

The Title Eloah

The consideration of this title of God assists in our understanding of some of the passages of the Bible which sometimes seem to be contradictory, as an example, see the verses below where Job's certainty of seeing God seems to be contradicted by the words of John and Paul. Brother John Thomas' explanations of the titles of God remove such difficulties.

For I know *that* my redeemer lives, and that he shall stand at the latter *day* upon the earth:

And though after my skin worms destroy this *body*, **yet in my flesh shall I see God:**

Whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another; *though* my reins be consumed within me. (Job 19:25-27 KJV)

No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared *him*. (Joh 1:18 KJV)

Who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; **whom no man hath seen, nor can see:** to whom *be* honour and power everlasting. Amen. (1Ti 6:16 KJV)

Elohim אֱלֹהִים, is a plural noun, which in the singular is written אֱלֹהַּ *Eloah*. The use of this in Hab. 1:11 shows that the idea of *strength or power* is the radical meaning of the word כֹּחַ לֵאלֹהִים, as to *this one, his strength is his Eloah*, or the one in whom he trusts. Three men who appeared to Abraham were each of them an *Eloah*, but not each of them *Elohim*: the three together were *Elohim*. ELOAH occurs fifty-six times in the scriptures, and four of these times only in the Psalms; but in Job forty-one times. The use of *Ail* and *Eloah* by Job would indicate that one and the same being is meant. Every member of the heavenly host is an *Eloah*, but of all the *Elohim* ONE ONLY is the original and self-existent AIL—the absolute, omnipotent, and independent power of the universe.

Speaking of Himself in his address to the ends of the earth, he says, "Look unto me, for I am AIL, and *none else*" —Isaiah 45:22; and to Israel he says, "Ye are my witnesses, and my servant whom I have chosen, that ye may know and believe me, and understand that I, YAHWEH, am He; *before me* AIL or Power, *has not been formed*, nor after me shall be" —Isaiah 43:10: a testimony that identifies *Ail* with

the *Logos* and *Theos* of John, which as ONE POWER, he says, “made all things; and without him was not anything made that was made.” From him came the Apocalypse; as it is written, “a revelation which the THEOS committed to Jesus Christ.”

Having thus shown the meaning of these several terms applied in the scriptures to Deity, I proceed to offer a few ideas upon the Divine Nature as suggested in the revelation of the mystery.

We learn from the Bible that the Deity it reveals has both body and parts. Paul teaches us this in declaring that the resurrected and anointed Jesus is “the *apaugasma*, or *reflexion* of the glory, and *charakter* or *peculiar nature* of the *hypostasis* or *substance* of the THEOS—Heb. 1:3. In other words, he partakes of the Divine Nature; so that what he now is, is what the Deity has always been. The substance of the Theos is essentially living substance. It could not exist and yet be dead substance, for “the Father hath life in himself,” and that life is his inherent peculiarity. It is underived from any antecedent existence; nor can it forsake the Divine Substance, for in that event the Deity would be mortal. But Paul styles him “the *Incorruptible* Theos,” and says that “He is the only one having *athanasia* or deathlessness.” Hence, the essential qualities of the substance, which underlies all that is predicable of him, are incorruptibility and life.

Incorruptible and living substance, then, is the Body of the Deity; and, as the glorified Jesus is “*the IMAGE of the Invisible Theos*,” he must have “parts.” It is not, therefore, a mere figure of speech to speak, as the scriptures do, of the hand, ear, eye, and so forth, of the Invisible Eternal Power. He has form and parts, as well as body, and is the Great Archetype, or divine original, after which all the *Elohim*, or immortal intelligences, of his universe are modelled and made. He dwells in unapproachable light and is “a consuming fire.” Light and heat, then, in their essentiality, with incorruptibility and life, are centred in his substance; for He is the great focal centre of these in all the universe of power. If I might venture a conjecture upon so profound a subject, I would suggest, that the Divine Nature is that wonderful and extraordinary essence observed in that terrible and destructive agent the scriptures term “spirit,” and philosophy, *electricity*, consolidated and corporealized from the necessity of the thing. This glowing substance is too intensely bright for human vision, therefore Paul not only says, “whom no man hath seen,” but adds, “*nor can see*.”

Now, in the preface to this prophetic blessing, it is written that Moses said: “Yahweh came from Sinai, and rose up from Seir unto them; he shined forth from

Mount Paran, and he came with ten thousands of saints” (verse 2). It was historically true that Yahweh came *to* Sinai; but is there nothing more in this than an historical allusion? Without other light than this affords, we could hardly answer the question with full satisfaction. We know that Israel’s history is typical, and that the text is in connection with prophecy; still, *came* is so decidedly *past time*, that it causes one to pause before we affirm that it here predicts the future.

But Habakkuk has made certain what, without his testimony, might be thought open to dispute. In the third chapter of his book, he prays that Yahweh would “revive his work in the midst of the years; in the midst of the years make known, or manifest; and in wrath remember mercy.” In response to this, he is favoured with a vision, in describing which, he says: “ELOAH (singular, *not Elohim*) came from Teman, and the Holy One from Mount Paran. Selah. His glory covered the heavens, and the earth is full of his praise.” If this testimony had been faithfully translated, there would have been no obscurity in it. The prophet did not write, “Eloah came from Teman.” The word rendered *came* is not *bah*, as in Deut. 33:2, where it is correctly translated, but *yahvo*, the future of the same verb, and, therefore, to be rendered *shall come in*. The text should be rendered thus: “Eloah shall come in from the South, and the Holy One from Mount Paran. Selah.” *Eloah* is the word used for the setter up of the kingdom in Dan. 2:44. It signifies the Adorable One, or the Strong One. It is the Deity made flesh, and justified by spirit, and equivalent to “the Holy One”—Messiah.

I conclude, then, from this positive declaration of Habakkuk, that Moses spoke not historically but prophetically. The coming of Yahweh to Sinai in the days of Moses was representative, as to power, place, and purpose, of his coming in the latter day. Since Habakkuk wrote the words, “Eloah shall come in from the South, and the Holy One from Mount Paran,” the prediction has not been fulfilled in any sense. If it had, “His glory would now cover the heavens, and the earth be filled with his praise,” which is very far from being the fact.

This, then, I believe is the place or country to which the personal Son of Man, “the Man Christ Jesus,” will come first at his approaching advent.

In the passage (spoken by Job) now under consideration he spoke of his Redeemer, who should stand up at last over his dust, and whom, though his body should be destroyed, he should see with his own eyes, and, seeing him, should “*see God*” (*Eloah*).

There is no reason for the amount of uncertainty concerning the translation of this celebrated passage (as illustrated in the abundant italics and marginal notes of the Authorised Version), except the prevalence of a doctrine of human life with which Job had nothing to do. Job was speaking of resurrection and “change” and a new body. (to be achieved by eloah namely Christ Jesus) Christendom speaks about “immortal souls” that survive the destruction of the body, and enjoy life very well without a body, and pass to glory beyond the skies without resurrection and judgment, and before “the latter-day,” and apart from the standing up of the Redeemer (compare Daniel 12.). But all this is mere heathenism, and all the more objectionable because tacked on to scriptural phraseology.

DHH