–Save This Page as a PDF–

On the Eighth Day,
When it was Time to Circumcise Him,
He was Named Yeshua
Luke 2: 21

On the eighth day, when it was time to circumcise Him, He was named Yeshua DIG: How did Jesus get His name? Is this His only name? What other names does He have? Why does He have so many names? Under what covenants was circumcision stipulated? What was the significance of each? Whose faith does the circumcision reveal? Why is the circumcision incomplete?

REFLECT: What is the difference between circumcision of the flesh and circumcision of the heart? Has your heart been circumcised? How? When? Where? Why not?



On the eighth day, when it was time to be circumcised, His parents took the infant to the synagogue in Bethlehem. **He was named Yeshua, the name the angel had given Him before He was conceived (Luke 2:21).** The last day of **Sukkot** is an additional festival day that the Torah calls **“The Eighth Day”** (**to see link click Gp – On the Last and Greatest Day of the Feast**). If **Yeshua** was born on the first day of the feast of **Sukkot** (see **Gn – Conflict at the Feast of Booths**), they must have **circumcised Him** on the day called **“The Eighth Day,”**

thereby literally fulfilling the scripture which says: **On the eighth day the flesh of his foreskin shall be circumcised (see the commentary on Leviticus Bt – Women After Childbirth).**

Under normal circumstances, the parents usually named their children, but, both **Mary** and **Joseph**, on separate occasions, were told by angels to name **their child Jesus**, meaning *salvation* or *savior*. **They** were both members of the believing remnant in Isra'el at that time and as such, followed the Torah of Moses **(Genesis 17:12)**. In the Jewish world, both then and today, **the child** is named on **the day he** is **circumcised**. So, **they** did not officially call **Him Yeshua** the day **He** was born, but, waited until **the eighth day**. At that time, **He** was officially named **Yeshua** in obedience to what **the angel** had told **them**.



The ancient prophet **Isaiah** had prophesied that the name of **the Son of God** would be **Immanuel** (see my commentary on **Isaiah Bw – The Sign of Immanuel**), which means *God with us* **(Isaiah 8:10b)**. **He** also said that **Messiah** would be called **Wonderful, Counselor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father** and **Prince of Peace (Isaiah 9:6b).** But, the only name that embraces all these names is **Yeshua**, the Hebrew form of the Greek word, **Jesus**. Also, **Christ**, which means *anointed One,* is the Greek version of the Hebrew **Messiah**. In **His** public ministry, **the Savior** was properly referred to as **Yeshua Ha'Meshiach**.

Brit milah, or *circumcision*, was prescribed under two covenants. Firstly, it was mandatory under **God's** covenant with Abraham (see my commentary on **Genesis En – For Generations to Come Every Male Who is Eight Days Old Must be Circumcised**), and secondly, under **ADONAI's** covenant with Moses **(Leviticus 12:3)**. But, the significance of **circumcision** was different under each covenant. **Circumcision** under the Abrahamic Covenant was a sign of Jewishness,

while **circumcision** under the Mosaic Covenant was a sign of submission to the Torah, specifically the first five books of the TaNaKh. When **Jesus** was born both covenants were in effect, so **Yeshua** was saved on the basis of both covenants.

Under the Abrahamic Covenant, **circumcision** was mandatory for Jews only, but, under the Mosaic Covenant it was mandatory for both Jews and Gentiles (see my commentary on **Exodus Az – Surely You are a Bridegroom of Blood to Me**). Since the death of **Christ**, the Mosaic Covenant is no longer in effect. Therefore, there is no longer any basis for **circumcision** for either Jews or Gentiles. But, because the Abrahamic Covenant is an eternal covenant, it is still mandatory for Jews to **circumcise** their sons **on the eighth day** as a sign of their Jewishness. Some believe this violates what Rabbi Sha'ul taught in **Galatians 6:12-16**. However, that is not true. Paul was arguing against **circumcision** for Gentiles on the basis of the Mosaic Covenant. But, since the Mosaic Covenant has been rendered inoperative, there is no basis for **circumcising** under the Torah. So, it is clear that in **Galatians**, Paul was not dealing with **circumcision** for Jews on the basis of the Abrahamic Covenant, but, **circumcision** for Gentiles on the basis of the Mosaic Covenant.

In addition, **circumcision** shows the faith of the parents and not **the child**. Being only eight days old, the baby cannot comprehend the concept of faith. And moreover, if given the option, he would probably decline. That is why baptism is not the completion of **circumcision**. Baptism shows the faith of the one being baptized, while **circumcision** shows the faith and obedience of the parents of the baby boy being **circumcised**. The antithesis to **circumcision** of the flesh in the Bible is never said to be baptism, instead it is **circumcision of the heart (Deuteronomy 10:16, 30:6; Jeremiah 4:4; Romans 2:28-29)**.[125]