

THE NAME OF GOD AND THE NAME OF THE MESSIAH: JEWISH AND
CHRISTIAN PARALLELS IN LATE ANTIQUITY

Michael T. Miller*

Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg, Germany

Mariano Troiano

Universidad Nacional de Cuyo, Mendoza, Argentina

Introduction

Recent years have seen an increasing focus on the relationship between Judaism and Christianity during the early centuries CE. Since the work of Martin Hengel¹ and Alan Segal² some forty years ago, scholars have been asking—and offering answers to—the questions of how accurately and at what historical point we can talk about rabbinic Judaism and early Christianity as distinct, separate religions. Authors such as James Dunn³ and Martin Goodman,⁴ and

* The authors thank Magdalena Diaz Araujo and Shayna Sheinfeld, who read and commented on earlier versions of this article.

1. Martin Hengel, *The Son of God: The Origin of Christology and the History of Jewish-Hellenistic Religion* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976).

2. Alan. F. Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports About Christianity and Gnosticism* (SJLA, 25; Leiden: Brill, 1977).

3. James Dunn, *The Partings of the Ways: Between Christianity and Judaism and their Significance for the Character of Christianity* (London: SCM Press, 2nd edn, 2006); James Dunn (ed.), *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways A.D. 70 to 135* (WUNT, 66; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992).

4. Goodman has contributed articles to both Dunn (ed.), *Jews and Christians*, and the more recent address of the matter, though with a significantly extended time-period, Adam H. Becker and Annette Yoshiko Reed (eds.), *The Ways that Never*

more recently Daniel Boyarin⁵ and Peter Schäfer,⁶ have attempted to demonstrate that the two faiths did not just share a common heritage in Judean religion, but for several centuries into the Common Era had been only points in a penumbra of Jewish religious thought and practice.⁷ Most of the first Christians were simply Jews—and therefore we could expect the traditions they developed to be little more than a new take on ideas which were also present within contemporaneous Judaism. While it is established now that Christianity draws on some trends within Second Temple Judaism that did not make it through to the rabbinic movement, it has also become increasingly apparent that some aspects of rabbinic thought were formed in response to or in dialogue with those of early Christians.⁸ In fact, if Boyarin's assessment is correct then there was, for a matter of centuries, no clear divide between the two faiths such that communities would know exactly which concepts were Christian and which Jewish, or how to align themselves.⁹ Recently, Annette

Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages (Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism, 95; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003).

5. Among his several publications which relate to this matter are Daniel Boyarin, *Borderlines: The Partition of Judeo-Christianity* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004); *idem*, *The Jewish Gospels: The Story of the Jewish Christ* (New York: The New Press, 2012).

6. Peter Schäfer, *The Jewish Jesus: How Judaism and Christianity Shaped Each Other* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012).

7. Standing apart from these is the work of Larry Hurtado, especially *One God, One Lord* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), wherein he argues that although earliest Christianity draws on emergent Second Temple Jewish trends and motifs, it from the outset represented a uniquely radical break with tradition due to the simple fact that Jesus, a second figure standing in some way distinct from God, was accorded worship.

8. This is the fundamental argument of Schäfer's *Jewish Jesus*; his contention (contra Boyarin) is that many of the rabbinic texts which might appear to evidence a Jewish tradition similar in content to a Christian one (which might therefore be the source of the latter) are in fact parodies intended to defame and subvert them.

9. Boyarin's use of the 'wave' metaphor is particularly useful, envisioning a state where innovations can emerge from a single stone's effect but quickly merge with existing ripples from other stones; see Daniel Boyarin, 'Semantic Differences; or, "Judaism"/"Christianity"', in James Dunn (ed.), *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways A.D. 70 to 135* (WUNT, 66; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992), pp. 65-85 (74).

Yoshiko Reed has suggested the concept ‘Jewish-Christianity’ to show the intimate connections that until well into the fourth century were still forged between Judaisms and Christianities.¹⁰

The trend in scholarship towards increasing the time period during which Christian and Jewish communities may have lacked a clear awareness of their difference, and during which doctrines and ideas might pass freely between what we now perceive as ‘two’, is clearly indicated by the titular progression from 1989’s aforementioned volume *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways A.D. 70 to 135* to 2003’s *The Ways that Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*.

One interesting aspect of the theological milieu during this time period of Jewish and Christian communities’ dialogue, discussion and confrontation is the role of the Divine Name.¹¹ By this point the tetragrammaton had become, on the one hand, deemed unpronounceable by pious Jews and on the other had passed—in some form or another—into explicitly pagan usage.¹² Many Coptic Christian texts also utilize the Name¹³ and the power of the Hebrew Divine Name was thus well known throughout the Ancient Mediterranean.

10. ‘In what follows, “Jewish-Christian” is used to denote those premodern figures, sects, and sources which can be meaningfully defined as both “Jewish” and “Christian” and which thus do not fit into a modern taxonomic system that treats “Judaism” and “Christianity” as mutually exclusive’. Annette Yoshiko Reed, *Jewish-Christianity and the History of Judaism: Collected Essays* (Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism, 171; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018), pp. 23-24.

11. Throughout this article we will refer to the Divine Name, meaning by this the tetragrammaton, the personal name revealed to Moses and transliterated variously as YHWH or YHVH, IAO, Yao or Jehovah. As Charles A. Gieschen, ‘The Divine Name in Ante-Nicene Christology’, *VC* 57.2 (2003), pp. 115-58 (127), writes, during Late Antiquity ‘there is clear recognition of the significance of YHWH as the personal and primary name of God’.

12. On the pagan usage of the Name, see Gideon Bohak, *Ancient Jewish Magic: A History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), pp. 196-214. On the movement towards non-pronunciation, perhaps in response to this pagan misuse, see Sean M. McDonough, *YHWH at Patmos: Rev. 1:4 in its Hellenistic and Early Jewish Setting* (WUNT, 2.107; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999).

13. See Marvin Meyer and Richard Smith (eds.), *Ancient Christian Magic: Coptic Texts of Ritual Power* (New York: HarperCollins, 1994) as well as the Greek Magical Papyri. Even the widespread use of the tetragrammaton in several magic ritual formulae, indicates the appropriation not only by popular Mediterranean culture

From Jewish Scripture, we know that the Name of God was highly important to Israelite religion. The Deuteronomic ‘Name-Theology’ describes the Name as present in the earthly Temple, while God himself dwells in heaven above. Several biblical passages refer to an angelic being, the ‘angel of YHWH’, who bears God’s own Name (e.g. Exod. 23.21). Moses received the most important revelation when God revealed himself through the burning bush (Exod. 3.14) and proclaimed ‘My Name forever ... My appellation for all eternity’ to be YHWH—He Is.

In all these traditions, there appears to be a suggestion that God’s Name in some way is a proxy for God, or mediates the Divine Presence. The Name is something *of* God in a more important ontological sense than we usually think of names now.

However, at some point the Name of God also came to carry a messianic implication. While in the texts that came to be the Hebrew Bible the Name can denote the presence and authority of God, and can be carried by an angelic being who interacts with Israel, in the post-biblical period we see a full-fledged development of the theology into one where the messiah will bear—or even be—the Name of God. Several articles over the past half-century have examined this tradition, the most recent concluding that ‘several of the references or allusions to the “name” of Jesus in early Christian literature ... are signifying that Jesus possesses the Divine Name, namely the Tetragrammaton’.¹⁴ This tradition has mostly been associated with early Christianity,

but also by pagan practitioners. See Michel Tardieu, ‘Introduction’, in Michel Tardieu *et al.*, *Noms barbares I. Formes et contextes d’une pratique magique* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2013), pp. 11-18 (17).

14. Gieschen, ‘Divine Name’, p. 116, and see also the review of previous literature therein; also Gilles Quispel’s work on John’s Gospel: ‘Het Johannesevangelie en de Gnosis’, *NTT* 11 (1957), pp. 173-203; *idem*, ‘Qumran, John and Jewish Christianity’, in James H. Charlesworth (ed.), *John and Qumran* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1972), pp. 137-55; Jean Daniélou, *The Theology of Jewish Christianity* (ed. and trans. John A. Baker; London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1964), pp. 147-63; and Larry W. Hurtado, ‘“Jesus” as God’s Name, and Jesus as God’s Embodied Name in Justin Martyr’, in Sara Purvis and Paul Foster (eds.), *Justin Martyr and His Worlds* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), pp. 128-36. C.R.A. Morray-Jones, ‘Transformational Mysticism in the Apocalyptic-Merkabah Tradition’, *JJS* 43 (1992), pp. 1-31 has also discussed many traditions and their relevance to contemporaneous Jewish mystical traditions. See also Andrei Orlov, *Yahoel and Metatron: Aural*

based on analyses of texts from the New Testament, the Church fathers and the Nag Hammadi library. There is little evidence from within rabbinic literature about it, as the rabbis believed that that angel became identified as Metatron, the powerful hierarch who bears God's Name (*b. Sanh.* 98b) and was dethroned when Abuya mistook him for a second deity (*b. Hag.* 15a), and there is only scant evidence in the apocryphal literature such as the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, where Yahoel bears the 'Ineffable Name within me' (10.8).

In the following we will argue that there is a tradition, arising from a 'Jewish milieu', based around the exegesis of select biblical passages, indicating that the messiah bears the Divine Name; this tradition appears to predate the Christian movement, and is referred to also in rabbinic literature carrying more ancient traditions. In the first section we will highlight a tradition regarding the relationship between the Name of God and the messiah, the righteous and Jerusalem. This tradition is shared by the Talmud and Revelation in the New Testament. The next section will look at a tradition regarding the pre-existence of the messiah's name, which appears to be known by several groups in the early centuries of the Common Era, if not before. The fact that several different groups share this tradition points to the existence of an important idea which may be independent of each of these specific manifestations, Enochic, rabbinic or Christian; a tradition which was common across several Jewish sects.

The ascription of the Divine Name to the messiah has been viewed by scholars as having significant consequences for theology, because 'the proper Name of God signifies the divine nature'¹⁵ and when ascribed to another being it appears to assert an ontological continuity between them. In the field of early Christian studies this has been understood as the logical progression of the Name Theology once a Divine (rather than human) messiah enters the picture. The present study will demonstrate that this is not necessarily the

Apocalypticism and the Origins of Early Jewish Mysticism (Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism, 169; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017), pp. 53-60 (53), wherein he comments that 'Jesus' mediation of the Name will include a wide range of onomatological modes, as early Christian authors depict him as either a recipient and a revealer of the divine Name, its angelic personification, or as a figure clothed with the Tetragrammaton'.

15. Jarl E. Fossum, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord: Samaritan and Jewish Concepts of Intermediation and the Origins of Gnosticism* (WUNT, 36; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1985), p. 86.

case. This suggests that the ascription of God's Name to the messiah is not a Christian innovation, and therefore is not necessarily linked to the Christological doctrine of ontological continuity between the messiah and God, but was an idea that was being discussed within a variety of Jewish movements for some centuries, based upon an exegetical tradition. Hence, this paper will show that an essential axiom in the Christian doctrine was in fact built in dialogue/discussion with, and based on, a late Second Temple Jewish exegetical tradition.

The Messiah, Jerusalem and the Righteous

The New Testament contains several passages in which Jesus is identified as bearing the Name of God. This tradition appears to be common in early Christian literature, although it was quickly forgotten and the passages in question took on new meanings.¹⁶ The traditions have been discussed several times, so we will only present a review here. It is written that God 'highly exalted him [Jesus] and gave him the name that is above every name' (Phil. 2.9; cf. Eph. 1.21). Scholars generally agree that 'the name that is above every name' here refers to the tetragrammaton,¹⁷ and so in these passages Jesus is

16. Of several Semitic expressions used of Jesus, 'one of the first to be given up, since it was unintelligible and dangerous in a Greek milieu, is that which designates Christ as the "Name of God"' (Daniélou, *Jewish Christianity*, p. 147). By the time of Nicaea it has 'virtually disappear[ed]', because 'the move of Christianity from Jewish to Gentile soil led to a widespread ignorance of the Tetragrammaton' and the complex theological concepts which accompanied it, and which were becoming more associated with heretical movements (Gieschen, 'Divine Name', pp. 156-57).

17. See Bert Jan Lietaert Peerbolte, 'The Name Above All Names (Philippians 2:9)', in George H. van Kooten (ed.), *The Revelation of the Name YHWH to Moses: Perspectives from Judaism, the Pagan Graeco-Roman World, and Early Christianity* (TBN, 9; Leiden: Brill, 2006), pp. 187-206 (201 n. 43) which cites from Richard J. Bauckham, 'The Worship of Jesus in Philippians 2:9-11', in Ralph P. Martin and Brian J. Dodd (eds.), *Where Christology Began: Essays on Philippians 2* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1998), pp. 128-39 (131), who states 'There can be no doubt that "the name that is above every name" (v. 9) is YHWH: it is inconceivable that any Jewish writer could use this phrase for a name other than God's own unique name.'

described as having been given God's own personal name. Jesus is the Son through whom God created the world, who 'sustains all things by his powerful word' and who is superior to the angels because 'the name he has inherited is more excellent than theirs' (Heb. 1.1-4). That Jesus' name is 'more excellent' than the angels seems suggestive, and if it is one he has 'inherited' then it predates his own reception of it; his 'powerful word' is then likely to be the Name, which often in Jewish and Christian thought around this time appears to be linked with the process or sealing of creation.¹⁸ In John's Gospel we encounter the most definitive statement, as Jesus refers twice to God's Name which has been given to him by God himself: 'Holy Father, protect them in your name that you have given me ... I protected them in your name that you have given me' (Jn 17.11-12).

The same idea is invoked in Revelation when we read that Jesus 'has a name inscribed that no one knows but himself ... his name is called the Logos of God' (Rev. 19.11-13).¹⁹ Here we are told not that Jesus is the Logos (which would be an unsurprising claim), but that his *name* is the Logos;²⁰ his name is the word of God, i.e. God's Name, the Name which has been removed from regular human usage. Furthermore, Jesus bears this name by means of its inscription upon him. This interpretation is also known in the second half of the second century: Irenaeus of Lyon in *Haer.* 4.20.11 used an exegesis of Rev. 19.13 and Mt. 11.27 (Lk. 10.22) to show the different manifestations of the Son of God, manifestations employed to teach humanity about the Father:

The Word, as revealer of the Father, being rich and multiple, He did not show himself under a single figure or appearance to those who saw

18. Fossum, *Name of God*, esp. pp. 245-56; see also Michael T. Miller, *The Name of God in Jewish Thought: A Philosophical Analysis of Mystical Traditions from Apocalyptic to Kabbalah* (London: Routledge, 2016), pp. 30-52.

19. Cf. 7.2 where an angel 'having the seal of the living God' rises from the sun.

20. On the association of Word (Logos) of God and Name of God, Quispel, 'Qumran, John and Jewish Christianity', p. 150, writes that 'Logos, "Word", and Onoma, "Name", are interchangeable and, in a way, identical' in Jn 17.6. See also Fossum, *Name of God*, p. 86. Philo made the association in just one passage, *Conf.* 146, yet he frequently identified the Angel of YHWH who bore the Name of God as the Logos. On the identification of Philo's Logos with the messiah, see Richard D. Hecht, 'Philo and Messiah', in Jacob Neusner, William Scott Green and Ernest S. Frerichs (eds.), *Judaisms and Their Messiahs* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), pp. 139-68.

him, but as was appropriate according to the times and moments of your economies ... He is dressed in a robe dipped in blood, and his name is the Word of God (Rev. 19.13) ... This is the way how the Word of God shows to men the images of what he had to accomplish and the figures of the Father's economies, teaching us the things of God.

And this name by which the Son reveals the Father is none other than the tetragrammaton, because both Father and Son are, for Irenaeus, one and the same: 'The Spirit appointed both with the name of God, both the Son who is anointed as to the Father who anoints' (*Haer.* 3.6.1). Moreover, in 6.2, Irenaeus clarifies, 'So, as I said above, no one else is called God or Lord, but rather God and Lord of all things, who said to Moses: I am who I am ... and also his Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, who makes sons of God those who believe in his name (Jn 1.12)'.

Irenaeus makes an explicit connection among Exod. 3.14, the tetragrammaton as the name of God and Jesus' name. Another connection between Jesus and the Name of God is found in Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with Trypho* (composed in the latter half of the second century).²¹ Here, the convert utilizes biblical passages in an attempt to convert the Jew Trypho, interpreting the angel of the Lord of Exod. 23.20-21 as the tetragrammaton and identifying it explicitly as Jesus:

We know too that in the book of Exodus Moses likewise indicated in a mysterious manner that the name of God himself was also Jesus; which he says was not revealed to Abraham or to Jacob. For it is written thus: 'And the Lord said to Moses, say to this people: Behold, I send my angel before your face, to guard you in your journey, and bring you into the place that I have prepared for you. Take notice of him, and obey his voice; do not disobey him, for he will not pardon you, because my name is in him.' Consider well who it was that led your fathers into the Promised Land, he who was called by the name Jesus, he who was first named Auses [Hosea]. If you keep this in mind, you will also realize

21. Timothy J. Horner, *Listening to Trypho: Justin Martyr's Dialogue Reconsidered* (Leuven: Peeters, 2001).

that the name of him who said to Moses, *My name is in him*, was Jesus [Joshua].²²

Returning to Revelation, there is an interesting expansion earlier in Revelation when Christ asserts that ‘I will write on you the name of my God, and the name of the city of my God, the new Jerusalem ... and my own new name’ (Rev. 3.12); this is followed by the description of ‘one hundred forty-four thousand who had his name and his father’s name written on their foreheads’ (14.1). Given the evidence cited already, it is likely that the inscription here is a single name, as a distinguishable symbol or symbols,²³ the one Divine Name that God and Christ—and now Jerusalem—share. Indeed, later in the text we find it said of the nations who will be saved that simply ‘his [God’s] name will be on their foreheads’ (22.4). Here the same tradition is mentioned but it is a single name, the one name of God. This is in direct contrast to the sinners, who will bear the name of the beast on their right hand and forehead (13.16-17; 20.4). In these passages Jesus is promising to share his own inheritance of the Name of God with the faithful; and thus the Name is inscribed upon Jesus, the faithful remnant and Jerusalem, as a means of indicating their righteousness, their special relationship with—and their ownership by—God.

This notion that God’s Name is shared by not just Jesus (the Messiah) but also Jerusalem and an elect group of humans is not found in other New Testament texts. However a surprisingly similar tradition in a rabbinic passage has so far gone unnoticed:

R. Samuel b. Nahmani said in the name of R. Johanan: ‘Three were called by the name of the Holy One, blessed be He, and they are the following: The righteous, the Messiah, and Jerusalem’ ... [As regards] the Messiah, it is written: ‘And this is the name whereby he shall be called: “YHWH our righteousness” [Jer. 23.6]’. [As regards] Jerusalem—it is written: ‘It shall be eighteen thousand reeds round about; and the name of the city from that day shall be “YHWH is there” [Ezek. 48.35]’. Do not read ‘there’ but ‘its name’ (*b. B. Bat. 75b*).²⁴

22. *Dial.* 75.1-2. See also comments on these passages in Philippe Bobichon (ed.), *Justin Martyr, Dialogue avec Tryphon* (Paradosis, 47/2; Fribourg: Editions Universitaires de Fribourg, 2003), p. 774.

23. We will see this allusion clearly alleged by Clement of Alexandria.

24. *The Babylonian Talmud*. III. *Seder Nezikin* (trans. I. Epstein; London: Soncino, 1935), p. 303.

Here we find an identical list of three things said to be named with the tetragrammaton: the righteous, the messiah and Jerusalem. This passage comes during a discussion of Jerusalem and the righteous, where it has already been stated that ‘The righteous will in time to come be called by the name of the Holy One, blessed be He’, citing Isa. 43.7, ‘Everyone who is called by my name, whom I created for my glory, whom I formed and made’. Then, this passage itself, which could transmit an earlier exegesis, is paralleled in *Lamentations Rabbah*, an early Palestinian midrash which compiles several different traditions on the name of the messiah (these traditions appear separately in other sources):

What is the name of King Messiah? R. Abba b. Kahana said: ‘His name is YHWH as it is stated, “And this is the name whereby he shall be called, ‘YHWH our righteousness”’ [Jer. 23.6]’. For R. Levi said: ‘It is good for a province when its name is identical with that of its king, and the name of its king identical with that of its God ... as it is stated, “And the name of the city from that day shall be YHWH is there” [Ezek. 48.35] ... as it is stated, “And this is the name whereby he shall be called, ‘YHWH [is] our righteousness”’ [Jer. 23.6]’ (*Lam. R.* 1.16, §51).²⁵

Notably, *Lam. R.* 1.16 does not mention the righteous and the tradition does not appear anywhere else,²⁶ so it is unclear whether the righteous figured as an original part of the rabbinic tradition or whether it was originally just Jerusalem and the messiah. All the sages cited in both texts are third-century Palestinians. While *Lamentations Rabbah* is one of the earliest midrash compilations, it is still dateable only to the end of the fifth century CE, and so not very far from the redaction of the Bavli in the sixth century CE.²⁷ *Lam. R.* 1.16 appears to be a compilation of several different passages found in the Talmuds, and as mentioned the passage in *b. B. Bat.* 75b comes after a discussion of the righteous and Jerusalem. It is more difficult to imagine that the

25. *Midrash Rabbah: Lamentations* (trans. A. Cohen; London: Soncino, 1939), pp. 135-36.

26. Except a parallel to *Lam. R.* 1.16 in *Midr. Ps.* 21.2, from the eleventh century.

27. Moshe David Herr, ‘Lamentations Rabbah’, in Michael Berenbaum and Fred Skolnik (eds.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (26 vols.; Detroit: Macmillan, 2nd edn, 2007), XII, pp. 451-52.

tradition existed minus the righteous, who were then inserted in order to make it relevant to *b. B. Bat. 75b*, than that the righteous were an original part of the tradition which were then deleted or ignored when compiling texts on the messiah's name. There is therefore reason to think that the recension found in *Baba Batra* is the earlier, and that the tradition originally consisted of all three elements, as it does in Rev. 3.12: the messiah, Jerusalem and the righteous.

The proof texts for both rabbinic passages are Jer. 23.6, where it is claimed that the messiah shall be called 'YHWH our Righteousness', and Ezek. 48.35 where it is asserted that Jerusalem will be named 'YHWH is there'.²⁸

Later in Jeremiah, there is a parallel passage where it is not the messiah but the sanctified city of Jerusalem which is given the title of 'YHWH is our righteousness' (33.16),²⁹ thus echoing the passage taken from Ezek. 48.35. Without embarking on an analysis of the original intention behind the passages, it seems that in Late Antique interpretation they have been placed together, to produce the soteriological claim that in the messianic age not only will the messiah but also the city of Jerusalem share in the Name of God.³⁰

The source for the rabbis' third element, the righteous, is given in *b. B. Bat. 75b* as Isa. 43.7 but this does not explicitly make the statement they draw from it; however, it is not difficult to ascertain from where such a notion may have its origin: it descends from Deut. 28.10, where Israel is said to be called by the Name of God.³¹ Here, the elect people of Israel who follow in the ways of God will be given the Name. The elements of the righteous and Jerusalem are combined somewhat later, in Dan. 9.18-19, 'open your [God's] eyes and

28. This itself echoes Abraham's naming of Mt Moriah in Gen. 22.14, 'YHWH will provide'. On rabbinic application of this to the whole of Jerusalem, see e.g. *Gen. R.* 56.10.

29. Jeremiah 33.14-26, due to its absence from the LXX, is thought to be a late interpolation, though still prior to the interpretations under discussion. See Willie Wessels, 'Jeremiah 33:15-16 as a Reinterpretation of Jeremiah 23:5-6', *HvTSt* 47 (1991), pp. 231-46.

30. That discussion of redemption focuses on the three elements of saviour, people and city is in itself not surprising, or unique. See *Sib. Or.* 5.414-30. However, there is no mention of a Divine Name here.

31. Cf. Jer. 14.9; 2 Chron. 7.14; Num. 6.27.

look at our desolation and the city that bears your name ... your city and your people bear your name'.³²

The term 'the righteous' is not explicitly associated with God's Name within the biblical texts, although we may find a hint towards it when, in Isa. 1.26, Jerusalem, elsewhere named with the Name of God, is now named the City of Righteousness. Therefore from the biblical text we can find a three-fold association where the Name of God is ascribed to the messiah, Jerusalem and the Israelites; and Jerusalem, the capital and focal point of Israel, is the City of Righteousness, i.e. the place where the righteous dwell and perform their service to God.³³

This ascription of the Name of God to the righteous or to Israel is not uncommon in Late Antique Jewish tradition, and it is worth examining other

32. This association of the people of Israel with the Name of God is also repeated in Daniel's near contemporary Ben Sira (33.13) and the first-century BCE *Psalms of Solomon* (9.9). The late first-century CE composition *4 Ezra* also contains the righteous and Jerusalem motifs. See 1.24; 2.16; 4.24; 5.25.

33. The typology of the righteous, an elect group which does not necessarily equate to the whole of Israel but only that subset who live righteously, is very common in Late Antique Jewish writings. According to D.S. Russell, *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964), p. 297, although the righteous is sometimes an ethical rather than national characterization, 'for the most part the tendency is to identify "the righteous" with Israel'. Notwithstanding his assertion that 'The *whole* Jewish nation, moreover, will share in this inheritance', we find the more limited conception throughout the Qumran documents, though never with reference to the Divine Name. It is worth noting that while the adjective Righteous is used of the Chosen One in *Parables*, it is very infrequent (*1 En.* 53.6); the three other instances are communal. See J.C. Vanderkam, 'Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man in 1 Enoch 37-71', in James H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), pp. 169-91 (170-71). Of course, if the Son of Man is in fact a metaphor for the whole people of Israel, then the messiah and the righteous are united here, as T.W. Manson, 'The Son of Man in Daniel, Enoch and the Gospels', in T.W. Manson, *Studies in the Gospels and Epistles* (ed. Matthew Black; Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1962), pp. 123-45 suggests. On the relationship between the Righteous/Chosen/Holy and the Righteous/Chosen/Anointed One, see George W.E. Nickelsburg and James C. VanderKam, *1 Enoch 2: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch Chapters 37-82* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012), pp. 98-101, 113-23.

appearances in the early Jewish-Christian milieu, where it is usually depicted as a physical inscription. This terminology is used repeatedly in Revelation, where the physical bearing of a name, either God's (7.3; 9.4; 22.4) or the Beast's (13.16-17), denotes ownership by the power named. In the *Odes of Solomon* (composed c. 100 CE)³⁴ Christ proclaims that 'I placed my name upon their head, because they are free and they are mine' (42.20) but in an earlier passage God sets the seal upon the face of the elect before their existence (8.13), and later commands the righteous ('those who cross [danger] in the name of the Lord') to 'Put on, therefore, the Name of the Most High and know Him' (39.8). While some of these texts mention the inscription of Jesus' name and some God's name, it should now be clear that these should be understood to be identical, as the name of Jesus is the Name of God, the tetragrammaton. That this interpretation was understood in the late second century CE is made clear by Clement of Alexandria who writes that 'the faithful bear through Christ the Name of God as if it were an inscription' (*Exc.* 86.2). Here Clement, following Rev. 3.12 and 14.1-4, clearly shows that the Name of God is inscribed upon the righteous through the medium of Jesus the Messiah.³⁵ This passage should be understood in relation to 26.1 where Clement communicates the arguments of Theodotus, that '... the invisible part [of Jesus] is the name, who is the son monogenes'.³⁶

Lastly (and perhaps most importantly), in the *Apocalypse of Elijah* (an almost entirely Christian text from probably the late second or third century CE), God proclaims he 'will write my name upon their forehead and I will seal their right hand, and they will not hunger or thirst' (1.9). Later in this

34. Following the dating of James H. Charlesworth, 'Odes of Solomon', in James H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1983, 1985), pp. 725-71 (726-27). Cf. M. Latke, 'Die Oden Salomos: Einleitungsfragen und Forschungsgeschichte', *ZNW* 98 (2007), pp. 277-307; M.-J. Pierre, 'Odes de Solomon', in F. Bovon, P. Geoltrain and S. Voicu (eds.), *Écrits apocryphes chrétiens I* (Paris: Gallimard, 1998), p. 675; A. Diez Macho, *Introducción general a los Apócrifos del Antiguo Testamento Tomo I* (Madrid: Ediciones Cristiandad, 1984), p. 208; A. Peral and X. Alegre, 'Odas de Salomón', in A. Diez Macho (ed.), *Apócrifos del Antiguo Testamento Tomo III* (Madrid: Ediciones Cristiandad, 1982), 62.

35. For an identification of Christ as the Name in Clement, see Gieschen, 'Divine Name', p. 149.

36. See Fossum, *Name of God*, pp. 98-101.

text, angels will be sent to save ‘those upon whose forehead the name of Christ is written, and upon whose hand is the seal’ (5.4).³⁷ Here again the text appears to assume that the Divine Name written upon the elect *is* the name of Christ; when God writes his own name, it is the name of Christ that appears. This demonstrates the interpretation of Revelation, equating the name of Christ with that of God, a single name written on the forehead of the elect.

The inscription tradition is in part a reference to the *totafot* (tefillin) of Exod. 13.9, 13.16 and Deut. 6.8, 11.18 where textual passages are considered a ‘sign’ of remembrance to be worn upon the hand and between the eyes. We can see in the texts cited from the beginning of the Common Era that this notion had become mixed with another, where inscription is a means of protection.³⁸ This latter finds its source in Ezek. 9.4 (cf. Exod. 12.7, 13, 22-23), where God commands a mark to be placed on the forehead of those Israelites to be protected/saved, in order to separate them from those who will be slain. In the Hebrew text the noun ‘mark’ is the spelled-out letter *Tau* (ת), the final letter of the alphabet, whose paleo-Hebrew form was that of an X.³⁹ The idea

37. O.S. Wintermute, ‘Apocalypse of Elijah’, in James H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1983, 1985), pp. 721-54 (726) sees in 5.2-6 a ‘mixing of Jewish and Christian strata’, only one such instance of Christ taking on a role previously assigned to God in the text.

38. The wearing of tefillin seems to have originated in the second or first century BCE. See Yehudah B. Cohn, *Tangled up in Text: Tefillin and the Ancient World* (BJS, 351; Providence: Brown Judaic Studies, 2008). In the Amoraic period, R. Eliezer the Great applied Deut. 28.10, ‘And all the peoples of the earth shall see that you are called by the name of YHWH’ to the tefillin (specifically those of the forehead), thereby equating that ‘mark’ to the Name of God (*b. Ber.* 6a; *b. Men.* 35b, etc.). On tefillin and the Name of God, see Cohn, *Tangled*, pp. 168-69. It is also claimed that the letters inscribed on or represented by the physical materials constitute the divine name Shaddai, and as such signify that the wearer belongs to God (*b. Men.* 35b). On a possible priestly precedent, see Meir Bar-Ilan, *ושמו את שמי על בני ישראל* (‘So Shall They Put My Name Upon the People of Israel’), *HUCA* 60 (1989), pp. 19-31 (Hebrew).

39. Paul M. Joyce, *Ezekiel: A Commentary* (LHBOTS, 482; London: T. & T. Clark, 2009), p. 103; Jack Finegan, *The Archeology of the New Testament: The Life of Jesus and the Beginning of the Early Church* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969), pp. 220-60. Finegan, *Archeology*, pp. 225-26, suggests that the tradition of tefillin, along with Isa. 44.6, 48.12, ‘I am the first and I am the last’, could indicate

that this mark signifies God's Name does not appear prior to the Common Era, but it is evidenced in rabbinic literature such as *Num. R.* 16.24, which relates that the Israelites were engraved with the Ineffable Name, and *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* to Deut. 28.10, which has the Name inscribed on the Israelites' tefillin.

Thus the concept of the Divine Name inscribed upon the elect is nothing new in Revelation, and had also persisted into rabbinic thought outside *b. Baba Batra*'s reference. These Jewish texts on the righteous, along with Isa. 43.7, Ezek. 48.35, Jer. 23.6 and 33.6, show the backdrop to the tradition found in Revelation⁴⁰ and *b. Baba Batra*, but are not themselves enough to explain the tradition arising twice in such similar formulation; their combination along with a specific interpretation must either have originated in Revelation, and been transmitted to rabbinic circles in Palestine, originated in proto-rabbinic Pharisaic circles and passed to the author of Revelation, or have been developed independently of all these and been incorporated in both from the same original source.⁴¹

that the Tau mark/cross was sometimes understood as representing the Name of God. The strongest argument for this comes from the identification of the mark of salvation as the Name of God in Revelation (cf. Daniélou, *Jewish Christianity*, p. 154). The cross form of Tau is still evidenced as late as some Qumran manuscripts (Finegan, *Archeology*, p. 222).

40. Revelation itself contains no explicit citations so sources are open to debate. Jeremiah 23.6 is referred to once in the New Testament, at 1 Cor. 1.30, here with regards to qualities of Christ, but not to his name.

41. Interchange between them is plausible because the Jewish background of Revelation is 'no longer contested', and it bears significant likenesses to other Jewish works of the same time, most notably other apocalyptic literature and some texts found at Qumran. See Pierre Prigent, *Commentary on the Apocalypse of St. John* (trans. Wendy Pradels; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), p. 22. Andrew Chester, 'Parting of the Ways: Eschatology and Messianic Hope', in James Dunn (ed.), *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways A.D. 70 to 135* (WUNT, 66; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992), pp. 239-313 (306), claims that, while the focus of Jewish eschatological texts between 70–135 CE is often 'nation, land, Jerusalem and temple', in equivalent Christian eschatology the emphasis is on 'church, baptism, Christ and Spirit'. Thus our Revelation passage stands more in line with Jewish thought at the time, something which could have made this particular tradition attractive to the Pharisees and rabbis.

The preceding has shown that some rabbinic texts share a tradition regarding the messiah, the righteous and Jerusalem bearing God's Name with Revelation, and examined the biblical passages which underlie this concept. While there is certainly an inheritance of Second Temple Jewish material on messianic thought in early Christianity, this tradition regarding the messiah and the tetragrammaton is unique within rabbinic writings and it is unclear how it came to appear there; at this stage it is possible that it was simply borrowed from Christian thought. Analyzing some of the other rabbinic currents surrounding the name of the messiah may help to shed light on this. The next section will place these texts in line with texts which pre-date both the rabbis and Christianity.

Before the Sun

As part of the compilation of messianic traditions in *b. Sanh.* 98b, there is a list of five names of the messiah, none of which are on the surface divine names:

What is his [the messiah's] name?—The School of R. Shila said: His name is Shiloh, for it is written, until Shiloh come [Gen. 49.10]. The School of R. Yannai said: His name is Yinnon, for it is written, 'His name shall endure for ever: before the sun was, his name is Yinnon' [Ps. 72.17]. The School of R. Haninah maintained: His name is Haninah, as it is written, 'Where I will not give you Haninah' [Jer. 16.13]. Others say: His name is Menahem the son of Hezekiah, for it is written, 'Because Menahem [the comforter], that would relieve my soul, is far' [Lam. 1.16]. The Rabbis said: His name is 'the leper scholar', as it is written, 'Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows: yet we did esteem him a leper, smitten of God, and afflicted' [Dan. 2.22].⁴²

These appear to be cunning wordplays intended to force the impression that each school's own leader is the messiah. As such, it should not be taken seriously as a description of real traditions; we would not expect that anyone outside those schools would accept them as objective readings, and we may be wisest to understand the passage as a parodic attempt to show just how untrustworthy attempts to prove the messiah's name are; for there is often an ulterior motive behind such attempts. However, there is one name here which

42. *Babylonian Talmud*. VI. *Seder Neziḳin* (trans. I. Epstein), pp. 667-68.

exists in other sources outside this passage: Yinnon. Yinnon is also used in the *musaf* prayer for Yom Kippur, *Az MeLifnei Beraishis* (Then before the world was created), composed by the seventh century R. Eleazar ben Killir.⁴³ This name is derived from Ps. 72.17, ‘before the sun may his name increase’. The Hebrew of Ps. 72.17 reads יהי שמו לעולם לפני שמש יגן שמו, containing the hapax legomenon, יגן. The root is גן which may mean ‘propagate, increase’⁴⁴ or ‘produce shoots, get descendants’,⁴⁵ and it is noteworthy that the conjugation *Yinnon* (יגון), provided in the *qere* of the Masoretic text, itself displays a notable visual similarity to the tetragrammaton (although this is never explicated by the rabbis). The fact that Yinnon, alone among the names given in *b. Sanh.* 98b, appears in another source during the classical rabbinic period, and has persisted into Medieval times, indicates that it is a stronger tradition than the rest, perhaps because its roots are not simply in parody.

The passage behind the use of Yinnon, Ps. 72.17, is used in other discussions of the messiah’s name, both within and outside rabbinic writings. So, elsewhere in the Bavli, in *b. Pes.* 54a, we read that,

Seven things were created before the world was created, and these are they: The Torah, repentance, the Garden of Eden, Gehenna, the Throne of Glory, the Temple, and the name of the Messiah ... The name of the Messiah, as it is written, ‘His name shall endure for ever, and has existed before the sun!’ [Ps. 72.17]⁴⁶

43. The entire list also appears verbatim in *Lam. R.* 1.16’s compilation, as well as in the late *Midrash on Proverbs*. Dated to roughly the eleventh century, it lists eight names: El, Yinnon, Tzemach (‘Branch’), Pele (‘Miracle’), Yo’etz (‘Counselor’), Mashiach (‘Anointed’), Gibbor (‘Hero’) and Avi Ad Shalom (‘Eternal Father of Peace’). These are all biblical titles, and all but Yinnon, Tzemach and Mashiach are from Isa 9.5. The use of the divine name El here is not too unusual, not having ever been limited to God alone.

44. BDB, p. 630.

45. *HALOT*, p. 696.

46. *Babylonian Talmud*. IV. *Seder Mo’ed* (trans. I. Epstein), p. 265. Cf. *b. Ned.* 39b; and *Gen. Rab.* 1.4 which lists the Torah, the Throne of Glory, the Patriarchs, Israel, the Temple, the name of the messiah and Repentance; and *Midr. Ps.* 72.6 which (incongruously) lists the ‘seven’ items as the throne of glory, the name of the messiah, Torah, Israel, Garden of Eden, Gehenna, repentance and the Temple. These two lists, unlike *b. Pes.* 54a, list Israel as pre-existent but none give Jerusalem. Unfortunately none of these texts provide a definite authority for the saying, but we can presume it

Beyond the rabbinic literature, the idea that the ‘name’ of Ps. 72.17 relates to the messiah was known during the early centuries of the Common Era.⁴⁷ Justin Martyr’s *Dialogue with Trypho* reads the ‘name’ of Ps. 72.17 as a reference to Christ.⁴⁸ It was also referred to in the second century by Clement of Alexandria (*Exc.* 20) and Irenaeus (*Epid.* 43), and in the early third century by Tertullian (although at least this last appears to be dependent upon Justin’s usage).⁴⁹

The Christian use of this passage in relation to the messiah appears to pre-date the rabbinic, which could suggest that the rabbis were deliberately reinterpreting the passage in order to defuse a Christian tradition, as seems to have been common practice. It should be noted that while Ps. 72.17 is used by both Christians and Jews, it is not utilized in the New Testament, despite clearly supporting what was a strong Christian tradition in regard to the messiah’s name. However, there is a strikingly similar passage in the *Parables of Enoch*, ‘dated sometime around the turn of the era’:⁵⁰

And in that hour that son of man was named in the presence of the Lord of the Spirits, and his name, before the Head of days. Even before the

to be early due to its placement especially in *Genesis Rabbah* and the sages cited for other elements there. Louis Ginzberg claimed the pre-existence of the messiah’s name to be a corrective to an older tradition of the messiah’s pre-existence which now appeared too Christian—see ‘Seride Tanhuma-Yelammedenu’, in *Qoves al Yad*, VI, 9, cited in E.E. Urbach, *The Sages* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1975), p. 684; however, we believe that *1 En.* 48.3, cited below, evidences the pre-Christian status of the tradition.

47. For the messianic usage of Ps. 72 during Late Antiquity, see Craig C. Broyles, ‘The Redeeming King: Psalm 72’s Contribution to the Messianic Ideal’, in Craig A. Evans and Peter W. Flint (eds.), *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), pp. 23-40. Broyles does not mention 72.17 as relating to the messiah’s name anywhere else at this time.

48. *Dial.* 64.5-6; cf. 34.6 and 121.1-2. In the next passage he uses Isa. 42.8 to establish that the Name is something other than God, reading it as ‘I am YHWH, [and] *this* is my name.’

49. *Marc.* 5.9-11, as analyzed in Oskar Skarsaune, *The Proof from Prophecy: A Study in Justin Martyr’s Proof-Text Tradition. Text-Type, Provenance, Theological Profile* (NovTSup, 56; Leiden: Brill, 1987), p. 443.

50. George W.E. Nickelsburg and James C. VanderKam, *1 Enoch: The Hermeneia Translation* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012), p. 5.

sun and the constellations were created, before the stars of heaven were made, his name was named before the Lord of Spirits (*1 En.* 48.1-3).⁵¹

Here again the salvific figure is named with a name that existed before creation and before the sun, a notion clearly dependent on Ps. 72.17.⁵² If we are here dealing with a specific name that has been *bestowed* on the son of man, rather than with a description of the selection and setting-aside of the son by the indication of his name, then we might be inclined to think this pre-existent name must be that of God; that is, if, rather than simply designating the chosen one by calling his name,⁵³ he is *adopted* by a process of naming with a special name, it is not difficult to conclude that this process is one of bringing the son of man into divine status through the ascription of the Name of God to him. From this passage alone, it is difficult to tell which is the case. However the latter conclusion of the son sharing God's Name is supported when the hidden name of the son is equated with a powerful secret name held within the oath which founds and guarantees all the elements of creation (*1 En.* 69.14-26). This conclusion is shared by Charles Gieschen, who writes that 'the references to the "name" of the Son of Man in *1 En.* 37-71 indicate that he shares the Divine Name of the Ancient of Days, the Tetragrammaton',⁵⁴

51. Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch* 2, p. 166.

52. In the *Odes of Solomon* there is a similar motif when Jesus recounts that 'I was named the Light, the Son of God' (36.3). This appears to evidence the *phōs* tradition, the LXX's term for light, which was also used to mean 'man' or person, thus instigating a myth regarding the primal Light-Man, the initial creation of God. See Jarl E. Fossum, *The Image of the Invisible God: Essays on the Influence of Jewish Mysticism on Early Christology* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995); but it may in part descend too from Ps. 72.17, or even potentially from *1 En.* 48.3, as Charlesworth claims in 'Odes of Solomon', pp. 732-33.

53. For instance as seen in Isa. 49.1, 'The Lord called me from the womb, from the body of my mother he named my name'. Unlike Ps. 72.17, this is not explicitly referred to in any of the present contexts and provides far less material in terms of pre-existence. Manson, 'Son of Man', pp. 134 posits an earlier source in ANE texts where gods name rulers long before they come to be; thus 'The naming of the name of a group or individual can mean simply the designation of that group or individual to some high destiny'.

54. Charles A. Gieschen, 'The Name of the Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch', in Gabriele Boccaccini (ed.), *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting*

There is no other mention of a concealed name in *Parables* than that of the son, who is hidden until his name is specifically revealed to the righteous: ‘And they had great joy, and they blessed and glorified and exalted, because the name of that Son of Man had been revealed to them’ (69.26).⁵⁵ Finally, we find another parallel to John’s Gospel when the son himself ‘was chosen and hidden in his [God’s] presence before the world was created forever’, (48.6); in John, Jesus asks to be glorified in God’s presence ‘with the glory that I had in your presence before the world existed’ (17.5).⁵⁶ Thus, the name of the messiah, first manifestation of God, hidden in him until the creation of the Cosmos, is the supporter/guarantor of the stability of the world.

Conclusion

Let us then recount the parallels we have examined. In *1 (Ethiopic) Enoch* we read that the messianic Son of Man was named prior to creation with a name

the Book of Parables (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), pp. 238-49 (cf. Gieschen, ‘Divine Name’, p. 238). Cf. Heb. 1.1-4 mentioned above, and also ‘your name, the source of all creation’ (*1 Clem.* 59.2), and ‘The Name of the Son of God is great and infinite, and sustains the whole world’ (Hermas, *Sim.* 9.14.5). However, when Kasbe’el requests the name from Michael (*1 En.* 69.14) this suggests, alternatively, that the name is not a being but an oath. On the oath, see Jonathan Ben Dov and Eshbal Ratzon, ‘The Oath and the Name in 1 Enoch 69’, *JSS* 60 (2015), pp. 19-51.

55. Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch* 2, p. 91.

56. Cf. Jn 17.24, where Jesus again claims to have been given the ‘glory’ before the foundation of the world. The description of the Son of Man as hidden ‘from the beginning’ before creation (*1 En.* 48.6; 62.7) places him directly in line with the Logos of John and the Divine Name of *Pirqe deRabbi Eliezer* 3; cf. *4 Ezra* 13.26, 52 where the messiah is hidden in God’s presence as well as 1 Pet. 1.20 and 2 Bar. 29.3; 30.1. Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch* 2, pp. 170-71 remark that the Son in both passages reflects Wisdom in Prov. 8.22-31 and Sir. 24.1-3. *Ruth R.* 5.6 has the messiah hidden after being initially revealed, but the final source may be Isa. 49.2, ‘in the shadow of his hand he hid me’; see M. Black, ‘The Messianism of the Parables of Enoch: Their Date and Contribution to Christological Origins’, in James H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), pp. 145-68 (157). The criticisms against *Parables* as preaching the pre-existence of the Chosen One himself are worth noting; see Vanderkam, ‘Righteous One’, pp. 179-82.

which had existed before the sun and stars (*I En.* 48.1-3); there is reason to believe this name to be that of God, and it is revealed to the righteous only through the revealing of the name of the Chosen One, the Son of Man (*I En.* 69.26). In the New Testament, Christ is frequently said to bear the Name of God, having been given ‘the name that is above every name’ (Phil. 2.9), a name which ‘sustains all things’ (Heb. 1.3). Jesus claims to ‘have made [God’s] name known’ in the world (Jn 17.6; cf. 17.25), a name through which God might protect human beings (Jn 17.11). This protection may come about through a physical inscription of the Name—as in Revelation, Christ ‘will write on you the name of my God, and the name of the city of my God, the new Jerusalem ... and my own new name’ (Rev. 3.12), the group in question being those elect who ‘had his name and his father’s name written on their foreheads’ (14.1). For Justin Martyr, Irenaeus of Lyon, Clement of Alexandria and some Gnostic Valentinian texts, the Messiah Jesus is the Name of God, who existed before all creation. In the Bavli, the messiah, the righteous and Jerusalem are ‘called by the name of the Holy One’ (*b. B. Bat.* 75b)—this name ‘existed before the sun’ (*b. Sanh.* 98b) as one of only seven objects prior to creation (*b. Pes.* 54a), and serves to protect the people of Israel as in Ezek. 9.4-6.

There is a constellation of biblical texts used here, contributing to a tradition of the messiah, his name’s pre-existence and the association of he, Jerusalem and the righteous with God’s Name. Jeremiah 23.5-6 provides the association of the messiah’s and God’s names, Jer. 33.16 and Ezek. 48.35 likewise for Jerusalem and God’s Name, while Deut. 28.10 adds Israel (only by the time of Dan. 9.18-19 has this come to be formulated in a less obviously specific way, as ‘the righteous’). Psalm 72.17 meanwhile has no explicit messianic meaning, but has been interpreted by the rabbis as well as Justin Martyr in terms of the pre-existence of the messiah’s name, specifically before the sun, and *Parables* also appears to know the tradition. It is logical that, if God exists prior to creation, and has a proper name which is not merely given to him by human beings, then the Name of God must exist before creation, and if the messiah too bears that Name then *his* name has existed before creation. But the phrasing of existing ‘before the sun’ is an unnecessary aspect which unites *Parables* and the rabbis, hinting that its use in *Parables* too depends on Ps. 72.17.

In terms of the two most important biblical passages, then, Jer. 23.5-6 is cited explicitly by several third-century Palestinian rabbis along with some other texts, and appears to have previously influenced Rev. 3.12 and 14.1.

Psalm 72.17, meanwhile, appears to have influenced the likely pre-Common Era Palestinian *Parables of Enoch*, and is cited explicitly by the second-century Palestinian Christian Justin Martyr and the third-century Palestinian R. Yannai. In all of these citations the name of the messiah is understood as somehow depending on the Name of God (with the possible exception of Yannai's, although the construction of the name Yinnon is evocative of the tetragrammaton).

The similarities between these passages suggest a relationship between them. But how did these traditions pass between them? The weight of scholarly opinion now prioritizes *Parables* as essentially pre-Christian, with the New Testament usage of concepts such as the Son of Man drawing in some way on innovations in *Parables*.⁵⁷ The traditions discussed herein may be another example of such an influence, therefore strengthening the case for early Christian reliance on Enochic materials. But Justin himself never cites the Enoch literature, suggesting that either *Parables* is not the source but instead has taken the motif of the Chosen One's name from an existing usage of Ps. 72.17 in a messianic setting⁵⁸ (one which Justin and R. Yannai were also

57. Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch 2*, p. 62 argue that *Parables* stands midway between Daniel and the New Testament in the development of Son of Man traditions. Revelation especially 'may well reflect knowledge of the Parables', sharing a saviour who is Son of Man, Servant and messiah. Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch 2*, p. 70. James H. Charlesworth, 'The Date and Provenience of the *Parables of Enoch*', in Darrell L. Bock and James H. Charlesworth (eds.), *Parables of Enoch: A Paradigm Shift* (Jewish and Christian Texts, 11; London: Bloomsbury, 2013), pp. 37-57 (56) argues that dating the *Parables* to the latter half of the first century BCE 'has become conclusive'. See also Lee Martin McDonald, 'The *Parables of Enoch* in Early Christianity', in Darrell L. Bock and James H. Charlesworth (eds.), *Parables of Enoch: A Paradigm Shift* (Jewish and Christian Texts, 11; London: Bloomsbury, 2013), pp. 329-63; Adele Yarbro Collins, 'The Secret Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch and the Gospel of Mark: A Response to Leslie Walck', in Gabriele Boccaccini (ed.), *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), pp. 338-42.

58. Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, pp. 191-227, argues that *Dial.* 48-108 is based on a traditional exegesis, a document he identifies as the 'recapitulation' source. He claims in Oskar Skarsaune, 'Jewish Christian Sources Used by Justin Martyr and Some Other Greek and Latin Fathers', in Oskar Skarsaune and Reidar Hvalvik (eds.), *Jewish Believers in Jesus* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2007), pp. 379-418 (406-407), that the exegesis herein of Ps. 72.17 was common. Will Rutherford,

aware of); or, that *Parables* is the source, but its influence in this reading of Ps. 72.17 spread through Palestine such that it became absorbed into Christian and rabbinic thought. The fact that *Parables* does not cite Ps. 72.17 as the source of the tradition whereas Justin and the rabbis do is not conclusive. However, it suggests that it may have picked up the reading ‘second-hand’ because it is less likely that Justin and the rabbis would inherit an orphaned tradition and then trace it back to discover and cite the biblical proof, than that they would inherit the interpretation of the original text just as *Parables* did. Therefore while we do not have extant any common source prior to the three investigated here, its existence is plausible.

We may be able to locate the emergence of the tradition more precisely because while the first-century BCE composition *Pss. Sol.* 17 uses Ps. 72 as inspiration for its messianism, it never cites v. 17.⁵⁹ This suggests that at the very least the tradition was not universal prior to the Common Era, a factor which again fits with *Parables* being the source. And while Ps. 72 has been shown to have contributed to messianic thought in Late Antiquity, we can now conclude that the interpretation of 72.17 in terms of the messiah’s name was a very influential tradition across several areas of biblical interpretation from the beginning of the Common Era onwards.

Recently, Peter Schäfer has argued that in many cases, similarities between rabbinic and Christian traditions are due to rabbinic parody, and not to an underlying Second Temple Jewish tradition from which both Christianity and rabbinic Judaism drew.⁶⁰ It is difficult to ascertain whether this is the case here or not. While the initial impetus for the use of Ps. 72.17 seems likely to be *Parables*, the relationship among this, Justin Martyr and the Rabbis is quite opaque. It is entirely possible that *b. Sanh.* 98b and *Lam. R.* 1.16’s name-lists are intended to defuse name-speculation through an *ad absurdum*

‘*Altercatio Jasonis et Papisci* as a Testimony Source for Justin’s “Second God” Argument?’, in Sara Purvis and Paul Foster (eds.), *Justin Martyr and His Worlds* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), pp. 137-44, pursues Skarsaune’s tentative identification of the ‘recapitulation’ source as the *Disputation between Jason and Papiscus* and suggests that the entire binitarian argument of *Dial.* 61-62 may depend upon it. However, there is no mention of Ps. 72.17 in any of the extant citations of the *Disputation*, nor in either of the possible descendants *Athanasius and Zacchaeus* and *Timothy and Aquila*.

59. See Broyles, ‘Redeeming King’.

60. Schäfer, *Jewish Jesus*.

demonstration; but it is less likely that they are aimed at Christian doctrine, because there is never any mention of a name equating with or suggestive of that of Jesus. The motifs of the messiah, the righteous and Jerusalem sharing God's Name, while only appearing in two texts (Revelation and *b. Baba Batra*), seems too neat to be coincidence but there is little to indicate that Samuel b. Nahmani or Johanan intended to parody Revelation, especially as they cite their sources carefully. The appearance of a very similar tradition in *Lamentations Rabbah* is curious because of its ascription to different sages and the absence of the righteous in that schema. The two most likely explanations are, first, that the Christian tradition had been recorded somewhere in Palestine during the third century and deemed acceptable by some rabbis, then ascribed to different sages by the respective redactors of the two texts. Or secondly, Revelation could have drawn on an earlier (perhaps Pharisaic?) tradition which placed the different biblical sources together. If this is the case then it is interesting to note that, although the Tannaim had grown weary of messianic speculation and largely neglected it as evidenced by their writings, some traditions shared by Enochic and Christian texts still managed to filter through to the Amoraic Rabbis recorded in the Talmud and Midrash.

This paper has shown that there are deep interconnections and influences regarding the messiah between different schools within the Late Antique Jewish-Christian milieu and that doctrines and biblical exegetical motifs were passed freely between those more commonly considered to be within the Jewish or Christian traditions. In fact, these speculations about the name of the messiah must be understood within the broad frame of Late Antique Jewish and Christian messianism. As Yoshiko Reed, among others, proposes, messianisms should be understood as a link not a disruption between Judaism and Christianity:

But if the histories of Jewish and Christian messianisms part, collide, and entwine, it is perhaps in ways that we have yet fully to recover—although always, it seems, in patterns more dynamic and complex than any simple contrast can capture. Consequently, it is perhaps not surprising that we glimpse something of their enduring entanglement even in the very discourse of messianic difference.⁶¹

The multiple influences and cross-readings show that in the early centuries of the Common Era and at least in some communities, the ways between

61. Yoshiko Reed, *Jewish-Christianity and the History of Judaism*, p. 253.

Christian and Jewish traditions still had not parted. This dialogue-discussion-controversy continued during most of Late Antiquity.⁶²

62. The debate that we raise in the present work also relates to the apparent opposition between ‘apocryphal’ and ‘canonical’, the corpus of writings pertaining to the Judaism of the Second Temple and rabbinic Judaism, and finally that of ‘Judaism’ versus ‘Christianity’. This tendency to definitively classify ancient sources is criticized by Annette Yoshiko Reed, in her approach to the so-called ‘Old Testament Pseudepigraphy’. In effect, the sources that emerged in that period cannot be classified homogeneously since they are related, in some cases more intimately than in others, with both Judaism and Christianity. However, numerous academic positions persist in an attempt to differentiate definitely Jewish sources from Christian sources. Yoshiko Reed explains: ‘This bifurcation has been naturalized not only by its resonance with the distinction drawn by contemporary faith-communities but also by a parallel distinction of scholarly disciplines. To label an ancient text as “Jewish” or “Christian” is not just to categorize it; rather, in practice, it is also to delineate the fields within which it is (and is not) studied’ (Annette Yoshiko Reed, ‘Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and Post-70 Judaism’, in Claire Clivaz, Simon Mimouni and Bernard Pouderon [eds.], *Les judaïsmes dans tous leurs états aux Ier-IIIe siècles [les Judéens des synagogues, les chrétiens et les rabbins]: Actes du colloque de Lausanne, 12-14 décembre 2012* [Turnhout: Brepols, 2015], pp. 117-48 [137]). See also Mariano Troiano, ‘Conocimiento oculto: “lo apócrifo” entre los textos gnósticos y heresiológicos’, *Horizonte: Revista de Estudos de Teologia e Ciências da Religião* 17.52 (2019), pp. 43-67.