. The Hebrew אֲהִיָּהּ אֲנִי never expresses any idea or

relation of self-existence; that idea, so far as conveyed at all in the Old Testament, has another and specific formula, viz: אֲנִי יְהוָה (I, HE) attended by some exclusive Monotheistic declaration. [Vid. Deut. 32: 39. Isa. 41: 4; 43: 10, 13; 46: 4; 48: 12.] The phrase "*I am*," is imported into this text, directly from the *Septuagint*, with its Alexandrian rendering, Ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ὢν; from which, through the Vulgate, comes our version. Until however, the discovery of the true derivation of "*Jehovah*," or יְהוָה, gave a clue to its meaning as a name, no motive existed for calling attention to the subject. In view of the foregoing facts, we would ask the attention of scholars to the following question: May not the *Septuagint* have given us, instead of the historical יְהוָה, God of the Scriptures, the philosophical Θεός, or "*God*," of Plato, and the school of Alexandria?

This question cannot be turned aside by ingenious reasoning on the nature and use of the Hebrew future, in the abstract. The forty witnesses to the future rendering of this form of the verb, might be thought sufficient to establish it beyond question, but the case under consideration is stronger than any one of these. Here is a series of distinct propositions, independent of any context from which a doubt could by possibility be borrowed; standing in an explanatory relation to each other, the first two being used as introducing and reviving an old Historic term. These propositions, then, must be judged by themselves on their own literal merits.

V. *Proclaimed by the Prophets.*

The dying words of David, the sweet psalmist of Israel and the kingly representative of the Messiah, are recorded in 2 Sam. 23: 1—8. This passage containing, as may be shown on established authority, a direct and beautiful prophecy of the coming of יְהוָה, is yet so obscure in our version as to be utterly meaningless to the ordinary reader. The number of interpolations by our translators shows that they could make no sense of the original, the text being to

them inextricably confused. Since their time, however, other mss. have been discovered, which throw great light upon the passage. Upon the authority of the oldest and best of these, the great reliance of Dr. Kennicott, his mss. No. 1, **YAHVEH** or *Jehovah*, being restored to the Heb. text as the subject of the passage, is seen to be the "sun" that "ariseth," and a prophecy at once appears, upon the discovery of which Michaelis congratulates the critical and Christian world. According to the critical text of Kennicott and De Rossi, the passage in the version mainly of the former, reads thus :

TITLE :

Now these are the last words of David —

PROEM :

The oracle of David, the son of Jesse,
 Even the oracle of the man raised up on high ;
 The anointed of the God of Jacob,
 And the sweet psalmist of Israel.
 — The Spirit of **YAHVEH** speaketh by me ;
 And his word is upon my tongue :
YAHVEH the GOD of Israel sayeth ;
 To me speaketh the Rock of Israel.

SONG :

The JUST ONE ruleth among men !
 He ruleth by the fear of GOD !
 As the light of the morning ariseth **YAHVEH** ;
 A sun without clouds, for brightness ;
 And as the grass from the earth, after rain,
 Verily thus is my house with GOD ;
 For an everlasting covenant hath He made with me,
 Ordered in all things and sure :
 For He is all my salvation, and all my desire.
 But the sons of Belial shall not flourish ;
 As a thorn rooted up shall be all of them ;
 For they cannot be taken by the hand.
 And the man who shall touch them
 Shall be filled with iron, and the staff of a spear :
 But with fire shall they be utterly consumed in their dwelling.

Isaiah proclaims the Coming of YAHVEH :

CHAP. XL.

"A voice crying:"

In the wilderness, prepare ye a way for YAHVEH !
 Make straight in the desert, a highway for our GOD !
 Every valley shall be exalted, every mountain and hill shall be made low ;
 And the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough places plain ;
 And the glory of YAHVEH shall be revealed,
 And all flesh shall see it together ; —
 For the mouth of YAHVEH hath spoken.

* * * * * [tain !
 Oh thou that tellest glad tidings to Zion, get thee up into the high moun-
 Oh thou that tellest glad tidings to Jerusalem, lift up thy voice with
 Lift it up ! — Be not afraid ! [strength !
 Say unto the cities of Judah, "Behold your GOD !"
 Behold the sovereign YAHVEH shall come with strength !

* * * * *
 He shall feed his flock like a shepherd :
 He shall gather the lambs with his arm, and carry them in his bosom ;
 And shall gently lead those that are with young."

Jeremiah proclaims the Deliverance of YAHVEH :

CHAP. XXXIII.

"Behold the days come, saith YAHVEH,
 That I will raise up unto David, a righteous Branch,
 And a King shall reign and prosper,
 And shall execute judgment and justice in the earth.
 In His days Judah shall be saved,
 And Israel shall dwell safely ;
 And this is his name whereby HE shall be called,
 YAHVEH OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS.
 Therefore, behold the days come, saith YAHVEH,
 That they shall no more say, "as YAHVEH liveth,
 Who brought up the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt!"
 But, "as YAHVEH liveth,
 Who brought up, and who led the seed of the house of Israel
 From the north country,
 And from all countries whither I had driven them !"
 And they shall dwell in their own land !

Zechariah foretells the Reception of YAHVEH :

CHAP. 11: 12, 13 —

"And I said unto them, If ye think good, give me my price, and if not,
 forbear. So they weighed for my price thirty pieces of silver.

10*

“ And YAHVEH said unto me, ‘ Cast it unto the potter — a goodly price that I was prized at of them ! ’

“ And I took the thirty pieces of silver and cast them to the potter in the house of YAHVEH.”

ZECH. XII.

* * *

saith YAHVEH,

Who stretcheth forth the heavens,
And layeth the foundation of the earth,
And formeth the spirit of man within him,

* * *

They shall look upon ME whom they have pierced,
And shall mourn.

Isaiah predicts the effect, upon the nation, of their treatment of YAHVEH :

CHAP. 8: 13, 15.

To YAHVEH of Hosts himself, pay holy homage,
Even Him be your fear, and Him your dread ;
And He shall be for a sanctuary,
But for a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence
To both houses of Israel ;
For a gin and a snare
To the inhabitants of Jerusalem.
And many among them shall stumble,
And shall fall, and be broken,
And be snared, and be taken.

Malachi, the last of the prophets, warns of the near approach of THE SOVEREIGN, YAHVEH Himself being speaker :

CHAP. 3: 1.

Behold I send my messenger,
And he shall prepare the way before ME ;
And THE SOVEREIGN, whom ye seek, will suddenly come
To His temple,
Even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in ;
Behold he cometh, saith YAHVEH of Hosts.

The term *הַיְהוָה*, THE SOVEREIGN, in this passage, is by Hebrew usage appropriated exclusively to the supreme God, and is in Exodus applied to YAHVEH, or Jehovah, as “ the

sovereign Jehovah, God of Israel." It occurs eight times in the Old Testament, and has this application in each instance, admitting of no other.

Along the line of history, the prophecies of the divinity, and the humanity of the Coming One, have hitherto stood in a measure apart. The great work of the prophetic era appears to be, the *interweaving* of these two ideas, as a preparation for the coming of the Divine YAHVEH, in the person of Messiah.

We now find a continued series of statements concerning the Divinity and the humanity of the Coming Deliverer, so interchanging the personalities of the two, as to identify beyond a possibility of separation, or essential distinction, the two sets of prophecies, as relating to *One Person*. "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given." "They shall call his name Immanuel (Heb. God with us)." "He shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, Mighty God, Father of Eternity, Prince of Peace."

Such passages, and those identifying the Deliverer of the past with the Deliverer to come, abound in, nay may be said to constitute of themselves, the prophecies of the Old Testament. The mind of the prophet was filled with the conception of YAHVEH as upon the throne of the universe, as walking the circle of the heavens, as dwelling in the fulness of glory. From that central position or point of conception, HE is seen as about to interpose His own arm of salvation to bring deliverance to man. Then HE appears upon earth, as "the man of sorrows," "stricken and afflicted," "despised and rejected," "acquainted with grief," "pierced," "making His grave with the wicked." Again, bursting the bars of death, HE rises and reigns as Messianic King, whose dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and His kingdom that which shall not be destroyed; and in the full glory of whose reign, even upon the bells of the horses, shall be inscribed :

HOLINESS TO YAHVEH.

VI. *Complete in Christ.*

And HE came. The long-expected Deliverer, THE SOVEREIGN came *suddenly* to his temple, yet heralded by angels, and proclaimed by his messenger: YAHVEH, in the person of CHRIST, speaks on earth. To this the apostle John testifies (12: 41), "These things said Esaias, when he saw His glory, and spake of Him (CHRIST)."

Now this is the glory which Esaias saw (Isa. vi.): "I saw the SOVEREIGN, sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up! and his train filled the temple; above it stood the seraphim . . . and one cried unto another, saying, Holy, holy, holy, YAHVEH of Hosts! The whole earth is full of his glory! Then said I, Woe is me! for mine eyes have seen the KING, YAHVEH of Hosts."

The above may stand as an illustration of the manner in which the New Testament writers refer to the Hebrew Scriptures in speaking of Christ. Their great aim appears to be, to identify Christ, the Messiah, with YAHVEH of the Old Testament. Thus they affirm: — that Esaias saw the glory of Christ. In Isaiah, it is the glory of YAHVEH. They affirm that Christ was the leader of Israel in the wilderness. In the narrative of their wanderings, they were led by YAHVEH. It is affirmed that Moses preferred the reproach of CHRIST to the treasures of Egypt. In Exodus, it is YAHVEH for whom he endures all things. It is affirmed, that at the giving of the Law, the voice of CHRIST shook the earth. In Exodus, it is the voice of YAHVEH. It is affirmed that the Spirit of CHRIST spake by the prophets. The prophets themselves refer their utterances to the Spirit of YAHVEH.

This breadth of reference in the New Testament writers, to Christ as pervading the history of the Old, cannot be explained on the ordinary view. So also, their references to passages in the Psalms and prophets as prophetic of Christ, appear often quite indiscriminate, and incomprehensible, on the narrow methods of interpretation prevailing at the present day in the Christian church, in respect to the Christ

of Old Testament history. And yet there is a strong undercurrent of feeling, that the mystery of Christ, as related to that history, is not solved.

The pressure of the facts above set forth, the continual identification, by the apostles, of the New Testament Christ with the Old Testament YAHVEH, has compelled the adoption by many, of the *theory* rather than the *belief*, that the "Jehovah Angel" was Christ. It is no new thing to assert that Christ appeared, in the form of the "Jehovah Angel," to his ancient people. It is safe to affirm, however, indeed it cannot be denied, that no distinction of *persons* can be maintained, between "Jehovah" and the "Jehovah Angel" of the Old Testament, or between יהוה and מַלְאֲכֵי יְהוָה. They are continually interchanged, in such a manner as to exclude the possibility of distinction except on the ground of a "manifested presence." vid. Ex. 3: 2—7 as one instance.

When YAHVEH *appears* to man, or gives any *visible sign* of his presence, that visible sign or appearance is called MALAK YAHVEH, OR MESSENGER YAHVEH. This "manifestation," "messenger," or "angel," as a *man*, walks and talks with Abraham; as an *angel*, wrestles with Jacob; communes face to face with Moses; is seen in the heavens, by the elders of Israel. The pillar and the cloud also, were the visible signs of YAHVEH's presence to the Israelites in the wilderness, leading them in their wanderings. Each was to them, in turn, MALAK YAHVEH; and out of the glory, and out of the cloud was heard the voice of YAHVEH, when he spake with Moses. MALAK YAHVEH, then, is the first manifestation of YAHVEH to Humanity, and the preparation for that more wonderful revelation of himself to the world as the Messenger of the New Covenant; of which great future manifestation, the name YAHVEH is itself a prophetic memorial.

Not only in this special manner do the apostles assert the identity of Christ with YAHVEH, but they assume that identity as an established fact, by attributing to Christ, in his final coming and kingdom, all the glory and dominion, everywhere throughout the Old Testament ascribed to YAHVEH.

The arguments, also, by which they establish the Divinity of the man Christ Jesus, are historical arguments. Beginning at the creation, they affirm that the same Being, who laid the foundations of the earth, and who manifested himself to the ancient church, from time to time, along the line of its history, appeared in the person of Christ on earth. They do not begin with his humanity, and add on names and attributes to prove him Divine. They begin with his Divinity, which Divinity, or Divine Personality, they declare superintended the world from the beginning; manifested itself, from time to time, in history; and finally appeared on earth as the Messiah.

In the apostolic view, then, the manifested presence of Christ began at the very foundation of the church, the transient and varying forms by which he appeared to his ancient people, preparing them for the more permanent and universal manifestation of himself in the person of the great MALAK YAHVEH, Christ the Messiah. Thus they declare, in the most absolute manner, the identity of YAHVEH, the Founder of the Jewish church, with Christ, the great High-priest, who by the sacrifice of Himself abolished the merely legal and representative ordinances, and completed the dispensation which HE instituted. This completed dispensation is set forth in the New Testament as a great historic fact and unit, containing, from beginning to end, the revelation of the work of Christ in the world, no part of which can be comprehended without the other; and of which, *one Divine person*, under the successive names YAHVEH and Christ, constitutes the sublime unity.

But here it may be asked, If these things are so, where is the doctrine of the Trinity?—the relation of Father and Son?—of God, and Mediator between God and man? Before these questions can be answered, it is necessary to set forth the distinctions everywhere preserved, in the original of the Hebrew Scriptures, in the names of God.

We find three great names used by the Old Testament writers: אֱלֹהִים, (ELOHIM), אֲדֹנָי, (ADONAI), יְהוָה, (YAHVEH). These names, as we have seen, are everywhere distinct in

the original, yet interchange under the relations of the work of deliverance and redemption.

ELOHIM and YAHVEH are the two distinctive names of the Old Testament. ADONAI (sovereign) is a title expressive of a governmental relation, and takes the place of either ELOHIM or YAHVEH, according to the circumstances or feeling of the writer. ELOHIM (God) "whom no man hath seen at any time," a name infolding *all* the attributes of *God* as opposed to *man*, stands "in the beginning," as Creator of the universe. "In the beginning ELOHIM created the heavens and the earth." This ELOHIM is a remarkable word. It is the title of *The One God*, as contrasted with polytheistic ideas. Yet this term is a plural noun, appearing everywhere as the subject or nominative, of verbs in the singular. This noun, standing thus in the plural number, and nominative to verbs in the singular, is also used as infolding distinct personalities, as in this remarkable case: "And ELOHIM said, Let us make man in our image, according to our likeness." YAHVEH, or YAHVEH ELOHIM, is a name of *relation*. It is a name, as we have shown, growing out of the expectation of humanity in view of a Divine promise. He who gave the promise, adopted its name, and entered into a relation of *affection* with the race. This name, originating in human want and need, having a human history and growth, and yet representing a Divine promise, was fitly chosen as foreshadowing the incarnation of the Divine person, who assumed it to himself, and proclaimed it as his *memorial name*.

YAHVEH ELOHIM also assumes all the attributes of ELOHIM, and makes use, in two instances, of the plural form, to which we have alluded: "And YAHVEH ELOHIM said, Behold the man has become as one of us, to know good and evil;" "And YAHVEH said . . . Let us go down, and there let us confound their language." Thus ELOHIM, by derivation and use, is a term expressive of *power*, and represents the object of awe and reverence — standing at the head of the universe. ADONAI (sovereign) expresses a relation of *dominion*. YAHVEH represents a relation of *deliverance* and *affection*. We

are now prepared to consider, historically, the questions before asked:—“In this view, where is the doctrine of the Trinity?—the relation of Father, and Son?—of God, and Mediator between God and man?”

The historic facts with respect to the Divine Personalities set forth in the Scriptures, are these: ELOHIM, the God of *Power*, appears first as *Creator*, and in speaking, uses a form of expression implying the existence of other Personalities on an equality with Himself. YAHVEH ELOHIM enters into relation with man, assumes all the attributes of ELOHIM, and maintains a special superintendence over the race. YAHVEH ELOHIM also, uses the plural form in speaking, implying the existence of other Personalities on an equality with Himself. And yet these names are continually interchanged in such a manner as to produce the impression of *Unity*.

Coming to the Psalms and the Prophets, however, the distinctions are more apparent. Two Divine Persons are represented, sometimes, *The One* as commissioning, sending and sustaining *The Other*, who is looked upon as *sent*. More often, however, the divine speaker identifies with Himself, a Person invested with all the attributes of Divinity, who is represented as a suffering Messiah, and also as a triumphant and reigning King.

The ground for distinction in Personalities is thus found in the Old Testament. Except for the comparatively few instances however, in which a Divine Speaker, *other* than YAHVEH ELOHIM appears, YAHVEH is “*the One God*” of the Hebrew Scriptures. That other Speaker, “whom no man hath seen at any time,” stands in a relation to the Old Testament YAHVEH as sending Him, and sanctioning His work, like that of the Father, in the New Testament, to the Son. In the course of the prophecies, when YAHVEH ELOHIM is looked upon as leaving heaven, and so as, in a measure, *parted off* from the full glory of Divinity, the name YAHVEH is, in a few instances, assumed by another Divine speaker, who takes the place of YAHVEH in the heavens, and, by adopting his name, expresses his own participation in the

work of deliverance and redemption, at the same time maintaining, in the world, the idea of a Divine Deliverer still at the head of the universe. When YAHVEH appears upon earth as the Messiah, and by his incarnation becomes our "elder brother," he bears another name, Christ, "the anointed," and is called the Son.

A joint interest in the one object of the economy of this world, is also in the New Testament expressed by the terms Father and Son, as distinctive of the Divine personalities engaged in the work, as in the Old Testament that idea is conveyed by an interchange of the name of the Deliverer, YAHVEH.

We have seen the origin and history of the term YAHVEH in the Old Testament. Yet superstition and false philosophy had so blinded the hearts of the Jewish nation that they know him not. Witness the following declaration of the Talmud Sanhedr. : "Etiam qui pronunciat nomen (Dei) suis literis, non est ei pars in seculo futuro." This was the superstition in the mind of Josephus when he wrote: "The name of God is a name not lawful to be uttered." That a similar tradition prevailed with respect to the law, or the ten commandments, is shown by the further remark of Josephus, in reference to these, "which," he says, "it is not lawful for us to write in their own words." This latter superstition may be taken as a measure of the value of the former.

Thus YAHVEH, the original name of the Promise, being veiled in superstition, and its meaning lost, we find the Expectation of the World represented by a new term. The Hebrew people now (before the coming of Christ), in common with the rest of the civilized world, have adopted a new language. In that language, which, spreading from the great centre of philosophy and art, merged all nationalities in one common tongue, the Expectation of the World is represented by a term adapted, through the medium of this universal language, to the comprehension, not of one nation only, but of the whole world. This term is in familiar use, as representing the expected Messiah; it is a Greek word,

the precise equivalent of the Old Hebrew YAHVEH , and its historical origin and growth are in a measure parallel.

'Ο Ἐρχόμενος, "The Coming One," or "He who is to come," represents, again, not the Expectation of a nation, but of the world. Thus John, hearing the fame of Jesus, sent unto Him two disciples, with this question: "Art thou ὁ ἐρχόμενος (the coming one), or look we for another?" We shall find this term adopted by the risen Saviour, and given through John, in Revelation, as a watch-word to his church, directing their expectation, again, to his second coming. Thus the promise of the ancient name YAHVEH having been fulfilled, another term, in another language, has arisen, to be adopted and proclaimed to the world as the equivalent of the memorial name YAHVEH , the design of both being, to keep alive in the mind the great idea — Behold I come! Watch!

We have seen the foundation for a distinction of personalities, laid in the very beginning of the Old Testament, gradually becoming more and more developed, till in the New Testament, it is made prominent in the relation of Father and Son. Throughout the Epistles, the distinction is, in a great measure preserved by the terms Θεός (God) and Κύριος (Lord), as applied to Father and Son; Θεός, however, often standing for the plural personality. Κύριος is also sometimes interchanged with Θεός; almost uniformly however, throughout the New Testament, it is a term applied to Christ.

It is a little remarkable, that the term Κύριος (Lord), through the Septuagint, and the Greek of the New Testament, is made to represent, first, YAHVEH , and then Christ — if there is no design of identifying the two — for, from the very beginning to the end, Christ is made to appear as Κύριος, (Lord,) to the glory of God the Father.

The necessary inference from the foregoing historical investigation seems to be the following: He who appears in the New Testament as *God the Father*, and of whom Christ declares, *No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he*

hath declared him; who in the Epistles is spoken of as Θεός, nowhere in the Old Testament appears as a distinct personality, save as appointing and sanctioning the work of YAHVEH ELOHIM.

YAHVEH, or YAHVEH ELOHIM, enters into relation with man, walks with him in the garden, communes with the patriarchs, delivers from bondage, proclaims the law, sends his prophets, comes to his own, is rejected and crucified, ascends into glory, and will come again to judge the quick and the dead! Zech. xii. : “. . . saith YAHVEH, who stretcheth forth the heavens, and layeth the foundations of the earth. . . . They shall look upon ME whom they have pierced, and shall mourn.” . . . Rev. 1: 7—9. 22: 13. “Behold, he cometh with clouds! and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him, and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him. . . . I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last. ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, ὁ παντοκράτωρ, who IS, and who WAS, and who IS TO COME, *The Almighty* (Heb. *El Shaddai*).

Here Christ announces himself as *El Shaddai*, *The Almighty*, as Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last, who began of old the work of the world's redemption, and who will complete that work at the final judgment. These terms, standing thus at the close of a completed revelation of the work of redemption, bringing together in *one* person *all* the names under which the Divine nature had revealed itself to man, from the very beginning of that work to its end, seem emphatically to enforce the interpretation, to the exclusion of any other, that the speaker Christ is the only person who has taken upon himself that work, from the beginning to the end of time.

The idea prevailing among commentators, that the proposition ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, is to be metaphysically interpreted, as expressing “eternity of being,” is founded solely upon the supposition that it is an Apocalyptic expansion of the “I am” interpretation of the name Jehovah, or YAHVEH, in Ex. 3: 15. But this rendering of the name YAHVEH, has been shown to be without foundation,

either in exegesis or history. Consequently, the passage under consideration must be looked at as standing by itself. In so considering it, we find that the very terms of the proposition excluded the metaphysical rendering. Since the Greek would require $\delta\ \delta\upsilon\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \delta\ \eta\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \delta\ \epsilon\sigma\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$, "who is, and who was, and who *will be*," instead of "who is, and who was, and who *will come*," — $\delta\ \epsilon\sigma\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$, instead of $\delta\ \epsilon\rho\chi\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$, as appears from the usage of Clemens Alexandrinus, in his comments upon the name "Jehovah," from the inscription of the Saitic temple of Isis, mentioned by Plutarch, and from the well-known formula expressing the eternity of Jupiter, quoted by Pausanias; in all of which $\delta\ \epsilon\sigma\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$, or its equivalent, stands as the last clause of the proposition. The New Testament use of the verb $\epsilon\rho\chi\acute{o}\mu\alpha\iota$, "to come," needs no discussion.

It appears from these references, that "eternity of being" was an idea familiar to the mind of Paganism, as expressing its philosophic conception of a Great First Cause; as such, it may be said to be a necessary idea of the mind.

There is a natural tendency in the speculative religious mind, to abstract from the idea of God all qualities relating him to man. The *whole aim of Revelation*, apart from the "I am" interpretation of Ex. 3: 15, appears to be to *counteract* this tendency, by presenting the idea of a God *in relation to Humanity*. It is certainly reasonable to suppose, therefore, that he who took upon himself the "form of a man," would also reveal himself under the limitations of *time*, as related to the duration and destiny of the world he came to save.

We have stated that $\delta\ \epsilon\rho\chi\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ was in familiar use as representing the *coming* Messiah. As such it is adopted by Christ as the watch-word of his second coming. $\Upsilon\alpha\eta\upsilon\eta\eta$, the promise of the first coming, is fulfilled; and yet $\Upsilon\alpha\eta\upsilon\eta\eta$, the memorial name, still remains in its equivalent $\delta\ \epsilon\rho\chi\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$. Of $\delta\ \epsilon\rho\chi\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ it is written: "Behold he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him!"

In these facts are found the way-marks of *A New Christology*.