

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

5-1-1944

The Significance of the New Testament Concept "In the Name"

Herman Witzgall

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_witzgallh@csl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Witzgall, Herman, "The Significance of the New Testament Concept "In the Name"" (1944). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 102.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/102>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bachelor of Divinity by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT CONCEPT
"IN THE NAME"

A Thesis Presented to
The Faculty of Concordia Seminary
Department of Exegetical Theology

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Bachelor of Divinity

by
Herman J. G. Witzgall

May 1944

Approved by _____

OUTLINE

- I. The origin of the concept "in the name"
 - A. The Hebrew idiom בְּשֵׁם
 - B. The Septuagint translation of בְּשֵׁם
 - C. The origin of $\text{ἐν ἢ ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι}$
 - D. The origin of εἰς τὸ ὄνομα

- II. The meaning of the concept "in the name"
 - A. The term ὄνομα in the New Testament
 - B. "To come in the name of the Lord"
 - C. "To ask in the name of the Lord"
 - D. "To receive in the name of the Lord"
 - E. "To believe in the name of the Lord"
 - F. "To baptize in the name of the Lord"
 - G. Other verbs used with the formula "in the name of the Lord"

INTRODUCTION

In the following pages I am presenting as clearly as possible the origin as well as the meaning of the New Testament formula "in the name" in the light of the most up-to-date research in the field of New Testament study. I am presenting what I believe to be the most plausible explanation. Further research by others may result in a more satisfactory solution.

I should say also that I have not examined all the occurrences of ὄνομα. I am restricting myself to a study of ὄνομα with the prepositions εἰς, ἐπί, and ἐν. The Septuagint and Hebrew usages of the formula were beyond the scope of this paper. I have referred to them only to establish the origin of the concept. I will treat, therefore, only the Greek ὄνομα with the prepositions mentioned followed by a genitive of person, which may be either a noun or a pronoun.

Even a beginner in the study of philology will admit the wide differences of meaning a word may have in two languages. The German equivalent of "conversation" is "Gespräch". But what a number of other meanings that word may have in German! It can refer to a dialogue, a colloquy, a parley. All these shades are not inherent in the English term "conversation". It is well to remember this fact also in New Testament word study and particularly in the examination of the formula **Concept**. Webster defines "name" as follows: "The title by which a person or thing is known or designated, a descriptive or qualifying appellation."¹ Yet this definition could never be applied to the Hebrew בְּשֵׁם or the Greek ἐν ὀνόματι . בְּשֵׁם and ἐν ὀνόματι mean more than our conception of name.

PART I

The Origin of the New Testament

Concept

"IN THE NAME"

The origin of the Hebrew בְּשֵׁם is rather obscure. Some scholars trace it back to the root "sh" meaning "to be high". In its etymological sense it therefore means "height".² Then, it came to mean "moment"³ or "momentary".⁴ By and by, however, the word took on the connotation "auxiliary" or "majesty".⁵ Other students connect the origin of בְּשֵׁם with the root "sh", which originally

1. Webster, Collexata Dictionary.
 2. Hastings, A Dictionary of the Bible, Vol. III, p. 478.
 3. Gen. 11, 4; II Sam. 10, 13; Is. 70, 13.
 4. Is. 56, 1.
 5. Ps. 54, 1.

Even a beginner in the study of philology will admit the wide differences of meaning a word may have in two languages. The German equivalent of "conversation" is "Gespräch". But what a number of other meanings that word may have in German! It can also refer to a dialogue, a colloquy, a parley. All these shades are not inherent in the English term "conversation". It is well to remember this fact also in New Testament word study and particularly in the examination of the formula before us. Webster defines "name" as follows: "The title by which a person or thing is known or designated, a descriptive or qualifying appellation."¹ Yet this definition could never be applied to the Hebrew $\bar{\alpha}\bar{\omega}$ or the Greek $\acute{\omicron}\nu\omicron\mu\alpha$. $\bar{\alpha}\bar{\omega}$ and $\acute{\omicron}\nu\omicron\mu\alpha$ mean more than our conception of name.

The origin of the Hebrew $\bar{\alpha}\bar{\omega}$ is rather obscure. Some scholars trace it back to the root "smo" meaning "to be high". In its etymological sense it therefore means "height".² Then, it came to mean "monument"³ or "mausoleum".⁴ By and by, however, the word took on the connotation "excellency" or "majesty".⁵ Other students connect the origin of $\bar{\alpha}\bar{\omega}$ with the root "wsm", which originally

1. Webster, Collegiate Dictionary.

2. Hastings, A Dictionary of the Bible, Vol. III, p.478.

3. Gen. 11,4; 2 Sam. 10,13; Is. 55,13.

4. Is. 56,5.

5. Ps. 54,1.

means "sign" or "token".^{6 7} This meaning can also be seen in the first meaning of $\square \cup$, namely a sign or designation of a person or thing.⁸

Among the Jews, however, the term "name" came to include much more than simply a sign or designation of a person or a thing. This wider sense of the term was due to a large extent to the close relation that existed between the name and the personality. In the very first recorded account of a name-giving we see the intimate, close relation between the name and the person. When the Lord made man, He called him $\square \tau \kappa$, which means "man" or "mankind". Adam, in turn, called his wife Eve, which means "living". And Eve, when she had given birth to her first son, called him Cain ($\zeta \rho$), that is, "gotten" or "acquired", because she said, "I have gotten a man from the Lord"⁹ or to be more exact, "I have gotten a man, the Lord", supposing him to be the promised Messiah. Abram's name was changed to Abraham ($\alpha \beta \gamma \delta \epsilon$), that is, "father of a multitude", after the Lord had promised him that he was to be the forefather of a great nation, yes, of that nation from which the Redeemer was to come.¹⁰ When the angel of the Lord promised Sarah a son in her old age, she laughed at this. Hence, the son was called Isaac ($\rho \sigma \tau$),

6. Hastings, loc. cit.

7. Gesenius combines these two suggested origins. (Gesenius, Hebrew-English Lexicon of the Old Testament, see $\square \cup$.)

8. Gesenius, *ibid.*, p. 1080.

9. Gen. 4, 1.

10. Gen. 17, 5.

that is, "laughter", "mocking".¹¹ Hannah, after receiving the object of her prayer, called her son Samuel (שְׁמוּאֵל), that is, "asked of God", because she had prayed to Jehovah and He had answered her prayer.¹² Finally, also the name שְׁמוּאֵל, (Hebr. שְׁמוּאֵל), that is "whose help is Jehovah", or "help Savior", brings out the very close relation that existed between the person and his name. In general we may say that names were given by the Jews in consideration of birth, personal relationship, personal peculiarities, functions to be performed, and certain experiences by the parents and also others.¹³ Keeping this fact in mind, we can readily understand why the Jews used the name often with implied reference to the personlity or character or peculiar function of the person named.

This Jewish usage eventually found its way into other nations and their languages, as we shall see later in this paper. Hastings, therefore, speaking of the term "name" in general, states: "It is a widely-spread belief among primitive and less developed peoples that one who knows a person's name has a power over the bearer of the name; hence the reluctance to give a stranger one's name."¹⁴ But be that as it may, among the Jews the close relation between the name and the person affected even the term "name", so that one did not necessarily have to refer to a person by

11. Gen. 21, 5.

12. 1 Sam. 1, 20.

13. Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol. IX, p. 153

14. Hastings, op. cit., p. 479.

using his name, as Jacob, Moses, or David, but one could simply use $\square \text{ װ}$ to refer to the person in question.

It is a matter of common acceptance that the Jews held the name of God in very high esteem. Like other Hebrew proper names it was more than a distinguishing title. In fact, they were so careful to avoid taking the name of God in vain or using it frivolously that they pointed the noun אֱלֹהִים with the vowels of the less sacred word אֱלִים , and then pronounced the word not אֱלֹהִים , as seems proper, but אֱלִים .

So the concept "in the name of God" came to hold a very prominent place in the Hebrew vocabulary. It came to mean more than the simple appellation "God", "Jehovah", or "Lord". It represented, and still does, the Hebrew conception of the divine nature or character of God and the revelation of God to His people. "It represents the Deity as He is known to His worshippers and stands for all the attributes which He bears in relation to them and which are revealed to them through His activity on their behalf, as well as through His holy record."¹⁵ More than that. It represents what God is. We read in Ex. 3, 14.15: "And God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM: and he said: Thou shalt say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you . . . the Lord God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you: this is my name forever, and this is my memorial unto all generations." In this

15. Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol. IX, p. 160.

phrase occurs approximately 57 times in the canonical books of the Old Testament and in over three fourths of the cases it is followed by "Jehovah". The significance to note here is that the phrase, יהוה אלהינו , is a set idiom, of which no variations, as far as אלהינו is concerned, occur in the Hebrew text. The prepositions never changed, although another could have been substituted. When a Jew wished to express the idea of the Godhead in so far as God has revealed Himself to us, he used this one standard phrase, אלהינו יהוה . So the children of Israel spoke, called upon, prayed, swore, prophesied, helped, saved, trod under foot, came and went, built, asked, lifted up their hands, cursed - all אלהינו יהוה . The formula was truly common and pliable.

Whereas the formula אלהינו יהוה was fixed in Hebrew, quite the opposite must be said of the Greek translation of the Hebrew, the Septuagint. This translation renders the Hebrew idiom with a great variety of prepositional phrases. the following table illustrates the Septuagint translations of the Hebrew:

THE SEPTUAGINT TRANSLATION OF THE HEBREW תורה

Book ¹⁸	<u>εϛ</u> (w. Dat.)	<u>επλ</u>) Dative	Simple Acc.	Simple Acc.	<u>απο</u> (w. Gen.)	<u>εκ</u> w.A.	<u>εϛς</u> w.A.	Total
Pentateuch	-	9	1	4	-	-	-	14
Samuel	3	2	-	-	-	-	-	5
Kings	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
Chronicles	5	2	-	-	-	-	-	7
Esther	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
Psalms	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	9
Jeremiah	1	4	1	-	-	-	-	6
Isaiah	-	1	1	3	-	-	-	5
Daniel	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Lamentations	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1
Joel	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1
Zephaniah	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	2
Malachi	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>2</u>
TOTAL:	27	19	3	10	1	1	0	61

18. The books not listed do not contain any of these translations of תורה.

A number of interesting facts present themselves as we examine these occurrences. The most obvious is the great frequency of ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι and ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι. Of the 61 occurrences of the Hebrew formula $\square \omega \gamma \gamma$, 46 are rendered by either ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι or ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι in the Septuagint. And let us here rid ourselves of the idea that there is any difference in the Septuagint between the expression ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι and ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι. Later we will examine the two prepositions, but it is clear as a pike-staff that in the Septuagint ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι and ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι are used interchangeably. By way of illustration, let us look at several passages. In 1 Chron. 21, 19; 1 Kgs. 22, 16; Dan. 9, 6; Zech. 13, 3 we find λαλεῖν with ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι, whereas in Ex. 5, 23; Deut. 18, 19.20.21; 1 Sam. 25, 9; Jer. 20, 9; 26, 16 we find ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι with the same verb. In one and the same book, in fact, we find the two prepositions used interchangeably with the same verb.¹⁹ There are other instances illustrating this point. In 2 Sam. 6, 18; 1 Chron. 16, 2; Ps. 129, 8 εὐλογεῖν is followed by ἐν ὀνόματι, whereas in Deut. 18, 5 and 21, 5 ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι occurs with εὐλογεῖν. The same is true of ἔρχομαι,²⁰ ἑπικαλέω,²¹ and ὀμνύει.²²

19. In 2 Chron. 15, 15 we find λαλεῖν ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου, whereas in 33, 18 we read λαλεῖν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι κυρίου.
 20. In 2 Chron. 14, 10 we see ἐπὶ and in 1 Sam. 17, 45 and Ps. 118, 26 ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι occurs with that verb.
 21. ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι in Gen. 12, 8 and ἐν in 1 Kgs. 18, 25.26; 2 Kgs. 5, 11; 1 Chron. 16, 8 & Ps. 116, 17.
 22. ἐπὶ in Deut 6, 13 and 10, 20; but in 1 Sam. 20, 42 ἐν occurs.

In the passage from Esther one gets the impression that the translator was so completely unfamiliar with the Hebrew concept that he omitted it and translated the noun following $\square \omega \eta \eta$ with the simple genitive.

If we take another glance at the table on page 8, we note that there is a complete absence of $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma \tau\acute{o} \delta\acute{\rho}\omicron\mu\alpha$, a phrase which is used quite a number of times in the New Testament.²⁵ I noted, however, that in 2 Macc. 8, 4 we do find $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma \tau\acute{o} \delta\acute{\rho}\omicron\mu\alpha$ but here $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ is used in the sense of "against" (so the A.V. and Goodspeed²⁶). In 3 Macc. 2, 9 we see:

25. In the Old Testament $\square \omega \eta \eta$ occurs ten times and is translated by $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma \delta\acute{\rho}\omicron\mu\alpha$ three times, according to Heitmüller (Im Namen Jesu, p. 34) In 2 Chron. 22, 5 we find $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma \delta\acute{\rho}\omicron\mu\alpha$, which is translated in the A.V. by "of fame and of glory". The word $\square \omega \eta \eta$ is a synonym here for "fame" (Gesenius, p. 1080), and the usage certainly is not the same as doing something "in the name of the Lord". In Neh. 6, 13 $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma \delta\acute{\rho}\omicron\mu\alpha \pi\omicron\rho\eta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ occurs, which might be translated "for an evil report" or as Luther "dasz sie ein boeses Gestreihættten." Again $\delta\acute{\rho}\omicron\mu\alpha$ is used in a sense different from that occurring in our formula. Finally in Is. 55, 13 the Hebrew $\square \omega \eta \eta$ is used synonymously for sign or token (Cramer, op. cit. p. 454): "and it shall be to the Lord for a name and an everlasting sign." Here again we find $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma \delta\acute{\rho}\omicron\mu\alpha$, but again $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ is used in a different sense, namely, "for" or "as much as". So although $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma \delta\acute{\rho}\omicron\mu\alpha$ occurs here, it cannot enter into this discussion, since the shade of $\delta\acute{\rho}\omicron\mu\alpha$ is much different from the concept "in the name". Again, I must say that $\square \omega \eta \eta$ is the only Old Testament equivalent of the formula "in the name" that can be found.

26. Goodspeed, An American Translation of the Apocrypha, p. 467.

καὶ ἀγίας τῶν νόμων σου εἰς ὄνομα σου. But this reading is doubtful. It is not found in all the manuscripts and is probably an interpolation.²⁷ Of course, the two passages, from 2 and 3 Maccabees are not at all important in our consideration, since it is even doubtful whether these books ever existed in Hebrew.

A word should be said concerning the use of the article in the phrase ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι and ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι. In all but two instances²⁸ the article is used whenever a possessive pronoun follows the formula, such as μου and the article is omitted when a genitive noun as κυρίου follows. I believe that in case such as ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου the translator is trying to reproduce the Hebrew idiom שׁוֹרֵי אֱלֹהֵי, in which case the אֱלֹהֵי is in the construct state and hence cannot have the article if a possessive pronoun follows the object.²⁹ At any rate the presence of either the pronoun or the genitive sets the formula apart from any similarity that might still exist between it and that mentioned on page nine, where the article does not occur, since the object of the preposition is used in an abstract sense.

27. Kautzsch, Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments.

28. In Deut. 18, 5 and Jer. 11, 21 we find ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι κυρίου.

29. Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek New Testament, p. 779.

It is, therefore, apparent that the Hebrew $\square \text{ מִן } \square$ is an idiom of which the Septuagint translators knew very little or nothing at all, which confused them, and which they consequently rendered in many different ways.

We shall now examine the profane Greek and the Koine in order to determine whether it sheds any light on the origin of the formula $\acute{\epsilon}\tau$ or $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota \tau\acute{\omega} \delta\acute{\rho}\omicron\mu\alpha\tau\epsilon$. We shall consider $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\tau\acute{\omega} \delta\acute{\rho}\omicron\mu\alpha$ later.

Greek classical literature is much more extensive than that of the Old Testament. We would naturally, therefore, if the formula had its origin there, expect to find a great number of instances where it occurred. But the exact opposite is true. According to Heitmüller, Reiskins-Mitchell has noted only six occurrences of $\acute{\epsilon}\tau \text{ or } \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota \tau\acute{\omega} \delta\acute{\rho}\omicron\mu\alpha\tau\epsilon$.³⁰ In only one instance the formula modifies the verb and is used in the same way as the Septuagint. It is found in Josephus and reads: $\tau\acute{\omega}\tau\acute{\omega} \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota \tau\acute{\omega} \tau\acute{\omega}\nu \delta\acute{\rho}\omicron\mu\alpha\tau\epsilon \text{ ποιῶν } \S \eta\tau\eta\theta\omicron\upsilon\sigma\omicron\upsilon\iota$.³¹ But this as well as two others mentioned by Heitmüller³² occur in texts written af-

30. Heitmüller, *op. cit.*, p. 49, quotes Reiskins-Mitchell, "Indices graecit. in orat. attio."

31. Josephus, *Antiquities*, IV, I, 1, 5.

32. Heitmüller, *ibid.*, p. 49; Ulrich Wilcken in His "Griechische Ostraka", II, found a receipt from the year 37 A.D. - $\acute{\epsilon}\tau \delta\acute{\rho}\omicron\mu\alpha\tau\epsilon \Sigma\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\upsilon \text{ } \omicron\mu\iota\alpha\iota$; and Frederick Kenyon, *Greek Papyri in the British Museum*, I, 1893, 65ff., from the 3rd or 4th century A.D.: - $\acute{\epsilon}\tau \delta\acute{\rho}\omicron\mu\alpha\tau\epsilon \nu\phi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$. Both of these are dated after the birth of Christ and hence lose their significance.

t̄er the days of the apostles. By no stretch of the imagination may we, therefore, make these passages responsible to the Septuagint formula.³³ It is much more likely that as a result of Hebrew influence the Greek language absorbed the idiom.³⁴

But there are differences of opinion with respect to the origin of this phrase. Deissmann ventures to say "dasz es wohl sei, wenn die Wendung $\pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\acute{\iota}\tau\epsilon\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\ \tau\acute{\omega}\ \delta\acute{\omicron}\rho\acute{\omicron}\mu\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}\ \epsilon\upsilon\omicron\sigma$ noch nicht aus einer ausserbiblischen Quelle bekannt worden sei."³⁵ And Brandt conjectures that the formula $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\ \tau\acute{\omega}\ \delta\acute{\omicron}\rho\acute{\omicron}\mu\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}$ is generally a misunderstanding of the Aramaic, the redactor translating $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ instead of $\epsilon\upsilon\sigma$, because he could no longer appreciate the significance of Aramaic terminology.³⁶ The fact remains, however, that there is no evidence in classical Greek or the Koine for the existence of this formula $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\ \sigma\iota\ \epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\ \tau\acute{\omega}\ \delta\acute{\omicron}\rho\acute{\omicron}\mu\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}$. Neither is there any evidence that the formula was incorporated into the vernacular language of the Jews, as Brandt supposes.³⁷ Surely, if the translators of the Hebrew

33. Heitmüller, *ibid.*, p. 49 quotes "Strabo" VI, p. 245, $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\ \delta\acute{\omicron}\rho\acute{\omicron}\mu\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$ ad Xenophon, "Cryp." VI: $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\ \acute{\alpha}\lambda\acute{\iota}\mu\omega\nu\ \delta\acute{\omicron}\rho\acute{\omicron}\mu\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}$. These passages, however, are not followed by a genitive.

34. As before, by a simple numerical comparison we may be certain that the Greek language cannot account for the origin of the formula "in the name". But I have cited these passages to show that it is not possible even with the material on hand to trace the origin of $\epsilon\ \pi\ \acute{\iota}$ and $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\ \tau\acute{\omega}\ \delta\acute{\omicron}\rho\acute{\omicron}\mu\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}$ to profane Greek.

35. Deissmann, *Neue Bibelstudien*, p. 25.

36. Brandt, as quoted by Heitmüller, *ibid.*, p. 3.

37. Heitmüller, *loc. cit.*

Old Testament, who knew Greek, had been aware of the existence of the formula $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ or $\epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}$ τῷ ὀνόματι, they would not have floundered and offered so many different translations, but they would have used the corresponding Greek idiom. Heitmüller correctly observes: "Die Profangrécität hat die Wndung $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ ὀνόματι als Modalbestimmung zum Verbum, so weit wir sehen können, nicht gekannt."³⁸ Cremer also substantiates this view when he says: " $\pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\acute{\iota}\nu$ τὸ $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ ὀνόματι εὐρος does not occur in classical Greek . . . because such a meaning of the word ὄνομα and such a significance as belonging to the name, is foreign to the classical Greek."³⁹

I have now shown that the term "name" had a significance among the Jews, which it did not have among other nations; and that the formula, $\overline{\text{א}} \overline{\text{ל}} \overline{\text{ש}} \overline{\text{מ}}$ took over that individuality. In classical Greek ὄνομα means: 1) the name by which a person or thing is called, 2) name or fame, 3) name and nothing else in opposition to the real person or thing.⁴⁰ And since until now Ptolemaic papyri, ostraka, and inscriptions as well as other koine literature have not yielded parallels to the LXX phrase $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ and $\epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}$ τῷ ὀνόματι, we must conclude that the LXX translations of $\overline{\text{א}} \overline{\text{ל}} \overline{\text{ש}} \overline{\text{מ}}$ were directly influenced by the Hebrew.

Although Cremer contends: "It may be taken for granted that Christianity first introduced the use of the expression

38. Heitmüller, *ibid.*, p. 49.

39. Cremer, *op. cit.*, p. 456.

40. Liddell-Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, cf. ὄνομα .

'in the name' into western languages",⁴¹ I must supplement the statement. As far as classical Greek is concerned, we have no evidence of the usage of $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\alpha\delta$ $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}$ $\tau\omega$ $\acute{\omicron}\rho\acute{\omicron}\mu\alpha\tau\iota$. Neither is there much evidence of its existence in the Koine. The expression, $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\alpha\delta$ $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}$ $\tau\omega$ $\acute{\omicron}\rho\acute{\omicron}\mu\alpha\tau\iota$ therefore, must have been carried into the Koine through the hellenized Jews. Heitmüller substantiates this position when he says: "Zwar nicht das Christentum, wohl aber das hellenische Judentum hat die Wendung ($\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\alpha\delta$ $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}$ $\tau\omega$ $\acute{\omicron}\rho\acute{\omicron}\mu\alpha\tau\iota$) in die griechische Sprache gebracht."⁴² True, the phrase may not be the most typical Greek but as Heitmüller says: "Wenn nun auch wenigstens die Wendung $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\alpha\delta$ $\acute{\omicron}\rho\acute{\omicron}\mu\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}$ $\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon\omicron\varsigma$ im Sinn und Gebrauch der Septuaginta allem Schein noch als Novum für die griechische Sprache anzusehen ist, so ist damit noch nicht gesagt, dass sie ungleichish, wenigstens ungriechisch in dem Sinn gewesen sei, dass sie dem Geist der griechischen Sprache zuwider laufe."⁴³

Thus when placing the LXX formula $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\alpha\delta$ $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}$ $\tau\omega$ $\acute{\omicron}\rho\acute{\omicron}\mu\alpha\tau\iota$ side by side with the New Testament $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\alpha\delta$ $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}$ $\tau\omega$ $\acute{\omicron}\rho\acute{\omicron}\mu\alpha\tau\iota$, we must say that the LXX translations of the Hebrew בְּשֵׁם were the foundation of the New Testament formula $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\alpha\delta$ $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}$ $\tau\omega$ $\acute{\omicron}\rho\acute{\omicron}\mu\alpha\tau\iota$. In the course of years the LXX expression $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\alpha\delta$ $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}$ $\tau\omega$ $\acute{\omicron}\rho\acute{\omicron}\mu\alpha\tau\iota$ found its way into the Koine so that in the days of the Lord it was known and used in Palestine

41. Cremer, op. cit., p. 456.

42. Heitmüller, p. 49., op. cit.

43. Ibid., p. 52, op. cit.

and other parts of the Hellenic-known world and as a result the writers of the New Testament did not have to grope in the darkness of the vocabulary for the idiom corresponding to the Hebrew $\bar{\alpha} \bar{\omega} \bar{\alpha}$.

Perhaps the most significant rendition of the New Testament concept "in the name" is $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma \tau\acute{o} \acute{o}\rho\omicron\mu\alpha$. Since the usage of $\acute{o}\rho\omicron\mu\alpha$ with the preposition $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ does not, when followed by the article, occur in the LXX, the question arises, whence did it come? Various answers have been suggested. Boehmer traces it back to the Old Testament formula $\bar{\alpha} \bar{\omega} \bar{\alpha}$.⁴⁵ Brandt suggests that it is not from classical Greek, "sondern ist eine wörtliche Übersetzung aus der aramäischen Sprache."⁴⁶ Preuschen and Bauer contend that it cannot be traced back to the Greek but that it has its origin in the Hebrew $\bar{\alpha} \bar{\omega} \bar{\alpha}$.⁴⁷ But in the light of the most modern research we must reject these theories.

Deissmann has made a most important contribution regarding the origin of the phrase. He mentions the occurrence of $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma \epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma \tau\acute{o} \tau\acute{o}\upsilon \beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\upsilon\varsigma \acute{o}\rho\omicron\mu\alpha$, "a petition in

45. Boehmer, "Das Biblische "im Namen", quoted by Heitmüller, op. cit. p.2.

46. Brandt, op. cit., quoted by Heitmüller, op. cit., p.2. Robertson is of the same opinion, when he says: "The common use of $\acute{o}\rho\omicron\mu\alpha$ for the person is an aramaism, but but it occurs also in the vernacular papyri." (Word Pictures of the New Testament, Vol. III, p. 12)

47. Preuschen-Bauer, Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch des Neuen Testaments, p. 910.

48. Deissmann, Bibelstudien, p. 43: "Pap. Flind. Petr." II, III, 1; II, KK-EE; and II, XLVII.

the name of the king", in three different cases in Flinder's Petrie Papyri.⁴⁸ These papyri go back as far as 260 B.C. This quite definitely established the fact that the formula $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \tau\acute{o}\ \delta\acute{\rho}\omicron\mu\alpha$ must have existed before the beginning of the Christian era. Furthermore, the phrase "a petition in the name of the king" is closely related to that in the New Testament, e.g. baptism in the name of the Lord. Of course, the full O.T. significance of "name" is not present in the Koine. But at least we have evidence that the formula existed at this time. For the usage of $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \tau\acute{o}\ \delta\acute{\rho}\omicron\mu\alpha$ in the days of Jesus there is a good deal of evidence.⁴⁹ Even the Church Fathers of the second century employed the formula.⁵⁰ Moreover, Deissmann recently discovered an ostrakon, upon which the formula appears in abbreviated form as $\delta\iota\alpha\delta\epsilon\iota\chi\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \omicron\omicron\omicron$, and which he dates to the second century A.D.⁵¹ There may be some truth in his statement that the formula was so frequent that it was abbreviated.⁵² Kittel is of the opinion that the

-
49. Heitmüller, *op. cit.*, reports the following occurrences in the papyri: "Aus Karien vom ersten christlichen Jahrhundert, $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \tau\acute{o}\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma\ \delta\acute{\rho}\omicron\mu\alpha$; and Mylasa $\delta\iota\varsigma\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \tau\acute{o}\ \theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon\ \delta\acute{\rho}\omicron\mu\alpha$; aus Theben vom 2. und 3. christlichen Jahrhundert $\delta\iota\alpha\delta\epsilon\iota\chi\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \delta\acute{\rho}\omicron\mu\alpha\ \lambda\omicron\upsilon\upsilon\kappa\eta\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\varsigma$ auch $\delta\iota\alpha\gamma\epsilon\alpha\gamma\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \delta\acute{\rho}\omicron\mu\alpha\ \kappa\lambda\eta\tau\omicron\upsilon\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \rho\omega\mu\alpha\iota\omicron\upsilon$." p. 101. He also cites Herodian II, 2, 10; 13, 2: $\delta\mu\upsilon\upsilon\tau\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \tau\acute{o}\ \delta\acute{\rho}\omicron\mu\alpha$ dating back to the second or third century A.D.
50. Ignat. Rom. 9, 3 and Justin Diol. 39, quoted by Heitmüller, *op. cit.*, p. 104.
51. Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*, p. 97.
52. *Ibid.*, p. 98, Note 3.

good Greek. It is certainly odd and contrary to what we would expect. Is it possible to say $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \tau\acute{\omicron}\ \delta\acute{\omicron}\rho\omicron\mu\alpha$ according to Greek grammar?

In late classical Greek we find two distinct tendencies that have a bearing upon the formula under consideration. We notice on the one hand that the dative becomes less frequent. Moulton properly warns: "The New Testament student may easily overlook the fact that the dative has already entered the way that leads to extinction."⁵⁷ On the other hand, we find very clear passages of $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ encroaching on the domain of $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$.⁵⁸ Moulton tells us that "there are many New Testament passages where a real distinction between $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ and $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ is impossible to draw without excessive subtlety."⁵⁹ Blaszyk observes, "Begrifflich ist das Schwanken da, wo ein Hebräisches ל , dem in klass. Griech. Dat. entsprechen würde, übersetzt wird, so bei $\mu\omicron\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\upsilon\tau$, $\delta\omicron\mu\upsilon\acute{\omicron}\rho\alpha\iota$, $\epsilon\upsilon\delta\omicron\kappa\epsilon\iota\tau$, und besonders bei der Wiedergabe von hebr. ל לִי ל ."⁶⁰

We can thus appreciate how the plain dative or the formula $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\ \delta\omicron\tau\ \epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\ \tau\acute{\omicron}\ \delta\acute{\omicron}\rho\omicron\mu\alpha\tau\omicron$ came to be supplanted by the Greek phrase $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \tau\acute{\omicron}\ \delta\acute{\omicron}\rho\omicron\mu\alpha$. Since New Testament is a true representative of the Koine, and since the authors of the New Testament were well acquainted with that language, we na-

57. Moulton, A Grammar of N.T. Greek, p. 62.

58. Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek New Testament, p. 535

59. Moulton, op. cit., p. 63.

60. Blaszyk-Debrunner, op. cit., p. 122.

turally find these tendencies apparent also in the New Testament. As a result we find ἐς τὸ ὄρομα where we would expect the plain dative or εἰ with the dative. Robertson observes, "The modern Greek simply uses ἐς and the accusative for the usual dative and locative ideas."⁶¹ Debrunner says:

Der Dativ war im höchsten Masse der Konkurrenz, verschiedener Präpositionen, besonders von und ἐς, ausgesetzt; damit und mit dem Schwinden des Dativgebrauchs nach Präpositionen hängt das im Ngr., vorliegende Ausgehen des Dativs und seine Ersetzung durch ἐς mit Akk. zusammen.⁶²

In closing this discussion of the New Testament "in the name" I add a few words to summarize my findings. In the first place, the New Testament ὄρομα must be traced back to the Hebrew אֱלֹהִים, which had a shade of meaning not found in the earlier Greek and other languages. This was due to the Jewish lofty concept of God and His name. In the second place, the Hebrew phrase אֱלֹהֵינוּ was unfamiliar to the Septuagint translators and caused them great difficulty in rendering the Hebrew formula. In the third place, no occurrences of the LXX Translation εἰ and ἐν τῷ ὄροματι can be found in the classical Greek and its usage in the koine Greek is not the same as its usage in the LXX or in the New Testament. Therefore, I trace the origin of εἰ and ἐν τῷ ὄροματι to the LXX. Finally, the New Testament concept, ἐς τὸ ὄρομα, is

61. Robertson, op. cit., p. 635.

62. Blaszyk-Debrunner, op. cit., p. 109.

not found in the LXX translation of $\square \text{ל} \text{ו} \text{ל}$, but it is found in the Koine, although in a much weaker sense than $\square \text{ל} \text{ו} \text{ל}$ $\text{ס} \text{ל} \text{ו} \text{ל}$. This and the development of Greek at the time cause me to believe that the formula $\epsilon\iota\varsigma \tau\acute{o} \acute{o}\rho\omicron\mu\alpha$ had its origin in koine Greek, which had been affected by the Old Testament concept $\text{ס} \text{ל} \text{ו} \text{ל}$ $\square \text{ל} \text{ו} \text{ל}$ and the particular meaning of $\square \text{ל} \text{ו} \text{ל}$ there.

THE HEBREW FORMULA $\square \text{ל} \text{ו} \text{ל}$

<u>Equivalent found</u>	<u>Where</u>	<u>Origin</u>
$\epsilon\iota \text{ or } \epsilon\pi\iota \tau\acute{o} \acute{o}\rho\omicron\mu\alpha\tau\iota$	Septuagint	Septuagint
$\epsilon\iota\varsigma \tau\acute{o} \acute{o}\rho\omicron\mu\alpha$	Koine Greek	Koine Greek

In the first part of this paper I have shown the possible
law meaning of the words "in the name" that meaning is preserved
in the designation of authority which is used in the
new in the new Testament.

There is a very close relation between the of the
old Testament and of the new Testament. Just
as the old Testament was the law of the new Testament.

PART II

The Meaning of the New Testament

Concept

"in the name"

It is described as a sign of his the name is
characteristic of the
all that has been revealed
is derived from
and was prob-
ably originally
The Greek form is
The word of God, for instance, denotes all that God
is for man and all that has revealed to man. "It is used
for those qualities which to his worshippers are summed up
in that name, and by which God calls Himself known to man."
In a particular sense, God's name is the expression or revela-
tion of what God is for the sake of salvation and not only
an expression but a communication thereof, intended for man-

1. Journal of Theological Studies, p. 147.
2. Journal of Theological Studies, p. 148.
3. Journal of Theological Studies, p. 149.
4. Journal of Theological Studies, p. 150.

In the first part of this paper I have shown the peculiar meaning of the Hebrew term $\alpha\omega$. That meaning is preserved in the Septuagint. We naturally wonder what does $\acute{\omicron}\rho\omicron\mu\alpha$ mean in the New Testament.

There is a very close relation between the $\alpha\omega$ of the Old Testament and the $\acute{\omicron}\rho\omicron\mu\alpha$ of the New Testament. Just as $\alpha\omega$ so also the New Testament $\acute{\omicron}\rho\omicron\mu\alpha$ denoted everything which the name covered, everything the thought or feeling of which is aroused in the mind by mentioning, hearing, remembering the name."¹ "It is a sign of him who bears it; it describes what is, or is said to be, characteristic of the man, and what appears as such."² In short, $\acute{\omicron}\rho\omicron\mu\alpha$ covers all that we know of the person, all that has been revealed to us concerning him. The word $\acute{\omicron}\rho\omicron\mu\alpha$ is derived from the same stem as $\rho\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ and $\gamma\epsilon\gamma\omega\sigma\kappa\omega$, and was probably originally $\acute{\omicron}\gamma\omicron\mu\alpha$. The Ionic form is $\acute{\omicron}\gamma\omicron\mu\alpha$.³ The name of God, for instance, denotes all that God is for man and all that God has revealed to man. "It is used for those qualities which to His worshippers are summed up in that name, and by which God makes Himself known to men."⁴ In a particular sense, God's name is the expression or revelation of what God is "as the God of salvation and not only an expression but a communication thereof, intended for know-

-
1. Thayer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the N.T., p. 447.
 2. Cremer, Biblio-Theological Lexicon of N.T. Greek, p. 454.
 3. Ibid., p. 454
 4. Thayer, Op. Cit., p. 447.

ledge and use of men."⁵

The name of Christ in the New Testament, to use another instance, refers to His person as the Son of God and the son of man, and to His office, as the Savior of the world. Thayer says: "The name of Christ is used of all those things which, in hearing or recalling that name, we are bidden to recognize in Jesus and profess accordingly of His Messianic dignity, divine authority, memorable sufferings, in a word the peculiar services and blessings conferred by Him on men, so far as these are believed, confessed, and commemorated."⁶ Similarly, Vincent, speaking of the name of Christ, writes: "It is equivalent to His person. The finite mind can deal with Him only through His name, but His name is of no avail detached from His person."⁷ The distinction between the person and work of Christ and "His name", therefore, practically vanishes. In fact, Lenski goes so far as to say: "The *ὄνομα* is really the person of Jesus Himself and all that He stands for, but so as known, revealed, and made manifest to men."⁸ The person and work of God or Christ to natural man is something very abstract. The "name" of God or Christ, however, is concrete, for it signifies all that we know about God or Christ, all that has been revealed to us; and the name of Christ refers primarily to what has been revealed with respect to His office and work as the Savior of men.

Let us examine two passages in which *ὄνομα* occurs

5. Gremer, Op. cit., p. 455.

6. Thayer, OP. Cit., p. 448.

7. Vincent, Word Studies in the New Testament, Vol. I, p. 150

8. Lenski, The Interpretation of St. Matthews Gospel, p. 910.

referring to Christ. Peter testified before the Sanhedrin at Jerusalem: "Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved."⁹ Here ὄνομα without question speaks of the person of Christ or Christ Himself. But it is more definite than that. Christ is pictured in His capacity as the Savior. There is none other who can save But Jesus. Therefore, the passage refers to whatever has been revealed to us about Christ as the Messiah. Another significant passage is Phil. 2, 9. 10 where Paul says: "Wherefore God hath also highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name: that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow. . . ." Here, again, the term "name" is much more than a designation. It suggests all that has been revealed to us concerning Christ and His vicarious atonement, with special reference to His state of exaltation. Jesus Himself showed us the significance of ὄνομα, when He prayed in the Lord's prayer, "Hallowed be Thy name." Here, too, ὄνομα includes all that has been revealed to us concerning God, especially what has been revealed to us with reference to our salvation. In his answer to the question, "How is this (referring to the first petition) done?", Luther says: "When the Word of God is taught in its truth and purity."¹⁰ Although he does not say that ὄνομα refers to the revelation of God's work through Christ, we can nevertheless see that such was his meaning.

9. Acts 4, 12.

10. Cf. Luther's Enchiridion.

Author	ἐν & D.	ἐν & A.	ἐν & D.	διὰ & A.	ἐν & G.	ἐν & G.	ἐν & A.	No Prep.	12	Total
Matthew	2	4	2	2	-	-	-	3		13
Mark	4	-	3	1	-	-	-	-		8
Luke	Gospel	4	-	3	1	-	-	-		8
	----Total	11	2	8	1	4	2	4	2	34
	Acts	7	2	5	-	4	2	4	2	26
John	Gospel	14	4	-	-	-	-	-	1	18
	----Total	14	4	-	3	1	-	-	1	23
	Epistles	-	-	-	3	1	-	-	-	5
Paul		6	2	-	-	-	1	2	1	12
Peter		1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
James		2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
Hebrews		-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	2
Total		40	13	13	7	5	3	6	8	95

11. This list does not include instances where ὄνομα occurs as the Nominative, simple Accusative, and objective Genitive.
12. Here the simple Dative and Genitive occur but the meaning is not "in the name."
13. The only usages I will treat are the first three, ἐν with the Dative, ἐν with the Accusative, and ἐν with the Dative. The other usages are outside the scope of my inquiry.

The verb used most frequently in the New Testament in connection with the formula "in the name" is ἔρχομαι . Eleven times we find the expression ἔρχεσθε εἰς ἢ ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι κυρίου . There are three different thoughts expressed in these passages.

In Matth. 21, 9. 23. 39; Mark 11, 9; Luke 13, 35; 19, 38 and John 12, 13 we find the expression εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος εἰς ὄνομα κυρίου . The quotation is taken over directly from the Septuagint, where it occurs a number of times as the translation of the Hebrew בְּיָמָיו וְעַד הַיּוֹם . Some expositors¹⁴ take "in the name of the Lord" here to mean as the Lord's representative or "at the command of the Lord and as His messenger."¹⁵ At first glance and without further thought this seems plausible. But let us examine the expression more closely.

The preposition εἰς which appears in these passages is used in the natural, local sense, as it is found in most cases in the New Testament.¹⁶ It denotes the sphere or connection of the following object.¹⁷ Therefore, we can literally say "in the sphere of, in connection with, or in union with my name." The term ὄνομα , as I have shown, designates all that has been revealed concerning the Lord, especially concerning His gracious work as the Savior of men.

14. Meyer, Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Gospel of Matthew, p. 61, Plummer, International Critical Commentary on Luke (ICC), p. 353.

15. Heitmüller, Im Namen Jesu, p. 18

16. Robertson, Grammar of the New Testament, p. 590; Lenski, op. cit., p. 968.

17. Blaszyk-DeBrunner, Neutestamentliche Grammatik, p. 129.

Therefore, it is quite evident that "by authority" or "as the representative" is not at all in keeping with the literal meaning of the original. The Jews that sang "hosannas" to Jesus as He entered Jerusalem meant to say that He is blessed because He came in the sphere of or in connection with the revelation of God which was found in the Old Testament, because He came "according to the promise of the Lord" made many centuries ago. Jesus came "as the Messiah to bring deliverance"¹⁸ to the children of Israel and as such came "in the name of the Lord," or, in connection "with the revelation of Jehovah."¹⁹

The second thought, expressed in John 5, 43, makes the matter clearer. Here Jesus states: "I am come in my Father's name, and ye receive me not: if another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive." Here *ἐν ὀνόματι* occurs twice. On the one hand, Jesus asserts that He came "in the name of His Father." This does not mean as Zahn supposes "der Beauftragter"²⁰, or as Meyer conjectures "by His own authority and self-representation"²¹, nor by the Father's authority, as His representative. No, the preposition *ἐν* and the noun *ὄνομα* demand that we take the statement to mean that Jesus came in connection with the revelation of the Father concerning Him, in fulfillment of the "testimony

18. Barnes, Notes on Matthew, p. 251.

19. Lenski, The Interpretation of St. John's Gospel, p. 830.

20. Zahn, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, Vol. IV, p. 310.

21. Meyer, Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Gospel of John, p. 264.

of the Scripture."²² Already in the garden God promised to send a Savior of fallen mankind, and throughout the Old Testament the promises of the Messiah became ever clearer and more definite. Now the Messiah had come, in fulfillment of all the prophecies, and yet He was not received. But, so Jesus said continually, if someone else would come in his own name, that is, in connection with what he said and revealed of himself, then the people would receive him. He would be a deceiver, because nothing has been revealed concerning him. Again, it is well to note that "in connection with the revelation of God" is the literal translation. It is the most natural translation. It is the one that fits the context best.

In Matth. 24, 5; Mark 13, 6; and Luke 21, 8 we have the third occurrence of the expression "to come in the name of the Lord." Jesus spoke these words in His great eschatological discourse during the holy week. The three synoptic evangelists record that discourse of the Lord. Luke's account reads: "Take heed that ye be not deceived: for many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ; and the time draweth near; go ye not therefore after them."²³ Whereas in all the other occurrences the phrase of "coming in the name" we find the preposition ἐν, here the synoptic writers use the formula ἐπι τῷ ὀνόματι. The question arises: Is there any difference between ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι and ἐπι τῷ ὀνόματι? I have shown in the first part of this paper that ἐν and ἐπι were used synonymously as a trans-

22. Lenski, Op. Cit., p. 404.

23. Luke 21, 8.

lation of the Hebrew preposition $\bar{\imath}$. This fact alone satisfactorily explains the appearance of the $\bar{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}$. But we can also see from the very meaning of $\bar{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}$ that there is very little difference to be found in the prepositions. $\bar{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}$ denotes generally the basis, "den Grund, namentlich bei Vb. des Affekts."²⁴ Therefore, we would translate "on the basis of my name" or "on the basis of what had been revealed concerning me." But we must confess that the distinction between "in connection with" and "on the basis of the name" is almost entirely lost in the translation of the formula, because of the peculiar connotation of $\bar{\omicron}\rho\omicron\mu\alpha$. So, I believe, that there is no or comparatively little difference between $\bar{\epsilon}\nu$ and $\bar{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}$. Just as we oftentimes use synonyms whose shades of meaning differ to express the same idea, so the synoptics writers did in this instance. We will notice this interchange of $\bar{\epsilon}\nu$ and $\bar{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}$ also in other instances in our study of the concept "in the name".

Christ warns his followers in Luke 21, 8 that false Messiahs would come and that His "name will be the basis of their claim." "They would not assume to be Jesus returned to earth, but they would claim His title of Messiah."²⁵ They would "on the basis of what was revealed concerning the Messiah, abusing it for their evil purposes."²⁶ Also Robertson says: "They will arrogate to themselves the Messiahship in (on the basis of) the name of Christ Himself."²⁷ According

24. Blaszc-Debrunner, *Op. Cit.*, p. 135.

25. Plummer, International Critical Commentary on Luke, (ICC), p. 478.

26. Lenski, The Interpretation of St. Mark and St. Luke's Gospel, p. 354.

27. Robertson, Word Pictures in the N.T., Vol. I, p. 7188

to Josephus these false Messiahs even took on the name of Christ, saying, "I am Christ. I am the Messiah."²⁸ They arrogated to themselves all that had been revealed concerning the Messiah and then called themselves by that name.²⁹

This last usage of ἐν τῷ ὄραμα with ἐξομα well illustrates that ὄραμα does not merely suggest power or authority but much more than that. As stated before, in New Testament usage it denotes everything that is known and revealed concerning a person's work, essence and nature.

John uses the expression "in the name of the Lord" or "in my name" six times,³⁰ and in every instance in passages which speak of prayer. Since Christians always pray "in the name of the Lord", a knowledge of the meaning of that phrase is particularly important.

Also in these passages we must take the ἐν in its natural sense, "in the sphere of", "in union with", or, "in connection with". ὄραμα denotes the revelation by which we know Jesus. This covers His person as well as His work. It is concentrated in His titles. Therefore when we ask a thing from God, we pray "on the foundation of the revelation which

28. Josephus, "Wars", VI, 54, quoted by Robertson, Loc. Cit.

29. Barnes, Op. Cit., p. 254 and Meyer, Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Gospel of Matthew, p. 128.

30. John 14, 13; 15, 16; 16, 23; 16, 24; 16, 26.

Jesus has given us of Himself and His work."³¹ Such a revelation includes the truth that He is the Savior, that we are justified by His vicarious satisfaction, that He dwells in us, guards and keeps us by His grace, and answers our prayers. But it also includes a revelation of the will of Christ, as a part of His essence and being. Thus we pray not only in union with what we know about Him as the gracious Savior but also "in harmony with Christ's will"³², for only when we have conformed our will to that of Christ, can we be certain of the promise contained in these passages.

In Matth. 10, 41; 18, 5; Mark 9, 37 and Luke 9, 48 we find the expression "to receive someone in the name of someone else." The passage in Matth. 10, 41 speaks of receiving a prophet "in the name" of a prophet and the remaining ones read: "receiveth a child in my name." In the passage Matth. 10, 41, ἐῖς τὸ ὄνομα occurs, whereas in the remaining passages we find ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι. This latter concept ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι is identical with the usage of the formula in the expression "cometh in the name (ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι) of the Lord." Although the more frequent phrase is ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι, here ἐν very

31. Godet, Commentary on the Gospel of St. John, III, p. 141.

32. Bernard, International Critical Commentary of John, (ICC), p. 544.

Slightly modifies the idea. The difference between $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ and $\epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}$ is so fine that we lose it almost entirely in the translation. At any rate, the thought expressed here is "to receive a child on the basis of the name" that is, the revelation of the Savior.³³ But it does not mean, as Robertson supposes,³⁴ "on the basis of my authority." The name, the revelation and teaching of Jesus, is the basis upon which the receiving is brought about, as Lange says: The fellowship of faith combining and uniting the teacher and the taught in the name."³⁵ Christians are to receive such "little ones" because they are attached to Christ through the revelation of His work and their acceptance of this revelation by faith.³⁶

The expression "to receive a prophet in the name of a prophet"³⁷ is significant, because $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ is used with $\delta\acute{\rho}\omicron\mu\alpha$ instead of $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ or $\epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}$. I shall treat this difference more fully in connection with the verb $\beta\alpha\pi\tau\iota\zeta\omega$ but I will say now that $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ has the same meaning as $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$. In the first part of this paper I showed the origin of $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ $\delta\acute{\rho}\omicron\mu\alpha$. It arose as a result of the disappearance of the dative and the interchange of $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ and $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$. This may well be applied here also. Robertson says: "In reality $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ is simply $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ with the same meaning. It is not proper to say that $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ has always to be translated 'into'."³⁸

33. Lenski, Interpretation of St. Luke's Gospel, p. 346.

34. Robertson, Word Pictures in the N.T., II, p. 137.

35. Lange, "The Gospel according to St. Matthew," A Commentary on Holy Scripture, p. 324.

36. Barnes, Notes on Matthew, p. 184

37. Matth. 18, 5.

38. Robertson, Word Pictures in the N.T., I, p. 85.

Preuschen Bauer distinguish between $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ and $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma$, but, I believe, in view of the origin and usage their distinction cannot be held. It certainly does not give good sense to "receive a prophet into the name of a prophet." No, the idea of motion is lost and the local sense is prominent. So must be rendered "in the sphere of" "in connection with".³⁹ The expression occurring here therefore means "to receive a prophet" in the sphere or in connection with what has been revealed concerning him and by himself, as Meyer states: "from a regard to that which the name implies, to the prophetic character."⁴⁰ Again, I would stress that the meaning of $\acute{\omicron}\rho\omicron\mu\alpha$ is always the same. It denotes that which has been revealed, which is known, concerning the genitive following it.

This interchange of $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ and $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma$ also appears in the expression "to believe on the name" of God or Christ. John uses this clause five times and has $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma$ τὸ $\acute{\omicron}\rho\omicron\mu\alpha$ in four instances.⁴¹ But in his first Epistle we find $\acute{\omicron}\rho\omicron\mu\alpha$ ⁴² the plain dative. According to Blaszc-Debrunner, correct Greek grammar would ordinarily demand the plain dative with $\pi\epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\iota\varsigma$.⁴³ But the dative was disappearing gradually from the Greek language and $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma$ was encroach-

39. Robertson, Grammar of Greek New Testament, p. 593-595.

40. Blaszc-Debrunner, Op. Cit., p. 121.

41. Meyer, Exegetical and Critical Handbook to the Gospel of Matthew., p. 305.

42. John 1, 12; 2, 23; 3, 18; 1 John 5, 13.

43. 1 John 3, 23.

ing upon $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ and so John and other inspired writers used either the accusative⁴⁵ or a prepositional phrase with the dative or accusative. In the expression "to believe on the name of someone," therefore, the usage of the plain dative has no special significance. The preposition $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$, on the other hand, must again be taken in the sense of $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ to mean "in the sphere of" in union or in connection with". In fact, the preposition could be omitted as far as the English translation of the expression is concerned. We could simply say: believe the name, the revelation of Jesus. The passages show clearly that $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu$ must be taken in the sense of the entire revelation of Christ concerning himself. We are to believe in the name, that is, the complete self-revelation of Christ in His redemptive grace. We are to believe all that He has revealed concerning His work of atonement but only what He has revealed. In short, we are to believe in Him as the "Son of God and Savior of the world."⁴⁶ This our faith has "His title as the object, which is the adequate expression of the inmost essence of the being."⁴⁷ Meyer significantly says: "The entire subject-matter of faith lies in the name of the person on whom we believe; the uttered name contains the whole confession of faith."⁴⁸

45. As in Acts 2, 21; 9, 21; 22, 16; Rom. 10, 13; 1 Cor. 1, 2 (B. D., p. 119, #202)

46. Bernard, International Critical commentary on John (ICC), p. 17

47. Godet, A commentary on the Gospel of St. John, Vol. I, p. 365.

48. Meyer, Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Gospel of John, p. 83.

A passage very much similar to 1 John 3, 23 is found in Matth. 7, 22, where we find; "In His name shall the Gentiles trust." The idea of trust is a part of believing. Matthew could have used either $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ or $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\iota$ or as John $\acute{\epsilon}\iota\varsigma$. But he chose to use the simple dative instead. As with $\pi\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\nu$ so also with $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\mu\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\iota$ no particular significance may be attached to the use of the simple dative.

The expression "to baptize in the name of someone" occurs seven times in the New Testament. It is found in Matthew 28, 19 in the baptismal formula, "baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." In his sermon on Pentecost Peter admonished the people "to repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins."⁴⁹ In Acts 8, 16 we read: "Only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." Peter commanded Cornelius and his household "to be baptized in the name of the Lord."⁵⁰ When Paul at Ephesus heard that the people were baptized "unto John's baptism," we are told: "They were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus."⁵¹ Finally, in his letter to the Corinthians Paul asked them whether they "were baptized in the name of Paul."⁵²

Let us briefly dwell on the first passage, the baptismal formula. Here we find "baptizing them $\acute{\epsilon}\iota\varsigma\ \tau\acute{o}\ \delta\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\mu\acute{\alpha}$ of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." The first fact to remember is that $\acute{\epsilon}\iota\varsigma$ is not used in a sense differ-

49. Acts 2, 38.

50. Acts 10, 48

51. Acts 19, 5

52. 1 Cor. 1, 13. 15.

ent from $\acute{\epsilon}\rho$ or $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}$.⁵³ In fact, Luke uses all three prepositions with $\beta\alpha\pi\tau\acute{\iota}\sigma\mu$. Therefore, we must not say "into" the name here as many commentators do.⁵⁴ The most natural formula would be $\acute{\epsilon}\rho$ $\acute{\omega}\nu$ $\acute{\omicron}\rho\omicron\mu\alpha\tau\iota$. But due to the interchange of $\acute{\epsilon}\rho$ and $\acute{\epsilon}\iota\varsigma$ and to the gradual disappearance of the dative, $\acute{\epsilon}\iota\varsigma$ with the accusative was used in many instances. So also here. Furthermore, the very meaning of $\acute{\omicron}\rho\omicron\mu\alpha$ forbids the translation "into". The connotation of $\acute{\omicron}\rho\omicron\mu\alpha$ here, as in all other cases treated, is whatever has been revealed or is known about the person in question. In the case before us, $\acute{\omicron}\rho\omicron\mu\alpha$ refers to all that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost have revealed to us concerning their essence, person and work. Of course, special emphasis is laid upon the justifying and sanctifying work of the Trinity for the salvation of mankind.

It is, therefore, not in keeping with the true meaning of $\acute{\epsilon}\iota\varsigma$ and $\acute{\omicron}\rho\omicron\mu\alpha$ to say that this baptism is to be performed "by the authority of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost."⁵⁵ Nor is it consistent with the common usage of the formula to suggest "unto the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost", meaning publicly to accept and receive the Trinity.⁵⁶ Furthermore, the formula here does not imply "to be received into union or communion with the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost",⁵⁷ although this is indeed a meaningful thought. I believe that the consistent exegesis demands: to be baptized in con-

53. Robertson, Grammar of the Greek N.T., p. 535.

54. Lange, Vincent, Bruce (Exp. Grk. Test.), Luthart, Klostermann, Allen (ICC), and other translate here "into". Cf. Commentaries on Matth. 28, 19.

55. Robertson, Word Pictures in the N.T., I, p. 245.

56. Barnes, Notes on Matthew, p. 331.

57. Vincent, Op. Cit., p. 149. Bruce, ICC on Matth., p. 306

nection with the revelation of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.⁵⁸ This is exactly the same way I have interpreted the other occurrences of the formula. Here the term "revelation" comes very close to the Gospel promises. It includes what we know concerning the Trinity with special reference to our salvation. It is presupposed, of course, that the person to be baptized knows this revelation and accepts it. Hence, the Lord said first of all: "Make disciples of all nations." Meyer correctly states that the term Father, Son, and Holy Ghost expresses "the sum total of the distinctive confession which the individual to be baptized is to accept as his, both now and for all time coming."⁵⁹ Cremer also observes that here "a full declaration of the character and relationship" of the Trinity is implied with reference of course, to the person to be baptized.⁶⁰

It is not difficult to supplement the text with other facts concerning baptism. We know that we are to use the name of the Trinity and in that manner baptize "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost". We realize also that through baptism we are made the children of God and enter into the closest communion with Him. But Matth. 28, 19 does not make these additions. It merely says that the baptizing is to be done in connection with the revelation of the character and work of the trinity, in the sphere of what we know about the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

In Acts 2, 38; 8, 16; 10, 48; and 19, 5 Holy Scripture

58. Lenski, Interpretation of St. Matthew's Gospel, p. 1155.

59. Meyer, Crit. and Exeg. Hdbk. to the Gosepl of Matth., p. 302.

60. Cremer, Op. Cit., p. 455.

speaks of "baptizing in the name of Jesus." The prepositions used vary. In Ch. 2, 38 we find ἐν, in 10, 48 ἐν, and in 8, 16 and 19, 5 εἰς. An examination of these passages shows that Luke used these prepositions loosely and in practically the same sense. There may be a shade of difference between ἐν and ἐνί, the latter denoting the basis and ἐν the sphere.

Why Luke used the name of Christ instead of the name of the persons of the Trinity, we do not know. We know from Scripture that Jesus is the very center of the revelation of our salvation. It is only because of His work as our Savior that baptism was instituted and is now efficacious. So Barnes states:

"It does not follow that in administering the ordinance of baptism the apostles used only the name of Jesus Christ. It is much more probable that they used the form prescribed by the Savior himself (Matth. 28, 19), though as the peculiar mark of a Christian is that he receives and honors Jesus Christ, this name is used here as implying the whole."⁶¹

Finally, Paul used the formula "baptize in the name" twice.⁶² In both cases he wrote εἰς τὸ ὄνομα and spoke about Himself as the person in connection with whom the baptism was performed. He asked the Corinthians whether he had baptized them "in his own name", εἰς τὸ ὄνομα Παυλοῦ. This is a rhetorical question and implies that he had not, but that he had baptized them in the name of Christ. Paul meant to impress upon his readers that he had not baptized them in connection with what he had revealed concerning himself, his own person or work. It was not

61. Barnes, Notes on Acts, p. 75

62. 1 Cor. 1, 13 and 15.

his name but the name of Christ that was to constitute "the sum of their creed and their confession."⁶³ The revelation of Jesus alone made their baptism valid and Paul's part in that baptism was very insignificant.

The formula "in the name" occurs with a number of other verbs in the New Testament. It is connected with the idea of doing something miraculous. In Mark 9, 39 Jesus says: "There is no man which shall do a miracle in my name, that can lightly speak evil of me." Here ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι occurs. We see that no one who does a miracle "on the basis of what has been revealed concerning Jesus", can speak lightly of Jesus. By deduction, then, it is evident that in order to do a miracle, the revelation, the knowledge, of the Savior and the miraculous power which He can give must be present. On the basis of this knowledge and in firm confidence, the miracle is to be done. This is especially true with reference to the casting out of devils. This expression and its close equivalents occurs six times with the formula "in the name of the Lord" or "in my name."⁶⁴

63. Meyer, *Op. Cit.*, p. 303.

64. In Mark 9, 38; 16, 17 and Luke 9, 49 we find "cast out devils in my name." In Luke 10, 17: "Devils subject to us in Thy name;" in Acts 16, 18: "Command thee (devil) in the name of Jesus Christ to come out of her;" in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ....to deliver such an one to Stan." 1 Cor. 5, 4.

In all the cases $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\ \tau\omega\ \delta\acute{\upsilon}\nu\alpha\mu\iota\varsigma$ is used. Here again the meaning is not "by the authority of Jesus"⁶⁵ but in connection with, in the sphere of what has been revealed concerning him. This revelation, of course, includes the ability to cast out devils, just as it embraces also the power to do miracles in faith. By faith in Christ's revelation a Christian can do all things. In the sphere of what Christ has revealed he can, therefore, also cast out devils.⁶⁶ 67

Luke joins such verbs as speak, preach, and teach with "in the name" in seven instances.⁶⁸ In five of the seven cases he says $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\ \tau\omega\ \delta\acute{\upsilon}\nu\alpha\mu\iota\varsigma$ ⁶⁹ in the remaining two $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \tau\omega\ \delta\acute{\upsilon}\nu\alpha\mu\iota\varsigma$. If we examine the context, we note that there is no evident reason for this difference of prepositions, also again the distinction between $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ and $\epsilon\pi\iota$ become very fine. On the one hand, Luke mentions speaking in connection or in the sphere of what Christ has revealed

-
65. Gould, International Critical Commentary on Mark, (ICG), p. 176. Also Barnes, Notes on Mark, p. 402.
66. In Acts 3, 6 Peter told the lame beggar: "In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth rise up and walk". The idea of doing a miracle is present also here, so what has been said above applies to this passage as well. Cf. also Acts 4, 1 and 10, where the impotent man was healed $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\ \tau\omega\ \delta\acute{\upsilon}\nu\alpha\mu\iota\varsigma$.
67. It might be well here to mention also the passage in Matth. 7, 22: "Have we not prophesied in Thy name?" Here $\tau\omega\ \sigma\omega\ \delta\acute{\upsilon}\nu\alpha\mu\iota\varsigma$, the plain dative occurs. As in the case of $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ and $\epsilon\lambda\pi\acute{\iota}\varsigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon$ no special significance may be attached to the use of the plain dative. The meaning of the passage is the same as those where the idea of doing a miracle is contained "in connection of what has been revealed concerning Christ".
68. Luke 24, 47; Acts 4, 17; 4, 18; 5, 28; and 5, 49.
69. Acts 9, 27. 29.

and on the other he uses speaking on the basis of all which the name implies, as in Matth. 24, 47 where his Messiahship is the basis of preaching and the thing which makes repentance effectual. 70 71

The formula "in the name" is used a number of times with verbs meaning "to do" in the New Testament. In all but two of the cases⁷² the preposition ²ἐν is used. So Jesus says in John 10, 25: "The works that I do in my Father's name, bear witness of me." In other words, the works which He did in connection with what had been revealed by the Father concerning Him as the Messiah bore witness to his Messiahship. This is the revelation given by God to Israel by which they should know the Father and be able to recognize works from Him. God's revelation shows omnipotence, grace, mercy, and these divine attributes shine out in Jesus works and miracles.⁷³ Paul, on the other hand, told the Colossians (3, 17): "Whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus." Christians are to do everything in connection with what has been revealed concerning Christ.

Thus we see that with the verb ποιεῖν "in connection with the revelation" gives good sense. The same holds true with other verbs of action. So "to give a person a drink

70. Plummer, International Critical Commentary on Luke (ICC), p. 563.

71. In James 5, 10 "speaking in the name of the Lord" also occurs. The preposition used is ἐν.

72. Matth. 10, 42; 18, 20. As shown before, there is no difference between the preposition ἐν and ἐνς as they used with ³τροφῆν in the formula.

73. Lenski, Interpretation of St. John's Gospel, p. 732.

of water in the name of Jesus" means to do that in connection with what He has revealed concerning Himself, also as one who has mercy on the thirsty.⁷⁴ When Jesus, himself, says He will keep those whom His Father has given Him in His Father's name⁷⁵, He again refers to what the Father has revealed concerning Himself. If we gather together "in the name of the Lord",⁷⁶ we do so in connection with His revelation, confessing and hearing all that we know about Jesus. The same is true of sending,⁷⁷ commanding,⁷⁸ anointing,⁷⁹ someone "in the name of the Lord. We do so in the sphere or in connection with what we know of the Lord. To bow the knee⁸⁰ and to give thanks⁸¹ "in the name of the Lord" similarly implies that we do so in connection with what has been revealed to us concerning the Lord.

And so we can be reproached,⁸² we can be justified,⁸³ and we can have life⁸⁴ - all in the name of the Lord, in connection with what He has revealed to us concerning His person and work. In all these cases ³¹ *οχι μν* is "the revelation which brings Jesus to us as the Christ, the Son of God, so that we may know and embrace Him by faith."⁸⁵ In a

74. Matth. 10, 41; Mark 9, 41.

75. John 17, 11. 12.

76. Matth. 18, 20.

77. John 14, 26.

78. 2 Thess. 3, 6.

79. Jas. 5, 14.

80. Phil. 2, 10.

81. Eph. 5, 20.

82. 1 Pet. 4, 14.

83. 1 Cor. 6, 11.

84. John 20, 31.

85. Lenski, *Op. Cit.*, p. 1372.

86. Lenski, *Loc. Cit.*

sense, we can say with Lenski: "The entire Gospel is nothing else but His name."⁸⁶

CONCLUSION

My investigation of the meaning of the formula "in the name" has resulted in the following two conclusions. The one is that there is no difference between the preposition and ἐν in their usage with the formula "in the name" and the only difference between ἐν and ἐν is that the former denotes the basis, the latter the sphere of ὄραμα. On the other hand, I have found that the phrase "the name of God" or "in the name of Christ", when used with the formula "in the name", always embraces all that we know of God or Christ, this knowledge being imparted by what has been revealed by the Father or the Son or the Holy Ghost.

"In the name" of Christ I also close this paper.

⁸⁶. Lenski, Loc. Cit.,

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ALLEN, WILLOUGHBY, C., A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Matthew, New York, Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1907.
- BARNES, ALBERT, Notes on the New Testament, Glasgow and Edinburgh, Blackie and Son.
- BERNARD, J. H., A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1929.
- CREMER, HERMAN, Biblio-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek, Trans. by William Urwick, Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark, 1886, 3rd English Edition.
- DEBRUNNER, ALBERT, Friedrich Blasiz' Grammatik des Neutestamentlichen Griechisch, fünfte durchgesehene Auflage, Göttingen, Vandenhöck und Ruprecht, 1921.
- DEISSMANN, ADOLPH, Licht vom Osten, Tübingen, Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), vierte, völlig neubearbeitete Auflage, 1923.
- DEISSMANN, ADOLPH, Die Neutestamentliche Formel "in Christo Jesu", Marburg, N.G. Elwert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1892.
- DEISSMANN, ADOLPH, Licht vom Osten, Tübingen, Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), vierte, völlig neubearbeitete Auflage, 1923.
- DEISSMANN, ADOLPH, Neue Bibelstudien, Marburg, N. G. Elwert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1897.
- GESENIUS, WILLIAM, A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, revised and stereotyped edition, Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1882.
- GODET, F. A Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke, New York, Funk and Wagnals, 1887.
- GODET, F., A Commentary of the Gospel of St. John, third edition, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1934.
- GOODSPEED, EDGAR C., An American Translation of the Apocrypha, Chicago, University Press, 1938.
- GOULD, EZRA, P., A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Mark, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1905.
- HASTINGS, JAMES, A Dictionary of the Bible, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1901.

- HEITMÜLLER, WILHELM, im Namen Jesu, Göttingen, Vandenhöck und Ruprecht, 1903.
- KAUTZSCH, E., Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen, Tübingen, Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1900.
- KEIL, CARL FRIEDRICH, Kommentar über das Evangelium des Matthäus, Leipzig, Dörfling and Franke, 1877.
- KITTEL, GERHARD, Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, Erster Band: A bis F, Stuttgart, Verlag von W. Kohlhammer, 1933.
- KLOSTERMANN-BAUER, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, Tübingen, Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1919.
- MEYER, H. A. W., Commentary on the New Testament, Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark, 1877.
- LANGE-SCHAFF, A Commentary on Holy Scripture, New York, Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1866.
- LENSKI, R. C. H., The Interpretation of Holy Scripture, Columbus, Ohio, Lutheran Book Concern, 1930.
- LIDELL-SCOTT, A Greek-English Lexicon, eighth revised edition, American Book Co., 1897.
- LUTHARDT, CHR. E., Die Vier Evangelien, Leipzig, Dörfling & Franke, 1899.
- MC LAUGHLIN, F. J., "Names of God," The Jewish Encyclopedia, IX, New York, Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1907.
- MEYER, H. A. W., Commentary on the New Testament, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1877.
- MOULTON-GEDEN, A Concordance to the Greek Testament, second revised edition, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1899.
- MOULTON, JAMES HOPE, A Grammar of New Testament Greek, I, "Prolegomena," third edition with corrections and additions, Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark, 1919.
- NICOLL, W. R., The Expositors' Greek Testament, London, New York, and Toronto, Vol. I: "The Synoptic Gospels," by A. B. Bruce, Hodder and Stoughton.
- PLUMMER, AEFRED, A Commentary on the Gospel according to St. LUKE, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906.
- PREUSCHEN-BAUER, Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments, Gießen, Verlag von Alfred Toepelmann, 1928.
- RAHLFS, ALFRED, Septuaginta, Württembergerische Bibelanstalt, Stuttgart, 1926.

ROBERTSON, A. T., A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the light of Historical Research, third edition, London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1919.

ROBERTSON, A. T., Word Pictures in the New Testament, New York, Richard R. Smith Inc., 1930.

THAYER, JOSEPH HENRY, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, translated, revised, and enlarged, New York, American Book Co., 1889.

VINGENT, MARVIN R., Word Studies in the New Testament, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1905.

YOUNG, ROBERT, Analytical Concordance to the Bible, twentieth American revised edition, Funk and Wagnalls Co., New York.

ZAHN, THEODORE, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, Leipzig, A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung (Georg Böhme), 1908.