

THE SACRED NAME

IS IT SACRED OR MYSTICAL?

© 1982 Church of God, The Eternal
Reprint 2007

Preface

The material presented in this article is, essentially, a compilation of various arguments, both pro and con, regarding the validity of the Sacred Name doctrine. To acknowledge the many individual statements quoted or paraphrased in this work would not only be a vast task in itself, but would detract from the readability of the presentation. Because of this, we have elected not to burden the reader with constant interruptions required if embeds were used to refer to individual sources. The exception to the rule is that authoritative reference works and some special books which cover specific problems relating to the subject are acknowledged.

Quotes and close paraphrases without ellipses from Names advocates are generally placed in indented paragraphs without noting individual authors or their publications. An examination of the quoted or paraphrased material used in this article will be found to be accurately quoted or closely paraphrased. This was done primarily to conserve space.

Emphasis throughout is generally ours, often within the indented paragraphs, but is not notated in order to spare the reader the necessity of being interrupted in his thoughts. This emphasis includes underscoring; capitalization of words, sentences, or parts of sentences; and quotation marks around words or parts of sentences.

We have elected to use the Yahweh form, in general, when referring to the Tetragrammaton—the four letter name of God—as this is the form which the majority of Names advocates accept and use in their presentations. Not all Names advocates agree with this form but some prefer another spelling. The reader will note this as he covers the material presented in the following pages.

We are indebted to those writers whose material we have used on the Sacred Name subject, both pro and con, and trust they will find the material presented in this work to be in the interest of Truth. We wish to acknowledge their contributions to the Sacred Name question *as a group* without noting individual efforts. May the reader find this work to be provocative and stimulating in his quest to resolve the major questions generated by the Sacred Name movement.

The Sacred Name—Is It Sacred or Mystical?

Bible students are aware that the Tetragrammaton, or the YHWH name for the God of the Old Testament translated "The Lord" in the King James version, appears many times in the Scriptures. Scholars tell us that the Tetragrammaton is used 5,321 times in the Old Testament. In conjunction with other names attached to it, as well as its use in the short form, "Yah," it is found more than seven thousand times in the Bible. Yet, in spite of this abundant use of the Tetragrammaton in the Scriptures, there are many people today who believe that the original meaning and pronunciation of this name have been lost.

On the other hand, the modern Sacred Name movement is predicated on the belief that the meaning and pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton, which is regarded as the "Sacred Name," have *not* been lost. It is the belief of advocates of the Sacred Names movement that not only the pronunciation of the Sacred Name is necessary for salvation but it is necessary to *use* it in worship. It is their viewpoint that because the Sacred Name is employed in the Hebrew text seven thousand times, it is a matter of extreme importance to know, use, and trust in this name. It is a matter of *vital importance* in serving the "True Mighty One."

Names advocates have much to say about the Sacred Name. They say that belief in the use of the Sacred Name is an important doctrine that will eventually mean the salvation of the soul.

To paraphrase or quote what they write, notice the following:

In order to have a right to the tree of life one must obey the Commandments. Those who love and make lies will be excluded. Since the Sacred Name is the first commandment of the Decalogue one must know and use it; continuing to believe anything less than the truth of the Word excludes one from Paradise. Those who believe we Sacred Name advocates place the matter of the Name on an equal par with the Sabbath are very much mistaken. We do more than place it on an equality with the Sabbath. We give proof of its *greater importance than the Sabbath*. The first three of the Ten Commandments emphasize the importance of His name. Translations which employ the use of the Sacred Name demonstrate the importance of using the name "Yahweh" *exclusively* in worship. After this, our next obligation is to submit humbly to the inspired word of our Heavenly Father.

The idea that names differ in various languages is only a feeble excuse for using a name different from that of the original inspired Scriptures. In order to distinguish the Creator from all various objects of worship we must call Him by His *Personal* Name if we wish Him to hear us.

We are not advocating the worship of a name. What we are advocating is the worship of Him who bears that name; the One whose Name *alone* is Yahweh. It is presumptuous to substitute a common title such as Lord because there are lords on the earth and the master of the most humble slave is a "lord."

The issue when this age comes to a close will be the name of the Creator, His Son, and the mark, name, and number of the Beast. True commandment keeping includes the correct Name. It is the blasphemy of the Roman Catholic Church and her Protestant daughters who are defaming the Sacred Name of the Most High. The substitution of such man-made titles as Lord, God, Herr, Gott, Theos, Jesus, and Jehovah are blasphemy.

If you are a member of a religious organization that does not call itself the Assemblies of Yahweh (some say Yahvah), can you believe you are in the true body of the Messiah?

True worshipers incorporate the Name of the Father which identifies them as part of the true spiritual family. It is our purpose to show the exclusive use of the revealed, Personal Name of the Heavenly Father.

One who does not know the Name of the Messiah or the Heavenly Father *cannot* be saved. The Name of the Heavenly Father is of supreme importance to your salvation. Without using it you cannot be saved. It is necessary to restore the Sacred Names of the Heavenly Father and of the Savior. In the Bible "Lord" and "God" should be translated "Yahweh" or "Lord" should be "Master." "God" should be "Mighty One" or "Elohim." "Lord God" should be "Yah Yahweh." "Jehovah" should be "Yahweh." "Jesus" should be "Yahshua." "Christ" should be "The Messiah."

And "Ghost" should be "Spirit." Man has gone away from his Creator and has amassed for himself a host of idols, worshiping them by many different names. The Sacred Name—Yahweh—is the one and only True Name of the Almighty which has been revealed to mankind.

What Is the Name?

Now let us paraphrase or quote what Sacred Name advocates tell us about the meaning and pronunciation of the Name:

Such names as Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Israel, David, Solomon, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel were all faithfully transliterated from the Hebrew into English. But the Name of the author of the Bible was removed and a foreign term substituted in its place. It is, therefore, necessary to correct this error and "restore" the Name of Almighty Yahweh to the text of the Bible. The Bible commands us to use and call upon the Name of the Almighty. It is those who use and call upon the name of Yahweh only who will be spared during the coming tribulation.

Just because Jews in different parts of the world pronounce the Hebrew Old Testament differently, this is no reason to refuse to sanctify and hallow the Name of the Heavenly Father. Such words as Jehovah or Lord are not the sound of the four letters which comprise the Tetragrammaton. The reason the original name is important is because substitute names obscure our instructions for spiritual survival. They introduce seemingly contradictions which generate conscious or subconscious doubts in our minds. By purging these names, doctrinal integrity will be restored and with it wholehearted belief. Those who become angry when they hear the Savior's Hebrew Name obviously do not wish to learn they have been deceived by trusting in a substitute name which holds no salvation. How can we ever hope to gain everlasting salvation without calling on the Name which contains eternity as an intrinsic characteristic?

Since the Sacred Name is vital to salvation, it is necessary to prove which is the "most correct" form of the Tetragrammaton. Now the evidence is becoming "more and more" overwhelming that the Name of the Heavenly Father is Yahweh. Those who say the pronunciation was lost leave no alternative but to use the pagan substitutes. The form Yahweh is "practically the best" and the original pronunciation "seems" to have been Yahwe or Yahway. *The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia* says the "prevailing opinion" is in favor of the reading Yahveh but this is open to some question. The *Rotherham Bible* says the transliteration [to write or spell words in the characters of another alphabet that represent the same sounds] Yahweh is adopted as "practically the best" and the only competing form would be "Yehweh." So, Yahweh, as the pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton, is 99 and 44/100% correct and until some other form is positively proven we shall use this one. Modern scholars unashamedly confirm the "more correct" transliteration of the Tetragrammaton as Yahweh but refuse to use it exclusively in worship because of traditional rejection of such a necessity.

Jehovah is a hybrid name made up from the Father's true name plus the vowel points Adonai. The Father's Name is not Yahveh or Yahvah, as some say, but Yahweh. This is because scholars say this name is "closest" to the original "as far as they can tell." According to *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, Volume 12, page 118, the correct pronunciation of the JHWH was known by members of the Babylonian Academy as late as 1000 A.D. It is believed the Name is derived from the Hebrew verb "to be" (havah). [It is for this reason some Names advocates insist the pronunciation of the JHWH should be Yahvah. Many Names people are troubled over the various forms of the Sacred Name but the majority have chosen Yahweh and "in faith" believe this is the name because *scholars predominantly agree* in this choice. So until a "better form" is learned from the Hebrew grammar and Hebrew authorities, most will continue teaching the Sacred Name as Yahweh.]

The short form of the Sacred Name is Yah. When Yah is prefixed to the name Hoshua (Numbers 23:16), the result is Jehoshua or the short form Yahshua. While many religious organizations know and use the Sacred Name of Yahweh, the personal Name of the Heavenly Father, few of these organizations know and use the Name of the Messiah. The Savior's Name was originally Yahshua. Yahshua is the "combining" of Yah and "shua" (which means "shall save"). Thus, we have the Savior's Name Yahshua which means "Yahweh is salvation." The Name "Jesus" does not mean "Yahweh is salvation" and as a consequence *there is no salvation in the name Jesus*. It was the Alexandrian Jews who altered the name Yahshua (Jehoshua) to Jesus in the Septuagint Version. The Greeks dropped the Hebrew terminology of names and substituted the name or letters of the supreme deity Zeus and Yahshua became Iesous (Jesus). The form Yeshua originated because of the Jewish refusal to maintain the correct form Yah. Thus, Yahshua was changed in the Old Testament Hebrew to Yeshua. Iesous came from the attempt to write the Greek characters of the Aramaic Yeshua. Since 16th century English did not have the "J" sound, Jeshua was translated as Iesous. Later, when the J sound was adopted from the French, the word became Jesus. Scholars have tried to show us there is no "sh" sound in the Greek and Iesous (Jesus) is acceptable. But Iesous is an attempted transliteration of Jeshua into Greek. If we are to find the pure and true worship we must "return as closely" to the source as possible. About the time of the suppression of using the Tetragrammaton in speech and writing the Jews began to distort the pronunciation of Yah making it into Ye. Yeshua is late Hebrew or Aramaic. The Savior came in His Father's Name. This name is Yah. *By combining Yah with the mission of the Savior we have Yahshua*. Jesus is the English translation of the Greek Iesous

or Iezeus. Iezeus is the personification of the Sun-god, the equivalent of "Lord." Will you worship the Greek Jesus or the Hebrew Yahshua? Your salvation depends on it.

The above paragraphs summarize Sacred Name arguments regarding the importance and pronunciation of "the Name." But what is the other side of the coin?

We have seen from the various comments that there is general agreement that the pronunciation of the YHWH as Yahweh is "more correct" than other names and titles employed in "translating the name of the Heavenly Father." Sacred Name advocates like to point out that the Moabite Stone (from the 900 B.C. period) contains the name of Yahweh but they fail to mention that the Hebrew script of that time did not contain vowel points. So, the Moabite Stone is little help in ascertaining the correct pronunciation.

Some, who disagree with the Sacred Name concept, claim that in order to restore the coined name "Jehovah" to a form closer to the Tetragrammaton, someone along the line placed the first "a" of Adonai into the first syllable of YHWH and the "e" of Elohim into the second syllable of the YHWH. The result is the modern word "Yahweh." One fact is certain, Sacred Name advocates are not in agreement *themselves* as to the correct pronunciation of "the Name." Some contend for Yahweh, others for Yahveh or for Yahvah or for Yaheveh. None of the selected forms such as Jehovah, Yehovah, Yahweh, Yahveh, Yahwe, Yahvah, Yahaveh, and Yahaweh are really demonstrated to be on a sound basis with a given reason. What is significant is that the YHWH has no true vowel points in modern Hebrew. Its vowel points are those of "Adonai." The much quoted statement from the *Encyclopaedia Judaica* that the pronunciation of the YHWH was never lost is predicated upon the idea that a few of the early Greek writers of the Christian Church testify to a pronunciation VERY NEARLY LIKE Yahweh. What Sacred Names writers fail to mention, with respect to the statement in the *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, is that the preservation of the proper pronunciation of the YHWH is *limited to the first syllable*, Yah, only (*Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Volume 1, article, "God, Names of").

The question is: Can anyone prove, beyond a doubt, what is the correct spelling and pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton? All who try to do so are forced to go to human sources and history for verification. But there is no agreement in this search. The best that can be said is that the various forms used today for the Tetragrammaton are "educated guesses." Yahweh is "more nearly correct" but as one writer says, "Is that good enough?" The derivation and pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton are still doubtful. The form Jehovah is regarded as an error. It is the result of pronouncing the YHWH with the vowels of Adonai. What is now generally assumed is that the YHWH is the causative form of the verb "to be" and should be pronounced Yahweh or Yahveh (*Encyclopaedia Britannica*,

eleventh edition, article, "Tetragrammaton"). This explanation was first advanced by Jewish writers in the Middle Ages and has found wide acceptance now. The serious objection to this explanation is that the verb "to be" has no causative stem in the Hebrew. So, in order to express this idea it is necessary to employ a different verb. In Exodus 3:14 the assumption is drawn that Yahweh is derived from the verb "to be." But the verb "to be" in the Hebrew is "hayah" and not "hawah." "Hawah" belongs to an earlier era of the language. In the historical sense, then, *Yahweh is not a Hebrew name.*

What should really be considered is whether or not the Bible intended to give an etymological interpretation of the name YHWH. And, did the name Yahweh originate with the Israelites or was it known by other peoples? The Bible account concerning Moses' father-in-law (Exodus 18) certainly indicates that the name Yahweh was known in the land of Midian and Yahweh was probably worshiped by various tribes south of Palestine (*Encyclopaedia Britannica*, eleventh edition, article, "Jehovah"). In giving the name Yahweh, or some similar form, it is believed the God of Israel was demonstrating the key to a *new relationship* with His people. He was now their *Redeemer* and *Covenant God* (*The Pentateuch*, translated by Isaac Levy, page 31). It is this relationship which most likely accounts for the large number of times YHWH is found in the pages of the Old Testament.

Sacred Names advocates say that archaeology has "now exploded" the theory that ancient Hebrew had no vowels. These vowels, therefore, preserve the correct pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton.

It is true there were some consonants which were designed to represent the most important long vowels and as such served in a secondary function. As such, this was a very *inadequate method* of vowel representation. It was introduced sometime before the Christian era and had to be changed in the early centuries A.D. The present vowel point system was finally established about A.D. 900 and superseded earlier systems. Those vowels which had already been denoted by consonants became part of the consonantal text and were left undisturbed. The newer and more comprehensive system was superimposed upon them (*The Books and the Parchments*, by F. F. Bruce, pages 40–41). What Bruce is saying by this statement is that if the consonants which served a secondary function as vowels had really done the job adequately there would be no doubt as to the proper pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton. But, *this was not the case.*

The pronunciation "Yahweh" is a strange combination of old and late elements. The "eh" ending is a late form. Also, in late times the "w" which began a word or syllable changed to a "v." This means the "w" of the second syllable of Yahweh represents a pre-Mosaic pronunciation. Also, the final "eh" most likely represents a post-Davidic form. In the light of these facts, it may be best to say that YHWH does not come from the verb

"hawava" (the early form of the verb "to be") at all. In addition, there are many places in the Old Testament where it is now recognized that the parallel of a name and its meaning are not of an etymological origin. Rather, words are often based on what is called paranomasia (use of the pun, meaning a literal pun). For example, Babel in Genesis 11:9 does not come from the verb "balal" (to confound) but sounds somewhat like balal. Likewise, we may conclude that YHWH does not come from the verb "hawa" (to be) which is cited in the Exodus three account as the first person "ehyeh" (I will be) but from a word of unknown origin which sounded somewhat like "hawa." If the word was spelled with four consonants in Moses' day IT WOULD HAVE TO HAVE more than two syllables. This is because all the letters were sounded. The pronunciation given by the Church Fathers; Theodoret (fourth century); Clement of Alexandria (early third century) are late witnesses and appear to contradict the older witness of Elephantine in Egypt where none of the name elements end in "eh." One thing is certain. *Critical speculation* about the origin and meaning of the name YHWH seems endless (*Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*, Volume 1, pages 210–212, edited by R. Laird Harris, Gleason L. Archer, Jr., and Bruce K. Waltke).

The curious fact is that the *ancient pronunciation* of the YHWH has been totally lost. While the Hebrews did pronounce and write the name of God, a later ban on pronouncing the Name was so thorough that the vowels were entirely lost. Only the consonants have been preserved. The Dead Sea Scrolls did not solve the problem but merely demonstrated that the ban was in effect two hundred years before the time of Christ. The form Yahweh is thus an incorrect hybrid with an early "w" and a late "eh." The indication, though, is that often the inspired writers of the Old Testament were not interested in etymology. Rather, they wanted to draw attention to the similarity of sound; that is, to use the pun and write a word descriptive of the event. Therefore, it is quite likely that the interpretation of the Name in Exodus 3:14 may not be etymological at all. What should be obvious in all this is that the pronunciation of the YHWH is an academic matter and the God of Israel is more interested in our personal relationship to *Him* rather than the pronunciation of His name. In fact, from the evidence now available, it may be argued that Yahweh is incorrect and Jahoweh might be the true pronunciation (*The Law and the Prophets*, pages 215–224, edited by John H. Skilton, Milton C. Fisher, and Leslie W. Sloat).

Y'hoshua was the name of ten Hebrew leaders. Yeshua is the Aramaic form and was the name of our Lord. This is clearly seen by the vowel pointing in Nehemiah 8:17. Joshua is Y'hoshua in the Hebrew and Yeshua is Y'shua. There is *no Scriptural support* for the notion that the original spelling of Joshua was Yahshua. Yah is not the form used in either of these names. The name Jesus would be the natural transliteration of Yeshua into the Greek tongue. The authority, R. Laird Harris, tells us that the Greek language had no medial *h* (*The Law and the Prophets*, page 223). This being the case, Iesous would be the natural pronunciation.

We are left with no valid tradition for the pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton. A valid tradition would have to go back to about 4,000 B.C. The Septuagint (LXX) does not help because it too follows the custom of banning the Name and uses the Greek equivalent. Early translations of the Name in Greek are all speculative. So, the name Yahweh represents an *attempt* to find the real pronunciation of the Name. But it is dependent upon the *theory* that the origin of the Name was derived from the meaning of a verb form of "to be." The origin of the name has been the subject of much controversy and there is as yet no general agreement among the scholars (*The Law and the Prophets*, pages 218–219). This fact is certain: *If the proper pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton is a divine requirement then why has God permitted it to be lost?* If the pronunciation is so important, why does the Creator permit such doubt? But the Bible prophesied it would be lost until restored by Christ at His return. And the primary way Israel profaned the name of God was by their disobedience to His commands!

Whose Name Is It?

Names advocates generally insist that the Tetragrammaton is the personal, specific name of the Heavenly Father. As such, it is not a title. It is the Name of the Holy One of Israel. The derivation of Yahweh, according to the Encyclopedias, came from a man by the name of Le Clerc in the early eighteenth century. The Tetragrammaton has been variously translated YHWH, YHUH, JHWH, IHVH, and vocalized as Jehovah, Yahweh, Jahveh, Yahveh, Jahve, Jahwe, and Yahve. Actually, the form Jehovah is much older than the generally assumed 1500's. It is found in the translation of the Book of Jasher by Alcuin of Britain in A.D. 800 and was most likely pronounced Yehouah or Yehowah. As noted, Yahweh is a *modern* reconstruction of the Tetragrammaton and its origin and pronunciation are strictly a matter of conjecture.

Obviously, Moses intended to tell us something by using the YHWH form. It has a meaning. Some believe the Name represents God as the Ever-living One and for this reason translate YHWH as "The Eternal." Israel knew the Name and used it even though it is apparent they did not realize the real significance. But, so did the false prophets use it. So, knowing and using the Name is of itself not that efficacious.

The distinction—between El Shaddai, as He appeared to the Patriarchs, and the name or title YHWH revealed to Moses—is the source of scholarly debate. The preponderance of Bible commentators believe that God showed Himself to the Patriarchs in the character of El Shaddai (The Almighty God) but did not make Himself known to them in the character of YHWH. It is obvious the Patriarchs were aware of the YHWH form. This can be seen in Genesis 4:26; 9:26; 12:8; 13:4; 26:25; 28:13, 16, 20–21. Name advocates insist that the Yahweh of the Old Testament was the Father of Jesus Christ, whom they call Yashua. They

say those who try to sidestep the importance of the Name of the Father teach the doctrine that the Yahweh of the Old Testament became the Savior of the New Testament. But this cannot be the case, they say, because the Savior said "I am come in my Father's name . . . " (John 5:43). Their reasoning is that if the Heavenly Father gave His name to His Son, who became our Messiah, then we are forced to seek the Name of our Father—the Name that is intrinsic to our salvation. They tell us that from Proverbs 30:4 there was a Father and a Son in the Old Testament Scriptures.

Names advocates admit the Elohim is a multi-plural noun but, like many, hold that Elohim is used to demonstrate the unity of the Father and the Son. But Names advocates are not incorrect when they say there is more than one Being in the "Godhead." This is seen in Genesis 1:26; 3:22; 11:7. But the Truth of the matter is that the Father is not revealed in the Old Testament. Jesus said *He came to reveal* the Father (Matthew 11:27). An examination of the word "Father" in *Strong's Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible* points out that the God of the Old Testament viewed His relationship with Israel as a Father-Son relationship (See Deuteronomy 32:6; Jeremiah 31:9, 20; Hosea 11:1). This relationship was in turn, reciprocated by Israel (Isaiah 63:16; 64:8; Jeremiah 3:4; Malachi 1:6; 2:10). But who was this God who regarded Himself as a Father to Israel?

Christ told the Jews of His day, ". . . Before Abraham was, I am" (John 8:58). He was telling these Jews of His preexistence as the "I am." He existed with God from the beginning and *was God* (John 1:1–2). He was the Word, or Logos—the Creator of all things (John 1:3, 10; Ephesians 3:9; Colossians 1:16). He was made flesh and dwelled as a man on the earth (John 1:14; Philippians 2: 5–8; Hebrews 2:14). He was Jesus Christ, the Son of God (Matthew 16:13–17). He was *very God* (Titus 2:10, 13). He said, "I and my Father are one" (John 10:30). Jesus and the Father were not one person but they were one in mission and purpose. Jesus came to reveal the Father. But, who was the God of the Old Testament, the One who called Himself the Father of Israel?

The God who entered into a covenant relationship with Israel called Himself, among other things, YHWH. He talked with Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden (Genesis 2:16, 18). He revealed Himself to Moses and spoke to the children of Israel at Mount Sinai (Exodus 3–6; 20:2). In the covenant relationship He made with Israel, He was known as Yahweh (or some similar pronunciation).

Who was He?

Isaiah 8:13–14 says that YHWH was to be greatly feared, that He was to be a stone of stumbling and a rock of offense to Israel. Peter quotes this text and applies it to Christ (1 Peter 2:7–8). Isaiah 40:3 says the way for YHWH must be prepared by a messenger.

Matthew 3:3 and Mark 1:3 apply this text to John the Baptist as the harbinger of Christ. Isaiah 43:14, 48:17; and Isaiah 60:16 are all YHWH texts applied to Christ (Luke 1:68–69; Philippians 3:20; Titus 2:13). Isaiah 43:15 is another YHWH text also applied to Christ (Mark 1:24; Acts 2:27; 3:14). The YHWH of the Old Testament said His name was "I am" (Exodus 3). Jesus Christ said, ". . . Before Abraham was, I am." The YHWH of the Old Testament is called the "Rock" (2 Samuel 22:2–3). Jesus Christ of the New Testament is called the "Rock"—the Rock that led Israel out of the land of Egypt (1 Corinthians 10:1–4, 9). In the light of all these texts there is only one inescapable conclusion: The YHWH of the Old Testament was the One who became Jesus Christ of the New Testament! Yahweh, or some similar pronunciation, was the covenant name for the God of Israel, the One who became the Son of God in the New Testament. Decidedly, Yahweh is not the specific, personal name of the Father. It is a name of the Son.

Is the Name Exclusive?

Sacred Name advocates tell us that Yahweh is the *specific, personal name* of the Father. We have already proven this is *not* so. It is a name of the Son, the God of the Old Testament, who became Jesus Christ. But is Yahweh Christ's exclusive, personal name? Some Sacred Names advocates recognize a problem with the argument that Yahweh is an exclusive name. In an answer to their own question, "What is the name of the Father who sent Yashua the Messiah to this earth?" they acknowledge that Genesis 19:24 says the Father's name is Yahweh also! At the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah Genesis 19:24 says, "Then YHWH rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah brimstone and fire from YHWH out of heaven." Sacred Name advocates admit that at one time, simultaneously, there was a Yahweh on earth and a Yahweh in heaven and that the Yahweh in heaven must have been the Father, while the Son in the Old Testament was on the earth and known by the name of Yahweh also. They then go on to say that Yahshua the Messiah came to reveal the Father's name to His disciples and to proclaim it to the world. By glossing over this text Sacred Name advocates fail to recognize it completely destroys the concept that the name Yahweh is *exclusively the name of the Father*. Genesis 19:24 is telling us that Yahweh is a *family name which applies to both the Father and the Son*. As such, it is *not* the specific, personal name of the Heavenly Father! Yahweh is a word like Elohim, a word that applies to *both* the Father and the Son. Elohim said, "Let *us* make man in our image" (Genesis 1:26). What Genesis 19:24 reveals is that the specific, personal name of the Heavenly Father has, to this day, *never been revealed*. Yahweh is a name that applies to *both* the Father and the Son. As such, it is not the specific, personal name of the Father! For the Father and the Son cannot both have the same specific, personal name!

David understood the relationship between the Father and the Son and he specifically referred to the Father as Yahweh. In Psalm 110:1 he said, "The Lord [Yahweh] said unto my Lord [Adon], Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool." Here the obvious meaning is the Father (Yahweh) is talking to David's Lord (Christ). Christ came to reveal the Father. He said no man had seen the Father's shape or heard His voice at any time (John 1:18; 5:37). An examination of the Scriptures clearly shows that the Father is often referred to as Yahweh. For example, Psalm 2:7 is quoted in Acts 13:33 and Hebrews 1:5 and 5:5, indicating Yahweh is the Father. Psalm 110:1 is quoted in Acts 2:34 to show that the "Lord" in this Psalm refers to Christ. Thus, Yahweh refers to the Father and the Son. In Joshua 5:13–15, the "captain of the host" is Christ and "the Lord" is Yahweh, the Father. In Isaiah 61:1, Yahweh's Spirit is on the speaker. Luke 4:18, 21 applies this Isaiah text to Christ. Yahweh who gave the Spirit to Him is the Father. Isaiah 42:1 was spoken by Yahweh (see Isaiah 41:21; 42:5). This is quoted in Matthew 12:18 and is applied to the Father. Zechariah 2:8–9 points out that both the Father and the Son are called Yahweh.

The "Angel [Messenger] of the Lord [Yahweh]" represents that Lord (Yahweh). In Genesis 22:15–16 the Angel of the Lord is Yahweh. This is also seen by comparing Genesis 28:10–22 with Genesis 31:11, 13. Exodus 3:2–4; Judges 2:1–5 and Judges 6:22–24 show the same thing. The phrase "of the Lord" defines the Angel of the Lord (Yahweh) as the representative of the Lord (Yahweh). The Angel of the Lord is the One who became the Christ of the New Testament. He represented the Father who is also called Yahweh.

One other point of interest is found in Genesis 14. Here Abraham gives tithes to Melchizedek, the priest of the Most High (verses 18–19). Paul demonstrates in Hebrews 7 that Melchizedek refers to Christ. As Melchizedek, Christ was the priest *of* the Most High. The Most High could only refer to the Father.

What Does the Bible Say About Using the Name?

According to Sacred Name advocates the Bible *commands* the restoration and use of the Sacred Name, Yahweh. Their arguments are summed up in the following paragraphs. Keep in mind, it is axiomatic to the Sacred Name argument that the Hebrew or Aramaic language is in some way sacred and that it is in these Semitic languages that the proper pronunciation for the name of God should be found.

The original Apostolic Assembly set out to return to the pure worship of Yahweh but somewhere along the way got sidetracked. It is the obligation of those who know the Name to restore the old paths by using the Sacred Name

and proclaiming it to the ends of the earth. Yahshua the Messiah came for the express purpose of declaring the Name of the Almighty to restore its use to the worship of Israel. It is the duty of true worshippers in our day to restore the faith and worship of Almighty Yahweh and the Savior Yahshua. Those who do so are the real leaders showing the way to the nations of the world. They have been selected for a marvelous work.

It was at the tower of Babel and the confusion of the languages that the trend developed of calling the Almighty by many different names, titles, and designations. But this made no difference to true worshippers. All the languages of the nations were confused at the tower of Babel "except" the Hebrew language. It is through this language that the thread of sound doctrine comes. Since the Hebrew speaking Israelites were able to understand the Heavenly Father when He spoke to them from the heavens at Mount Sinai (it was the Son, the One who became Christ who spoke to the Israelites) the heavenly language must have been Hebrew or something very similar. Yahweh's people were not at Shinar at the confusion of the languages. The ancestor of the Israelites, Heber, continued the language of his father. This language was the Semitic language which came to be known as Hebrew. Abraham was called from Ur of the Chaldees so that he would not be contaminated. He spoke Semitic-Hebrew. The reason Hebrew is not in itself a Semitic dialect different from that of the language of Adam is because when God spoke to the Israelites at Mount Sinai they were able to understand Him just as Adam did. If Hebrew is not the pure language why did God choose to speak to the Hebrews in their native tongue? There is no instance in the Bible where any person who ever received the Word of the Almighty was able to speak any language other than the Semitic languages. According to the Scriptures, the Hebrew language was the language of Eden. Speaking of Adam and Eve, the Scriptures say that their name was called Adam "in the day they were created."

We are not advocating the necessity of speaking the Hebrew language as a whole. What we are advocating is the necessity of calling our Heavenly Father and His Son by their true names. Since Yahweh revealed Himself to the Hebrew race and Israel in particular, the evidence is that Hebrew was the chosen tongue. The fact that Yahweh promises to return to man a pure language indicates the original language was Hebrew. A pure language means a pure lip. A pure lip is one free from contamination by praising idols. Since Abraham is called a Hebrew, his language must have been Hebrew. Hebrew

is the language God uses to communicate with mankind. During the life of Yahshua the only Scriptures available were the Hebrew Old Testament. While the Jews were entrusted to preserve the Old Testament (Romans 3:1–2) there is no evidence anyone was entrusted to preserve the New Testament. The Greek New Testament does not accurately quote the Hebrew Old Testament. The Greek New Testament quotes the Septuagint in many instances. Something has to be wrong when the Greek New Testament does this.

The problem with the Greek New Testament is that it does not reflect the original language of the New Testament period. The vernacular of the people in Judea during the first century A.D. was Aramaic, not Greek. The Septuagint (Greek translation of the Old Testament Scriptures) was not used in Palestine as it would not have been understood there. The translators of the Septuagint employed pagan names and terms. This is a terrible error. No wonder our Heavenly Father is displeased with our world. Our only recourse is to go back to the proper names and titles of the Almighty and the Messiah. Dr. F. F. Bruce in his work, *The Books and the Parchments*, suggests we return to the Hebrew Scriptures to learn the meaning of the various Bible terms. The New Testament writers followed the pattern of the Septuagint which had somehow gained some kind of inspired status.

What, now, is the Truth concerning the assertions made in the above paragraphs?

For one thing, when Jesus called the Father "Eloi, Eloi" (Mark 15:34) He was speaking Aramaic, not Hebrew. This in itself is proof that He saw no necessity in using Hebrew as a sacred language. He used Aramaic and *Aramaic was the language of Babylon*. So, the idea that Hebrew is a sacred language is not valid. As noted, the Sacred Name argument rests primarily on the *assumption* that the Hebrew language is some sort of sacred language to the exclusion of all other languages. At the time of the tower of Babel, the Genesis 11 account says there was *one* language only. So, there is no valid proof there has ever been a pure language on the earth since that time. If anything, God recognized the various languages of the world on the day of Pentecost. The Sacred Name idea is that Hebrew/Aramaic is some sort of sacred language which has continued uninterrupted from the beginning. It is the pure language God Himself uses. As such, the Tetragrammaton is the inspired pronunciation of the name of God.

But, what is the origin of the Hebrew language?

According to the *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, article, "Alphabet," the Hebrews adopted the alphabetic script along with the cultural values *from the Canaanites* during the eleventh

and twelfth centuries B.C. They followed and used the then current Phoenician script until the ninth century B.C. when they began to develop their own national script. So, the Hebrew alphabet, as we know it today, had its origin in the proto-Canaanite alphabet and is not "sacred" in any sense of the word.

What is clear from the Genesis 11 account is that it was *the language* that was confounded. The *Critical and Experimental Commentary*, by Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown, commenting on the Genesis 11 account, tells us that the degree and extent to which language was confused at the tower of Babel is impossible to satisfactorily solve. It must have occasioned a complete dissolution of human society and the word "confusion" meant "confusion of lip." The old language was broken into a variety of dialects which rendered common intercourse impossible. So, from this conclusion in the *Critical and Experimental Commentary* we could ask ourselves this question: If the language was confounded at the tower of Babel, where is the "pure language" today?

The incident at the tower of Babel occurred about one hundred years after the flood. All authorities agree that the word "Hebrew" comes from Eber. In the Eber line we have Salah and Arphaxad. Arphaxad, Salah, and Eber were all born before the confusion of the languages at the tower of Babel. Peleg, the son of Eber, was the first in the line of Shem to have been born after the confounding of the languages. The only possible way for the continuation of a "pure language" would have been for either Arphaxad, Salah, or Eber to have preserved it through the Babel incident. Yet, it is generally accepted that Arphaxad, Salah, and Eber *represent the three major language divisions* found in the world today. What this demonstrates is that even the children of Shem—Arphaxad, Salah, and Eber—became divided in their language. If one of the three descendants of Shem would have retained the original language the others would have been able to understand. What is obvious is that not one language represented the original pre-flood tongue. Had the original language been retained *anywhere*, the people could have been brought back together readily. So, when did the Hebrew language originate? Certainly not before the tower of Babel! Where in the world today can we find a language which has not been influenced by other languages? Yet, the time is coming when the Lord shall return a pure language to His people (Zephaniah 3:9). It is obvious there is not one language that is a pure language on the earth today!

It was during the *Babylonian captivity* that the Jews adopted the Aramaic language. The Aramaic language was the *language of Babylon*. The Jewish priests and scribes alone continued to use the Hebrew language and when the Scriptures were read in Hebrew to the common people, it was necessary to paraphrase what was read into the Aramaic language. These paraphrases were called Targums. Hebrew ceased to be a living language shortly after the time of Nehemiah and Aramaic became the language of the common people.

Sections of the Bible were even written in Aramaic or Chaldean as it is sometimes called. These passages include Jeremiah 10:11; Daniel 2:4 through 7:28; and Ezra 4:8 through 6:18. If the Hebrew language is divine, why would God have inspired sections of the Old Testament to be written in Aramaic? The Sacred Name answer to this is that Ezra and Daniel wrote originally in Hebrew but later scribes inserted Aramaic vowel points in certain chapters. What this really says is that Sacred Names advocates not only do not believe in the inspiration and preservation of any New Testament Scriptures, they do not believe in the inspiration and preservation of the Old Testament Scriptures either. They cannot accept the Old Testament Scriptures as they are written because to acknowledge the fact that portions of the Old Testament were inspired in Aramaic would mean that Hebrew is not some kind of exclusive sacred language. While Hebrew and Aramaic are related they are *not the same language*. As a whole, it was the Babylonian language which replaced the Hebrew language. To say the Babylonian language was a pagan language would be an understatement. So, if Greek is to be rejected as the language of the New Testament because of its pagan origin, what can be said about Aramaic, the language which Sacred Names advocates say was the original language of the New Testament Scriptures? And why would Christ use such a language if it is at least as pagan as the Greek language? If God speaks in the Hebrew language only, why did the multitude on the Day of Pentecost hear the wonderful works of God *in their own languages*? If God speaks in the Hebrew language only, then how can we have any confidence He hears us when we pray in any language other than Hebrew?

If the Jewish translators of the Septuagint could render the Hebrew names of God into Greek for the purpose of giving understanding to the Gentiles, why should we not assume it is permissible to do the same thing in order to make the Truth known in any other language? What is significant is the meaning of a name, not its particular articulation. One who exercises faith in God must believe that He *is* (Hebrews 11:6), not whether one knows or does not know the proper pronunciation of His name. One fact is certain: If the people of the world are to be returned to a pure language, as stated in Zephaniah, then we do not already have one. The Bible does *not* state that God will give the world what it already possesses.

Sacred Name advocates like to stress the importance of Aramaic during the time of Christ and the relative unimportance of the Greek language. While they say that Aramaic was spoken throughout the Roman Empire they do admit this was not done by a large percentage of the population. They reason that it was not unusual for the Jews of the Diaspora to have spoken Aramaic in their home and religious life. Also, Aramaic was the language spoken by Christ and His disciples as it was the native language of Palestine. Sacred Name advocates tell us the following:

There is nothing to suggest that Christ and His disciples were acquainted with the Septuagint. *Aramaic* was the language in which the first Christian documents were written. But by the end of the first century the language of the Church was definitely Greek. As far as the Jews were concerned they refused to allow themselves to be contaminated with Greek customs and manners. The Palestinian Jews jealously preserved their religion and language from contamination. The idea that the Jews of the Dispersion all knew Greek is advanced as a necessity in order to support the Greek New Testament. Even Josephus stated that Greek culture did not contaminate the language of Palestine and that the Jews did not encourage the learning of the languages of other nations. Those who did so were viewed as common. To the Jews, a wise man was one who was acquainted with Jewish laws. The word common does not mean "ordinary" or "usual" but rather "beneath their dignity." If Greek was the common language of Palestine why did Pilate write the accusation against Jesus in Hebrew, Latin, and Greek?

During the times of Yahshua the readings in the synagogue had to be orally translated to the people in Aramaic. "Many scholars" feel Aramaic is a dialect of Hebrew. This is why the Gospels and the Talmud tell us that the Galileans were recognizable by their language.

There are "numerous renowned scholars" who *feel* that certain books of the New Testament were originally written in Hebrew or Aramaic and subsequently translated into Greek. We *believe* the entire New Testament can be traced back to Hebrew and Aramaic originals. Scholarship will prove if such a conclusion is correct. The Bible says the Messiah spoke Hebrew when He revealed His name to Saul (Acts 26:14). Scholars "admit" that the book Matthew was written in Hebrew. Early Apostolic Assembly leaders (Eusebius, Origen, Jerome, Augustine) support the *opinion* that Matthew originally wrote to the Jews in a Semitic language (Hebrew or Aramaic). But there is a question whether or not Matthew translated his gospel into Greek. A compelling reason for rejecting the idea that Matthew was responsible for a Greek version of his gospel is because the text does not preserve the Sacred Name. It appears, what we now have in any one of the many copies of the Gospel of Matthew is an imperfect translation of imperfect copies of the original inspired Word.

One "outstanding scholar" Sacred Name advocates often refer to is Charles Cutler Torrey. In his book, *Documents of the Primitive Church*, he tells us that the apostolic church saw it as their mission to convince the Jews everywhere, beginning in Jerusalem, that Jesus

was the Messiah. Written testimony began at an early date by educated and intelligent men who were attracted to Jesus' mission and purpose. It is this material that is found in the synoptic Gospels (Matthew, Mark, and Luke). The idea that it was forty or more years before any written material was made available is absurd. The four Gospels, Acts 1–15:35, and the Book of Revelation represent the first stage of Christian origins. Later it became Paul's program to expand and reinterpret the Gospel. The conclusion that Mark and Matthew were written at an early date is confirmed by the Talmud. The Talmud calls these writings "the gospels" and regards them as authoritative Christian literature. This was as early as the third quarter of the first century. The gospels mentioned in the Talmud were Semitic, not Greek. The first of these was Mark, followed shortly by the Gospel of Matthew. A Greek translation was also in circulation at an early date. As far as the Gospel of Mark is concerned, it was issued in its original language—Aramaic—with a Greek translation intended for the Gentiles. The Aramaic originals did not outlast the first century, destroyed by the Jews, ignored by the Christians.

Torrey tells us that the reason we know Mark was written at an early date in Aramaic is due to the fact the "abomination of desolation" in Mark 13:14 is a reference to the attempt the Roman Emperor Caligula made to set up his statue as a deity in Palestine. This means the Gospel of Mark was written in A.D. 40. When Caligula was assassinated and the abomination was not set up as predicted, Matthew could write more plainly a few years later. Paul apparently used the Gospel of Mark in his instructions concerning the second coming of Christ in 2 Thessalonians. Paul gives them "the word of the Lord." Every point Paul covers in 2 Thessalonians can be derived directly or inferred from Mark 13. Very obviously, Paul's "word of the Lord" on eschatology is taken from Mark 13. This is a further attestation to the fact that Mark was written at an early date—in Aramaic. Anyone familiar with the program of the Hebrew prophets can see the close connection between Caligula's project and the origin of Mark's Gospel. When the gospels were originally made in Aramaic, the accompanying Greek translation needed many explanations of Aramaic names, terms, and phrases.

Torrey adds, the Apocalypse was written in A.D. 68 in Aramaic by a member of the church of Ephesus. The writer was a man of splendid faith, religious fervor, an extraordinary gift of imagination, understanding of Hebrew Scriptures, and insight into the circumstances of his time. The writer, as the apostle he impersonates, envisions himself to be one of the Israelite prophets. The chief sources of the Apocalypse are the Old Testament Scriptures, current eschatology, and the writer's own creative mind. We know of no other writer endowed with a livelier and more fertile imagination than the writer of the Apocalypse. His fancy is too exuberant. The date of the Apocalypse can be determined by the fact that it was written during the time of the sixth king (Revelation 17:10). This king was Nero and "Nero Caesar" adds up to 666. The worship of the Beast is clearly a reference to the worship of Nero who was rumored to have come to life again after his assassination.

Torrey says the author of the Apocalypse was a master of Greek and a man of learning who writes with a Semitic idiom which contains many major offenses against Greek grammar. While he was a master of Hebrew, he was as thoroughly at home in Greek as Hebrew. In every case where there is a barbarism the correct usage is found elsewhere in the Apocalypse. The linguistic character in the book is unique and is a Greek translation from Aramaic which is a remarkable close rendering from the original. As with Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, the author of the Apocalypse produced a text which could be understood by the Greek reader while at the same time faithfully mirroring every word and phrase of the sacred original. The original was all-important and was kept constantly in view. Its close conformity to the original required the translator to disregard Greek grammar in order to imitate Semitic grammar. Thus, the sense of the passages in the Apocalypse is never altered or obscured.

Seizing on the remarks of Professor Torrey and a few others, Sacred Names advocates conclude that, for the most part, the New Testament was written in Aramaic. They tell us that the New Testament was available in Hebrew and Aramaic as late as the fourth century A.D. It was Greek usurpers who translated the New Testament and substituted the names of their pagan deities—such as Zeus, Kurios, and Theos—in the place of the inspired names of God. These Greek usurpers methodically destroyed every trace of the Hebrew text and palmed off the idea that the New Testament was written in Greek. Those passages which indicate an interpretation in the Greek (for example, John 1:38, 41–42) are to be understood as an explanation of one Aramaic dialect to another. The phrase " . . . which is, being interpreted, the Christ," is a translator's note carried in the text instead of in the margin since there was no need for an interpreter between the two brothers speaking in John 1:40–41. Actually, when the translator of the Greek text saw in his original Aramaic text a Hebrew word which he wanted to point out to his readers, he would transliterate the Hebrew word into Greek characters and then translate it into Greek. *When we begin with the basic understanding that we must call upon the Name of Yahweh to be saved*, we can see that the explanations of those who do not believe the New Testament was originally inspired in Aramaic are not sufficient and do not support the Truth. When the Aramaic names for the Creator are different from the Hebrew names we must realize these Aramaic names are not names but titles.

Sacred Name advocates further conclude that there was a corruption of the New Testament text which demonstrates the reliability of the Hebrew Old Testament over the extant copies of the Greek New Testament. Since the commission and mission of the New Testament Assembly ended around A.D. 70, the Christian church later in the first century was totally different from its Jewish predecessor. Therefore, where the New Testament disagrees with the inspired Old Testament Scriptures, the Old Testament must be regarded as the authoritative source.

Torrey adds that when the Gospels of Mark and Matthew were written there was no thought of a religion or sect outside Judaism. The Nazarenes were regarded as loyal Jews. The faith of the Nazarenes was that of contemporary Judaism except in the matter of the Messiah. Jesus did not tell His disciples in the Olivet prophecy that His return was to be delayed beyond the lifetime of men then living.

Sacred Name advocates may not agree with some of Torrey's remarks but they nevertheless use much of his material to substantiate the Sacred Name doctrine. They say we have no inspired originals of the New Testament for doctrine. Even though they might acknowledge that some portions of the New Testament were written in Greek, they do not view this as a reason to delete the Sacred Name of Yahweh and of the Savior, Yahshua. To them the concept of an inspired Greek New Testament is an unscriptural doctrine which opposes the exclusive use of the Sacred Name of Yahweh. They believe we cannot worship "the true Mighty One" unless we use His correct inspired name. The Sacred Name position is that the New Testament was inspired in its Aramaic original but because of man's tampering there is not Greek text that is not corrupt. All doctrine, therefore, must be based on the Old Testament. If any of the original inspired Aramaic books of the New Testament are found they will, no doubt, show that the inspired Hebrew names for the Heavenly Father and His Son have been retained.

But, are there some other considerations to these arguments?

For one thing, Pilate did write the accusation against Jesus in three languages. One of these languages was Greek (Luke 23:38). Both Matthew and John tell us that the superscription contained the name "Jesus" (Matthew 27:37; John 19:19). So what do we find? Even if the original gospels were written in Aramaic, we find Greek, "Jesus," in the "inspired original."

We are told by Sacred Name advocates that according to Matthew 26:73 the Galileans were recognized by their Aramaic language. The Sacred Name argument is that the Jews in Jerusalem spoke Hebrew but the Galileans spoke Aramaic.

This is not the case.

All Jews during the time of Christ, except the scribes and priests, used the Aramaic language. The common people did not know Hebrew. It was necessary for the *priests* or *scribes* to paraphrase the Hebrew into Aramaic so the people could understand what the Hebrew Scriptures were saying. Peter was recognized because of his *accent*, not because he spoke a different language, as is clearly seen in the account in Matthew 26:73; Mark 14:70; Luke 22:59.

Torrey's concept of Paul's ministry, that Paul had to expand and reinterpret the program Christ set forth, is typical of the thinking of many "scholars." What is overlooked is that it was Jesus' intention from the beginning to expand the Gospel message to the entire world. This was very plainly said by Christ in Matthew 28:19–20 and Mark 16:15, 20. Paul did not have to "expand and reinterpret" anything. His commission was to the Gentiles (Galatians 2:7). As such, the Greek language was his major means of communicating to the Gentiles (Acts 17:16–34). It is clear from this incident recorded in Acts 17 that he did not speak to the Greek philosophers in Aramaic or Hebrew.

Torrey's assertion that the Aramaic gospels were recognized by the Talmud as authoritative Christian Scriptures, which had to be repudiated by the Jewish religious leaders, is disputed by other scholars. Christian writings, in general, were eventually repudiated by the Jewish leadership and it is clearly an assumption on Torrey's part to call these writings the gospels as we now know them. As we shall see, early Christian writings may have in some way served as a basis for the present Gospels but they do not constitute the Gospels as such.

The explanation that words written in Aramaic or Hebrew clarify the meaning of Greek New Testament words such as Gabbatha, Golgotha, Abaddon, and Armageddon would have no meaning if the rest of the New Testament were written in Aramaic. There is no proof for the assumption that such words were Aramaic explanations of Hebrew words or explanations of one Aramaic dialect into another. This explanation is merely an attempt to sustain the argument that the names of God in all the Bible must be vocalized according to the original Hebrew pronunciation.

Aside from Torrey's interpretation of Mark 13:14 and Revelation 17:10 as a basis for the dates of Mark and Revelation, the idea that the commission of the New Testament Church ended around A.D. 70 is disproved historically. Following the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus in A.D. 70, the Christians returned to Jerusalem and carried on extensive activities until the second Jewish war in A.D. 135. It was then that they repaired to an area east of the Jordan river and remained. The faith of the early Jewish Christians or Nazarenes, as they were called, was decidedly *not* that of contemporary Judaism. Contemporary Judaism was the "tradition of the elders" and was a rejection of the revelation given by God to Moses. The early Christians separated themselves from these traditions and practices which had their origin in Babylon.

The Sacred Name concept that the Old Testament takes precedence over the New Testament Scriptures in cases where the two contradict is a total error. The Old and New Testaments do not contradict (John 10:35). It is ignorance of the unity between the Old and New Testaments that has led Names advocates to assume there is a dichotomy between the Old and New Testaments. So called contradictions are misinterpretations of the Scriptures

in the vast majority of cases (2 Peter 3:16). In other cases, alleged contradictions are the result of mistranslations. These mistranslations do not include the "Sacred Name."

It was Papias, bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia, during the early second century, who said that "Matthew compiled the oracles [that is, the oracles uttered by the Lord] in the Hebrew speech, and everyone translated them as best he could." He may have been referring to something that was incorporated in our Gospels (Bruce, page 231). Aramaic was the language commonly spoken in Palestine in early New Testament times and was the language of our Lord and His apostles (Bruce, pages 54–55). Bruce adds, some sections of Acts are strongly marked by Aramaic idioms and appear to have been translated from Aramaic. But, this is exactly what we should expect of the reports of the sayings of our Lord and others who spoke in Aramaic. We should carefully examine those theories which purport to say Gospels as such were written originally in Aramaic. The evidence is against those scholars who argue that the Gospels were written in Aramaic and translated in Greek. There were, no doubt, Aramaic summaries of the story of Jesus as well as collections of His sayings in circulation at an early date and while our Gospels are drawn upon these, they are not in themselves translations. It is expected to find traces of the Aramaic idiom in those works which record the sayings of people who spoke Aramaic. Some were, no doubt, written by people whose native language was Aramaic. While the study of Aramaic and its relationship to the Gospels may be interesting, it has its limitations and is not any kind of key to unlock all mysteries (Bruce, pages 56, 70–71).

What *would* be surprising would be the *lack* of a Semitic influence on the Greek language by those whose native tongue and thought were Aramaic. Semitic idiom in the New Testament takes two forms. One is the influence of the Greek translation—the Septuagint; the other, the influence of the Aramaic vernacular or common language of the Palestinian Jews (Bruce, page 69).

It should be called to the reader's attention that most scholars who support the idea that there is evidence of Aramaic influence behind the New Testament Scriptures *limit this influence to a few books only*. Names advocates carry this to the extreme by teaching that *the entire New Testament* was written in Aramaic. But no Aramaic copies of any New Testament book exist and if, for example, Matthew was originally written in Aramaic there is every reason to feel that Matthew was responsible for the Greek translation. Bruce tells us that up to about the sixties of the first century there does not appear to have been any need for written Gospels. This was the case as long as there were eye witnesses to the life and story of Jesus (Bruce, page 105).

The idea that Paul wrote his epistles in Aramaic has no substantiation whatsoever. The Diaspora in the sections of the world to which he ministered spoke Greek. Paul's native city, Tarsus, was a Greek city. Paul worked among Greek-speaking people. The New

Testament shows he never needed an interpreter. The Sacred Name argument that Greek-speaking Jews knew Hebrew, as shown in Acts 21:37–40, overlooks the fact that the incident recorded here took place in Jerusalem. According to Sacred Name advocates the Jews in Palestine could not speak Greek; they knew Aramaic/Hebrew only. So, the idea that the Jews in Palestine knew both Greek and Hebrew contradicts their own argument that there is no possibility that Greek was a language common to the Holy Land during the time of Christ.

There is no authority or proof of any kind that the preserved New Testament was written in any language other than Greek. From the grammatical viewpoint, the New Testament, as a whole, could not have come from Hebrew/Aramaic. There may be some exceptions such as the Gospels, portions of the Book of Acts, and Revelation. But the burden of proof is on the Sacred Name advocates to *produce* original copies of any Aramaic New Testament book. All second century writers (Tatian, Papias, Tertullian, Irenaeus) describe and quote the original New Testament writings. They never use anything other than a Greek text. If even a *single* New Testament *book* was inspired in Greek then the entire basis for the Sacred Name argument vanishes into thin air. The inspired Greek clearly demonstrates no Biblical injunction or requirement to use the Sacred Names of God. So, for the preservation of their own movement, Sacred Name advocates cannot admit to a single New Testament book inspired in Greek. Rather, they must hold to the concept we have *no inspired New Testament* which has been preserved—hence no preserved words of Jesus Christ!

Aramaic versions of the New Testament extant today are translations from the Greek. Even Professor Torrey admits this. He says that the origin of the Peshitta (Aramaic) is unknown beyond the fact it is a close translation from the Greek (Torrey, page 245). While Lamsa claims the Peshitta Gospels preserve the words of Jesus better than the Greek Gospels, Bruce says this is quite wrong (Bruce, page 189). Regardless, one thing the Aramaic version does not do is preserve the Sacred Name.

Concerning the Greek language, during the time of Christ and the apostles, Greek was the international language of the Roman world. The vast majority of the Diaspora could not speak Hebrew or Aramaic. These two languages were limited and not suited for the universal diffusion of the Gospel.

Christ set forth His program that the Gospel should be preached to all nations, beginning at Jerusalem (Luke 24:47). It was the international language of the day—Greek—which was most appropriate for this task. The Greek language was a thoroughly international language. It was not a strange language to the Apostolic Church even when the Church was confined to Jerusalem. Acts 6 tells us the Jerusalem church was comprised of Greek and Aramaic speaking Jews. In fact, the seven men appointed to oversee the needs of the widows all had Greek names which indicates they were Greek-speaking

(Bruce, page 57). The Hebrew/Aramaic language was not the language suitable for expressing the abstract concepts found in the New Testament. By comparison, Hebrew is abbreviated and more elementary. Jesus came from that section of Palestine which was regarded as corrupt in the eyes of the Jews in Jerusalem. One indication being the Greek language which was spoken there (John 1:46; Matthew 4:15; 12:18).

As far as Greek was concerned, the Jews were well acquainted with it. They permitted the Old Testament to be translated and written in Greek, notably the Septuagint. While Dr. F. C. Burkitt says there is nothing to suggest that Christ and His first disciples were acquainted with the current Greek version—the Septuagint—the *Encyclopedic Dictionary* states that Jesus and His disciples frequently quoted the Septuagint in place of the Hebrew and that the Jews, in general, had a high regard for the Septuagint. It was not until the Messianic passages began to be used effectively by Christ's disciples that the Jewish religious leaders called a fast to mourn the fact that the Septuagint was ever made. They commissioned Aquila to make a new version for synagogue use. Copies of the Septuagint were used by Jews in the Mediterranean area because Greek was the everyday language with which they were familiar. What the Jewish translators of the Septuagint did not do was to carry the Hebrew names for God into the Greek version. Elohim was translated "Theos," Yahweh was translated "Kurios," Messiah was translated "Christ," and Joshua was translated "Iesous." New Testament writers used eighty-eight direct quotes from the Septuagint. Other texts with the same meaning were borrowed. Paul's epistles, inspired in Greek, used the Greek words for God, not the Hebrew/Aramaic. There is no substantiation from Paul's epistles or elsewhere in the New Testament that the apostles used Hebrew names exclusively when speaking to the Greeks.

When the Gospel began spreading among Greek-speaking Jews and Gentiles, the Septuagint was the version used for the Old Testament by Christians (Bruce, page 148). The Septuagint is to be understood as the Greek Old Testament in its various forms. Because of this, New Testament writers did not have to invent a Greek theological vocabulary. It already was found in the Septuagint.

Sacred Name advocates make much commotion about Bruce's statement that the general religious vocabulary of the Greek language was pagan in character and elements of it were used as equivalents of the significant words of the Old Testament. This statement is particularly applied by Sacred Name advocates to the Greek names for God. But they fail to mention the continuation of Bruce's statement. Bruce says in Greek-speaking Jewish circles *these words did not bear their original pagan significance but rather the new significance which they acquired from the Hebrew vocabulary* they represented. This applied to words such as righteousness, mercy, truth, sin, and atonement as well as *the names and titles of divine beings*. What is important is the understanding of these words in their New

Testament sense and not in their original pagan sense. Thus, Greek words take on the meaning and significance of their Hebrew equivalents. So, in the wisdom of God, the Septuagint played a great and important role in preparing the Gospel for the world (Bruce, pages 152–155). The Septuagint was a kind of authorized version of the Old Testament for Greek-speaking Jews and Christians. As such, it exercised a strong influence on the writing style of the New Testament. The Septuagint was not written in magnificent Greek as its construction is Hebrew while the words are Greek. It was this same approach that was carried out in the New Testament. While some early versions of the Septuagint used the YHWH this is not the normal usage and most copies used Kurios. No New Testament manuscripts use the YHWH.

An examination of the New Testament Scriptures demonstrates that *Jesus called Himself* the "Son of God," never the Son of Yahweh. There is no evidence that Jesus used or pronounced the Tetragrammaton. To do so was a violation of Jewish law. If anything, His name was to be El. Matthew 1:21–23 states that He was to be called "Emmanuel"—God with us—not Yahweh. Jewish refusal to use the Sacred Name is seen in Mark's account of the trial of Jesus. The High Priest asked Jesus if He were "the Son of the Blessed." He did not ask if He were "the Son of Yahweh." This is also seen in Matthew's account where the ordinary Greek equivalent "the Son of God" is used. R. Laird Harris tells us that when Christ answered, *He likewise avoided the pronunciation of the Name*. To use the Name would have involved Him in a technical charge of blasphemy and would have justified Jewish accusations against Him. Other examples of the refusal to use the Sacred Name are seen in such expressions as "kingdom of heaven" and "kingdom of God." These substitute words were used in place of "kingdom of Jehovah." The words "Holy Spirit" were also used in the same manner to substitute for "Spirit of Jehovah" (*The Law and the Prophets*, pages 216–217). What is obvious by these examples is that the use of the Sacred Name is not a Scriptural requirement as demonstrated by Christ and the inspiration of the Holy Spirit.

Forcing and Misinterpreting Scripture

Anyone who has read Sacred Name literature rapidly becomes aware of one thing: Scriptures are forced and misinterpreted in order to substantiate Sacred Name doctrine. Sacred Name advocates are absolutely locked into the concept that the word "Name" can mean on thing and one thing only—the correct pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton. We will examine the word "Name" later but at this point it would be profitable to examine a number of texts which Sacred Name advocates force or misinterpret in order to uphold their doctrine.

We are told by Sacred Name advocates that Psalm 68:4 says we are to extol Him by His name, Yah. According to them, the Almighty has only one Name and that is Yahweh. This text does not say God has one name only. It says His name is Yah, not Yahweh.

Ezekiel 39:7 is quoted to prove that the pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton has not been lost. But this text indicates events taking place in this chapter, including making the holy name known (whatever that means), will occur *after* the return of Jesus Christ.

Psalm 111:9 is used to support the notion that the Sacred Name must be called upon and revered if we wish to receive salvation. This text simply states "holy and reverend [awesome] is His name." It does not say what the name is or what its pronunciation should be nor does it say eternal life is promised to those who use it.

Hebrews 13:15–16 is cited as a text which requires the use of the Sacred Name in worship. Again, this text does not say which name to use nor does it say any name other than Yahweh displeases Him.

Jeremiah 8:8–9 is employed to describe how the Sacred Name was removed from the Scriptures. This text says nothing about the Sacred Name. It simply states the wise men have rejected the Word, not the name, of the Lord.

Exodus 23:13; Joshua 23:7; and Psalm 16:4 are employed to prove it is wrong to use any other title or name except Yahweh as the name of "the truth Mighty One." The Hebrew for "mention" here means to infix or penetrate into the mind, to preserve in memory. It does not refer to not mentioning the names of other gods as this was often done by the prophets. Nor does it state that the use of any other name than Yahweh is sinful.

Exodus 20:7 and Leviticus 19:12 supposedly condemn the substitution of any name other than Yahweh because the word "vain" means to falsify, to bring God's name to nought, to substitute. The Hebrew authority Gesenius says the meaning here is "utter not the name of Jehovah upon a falsehood, " do not swear falsely. This definition, then, means not to use the Name of Yahweh when falsely swearing and has no reference to using a substitute name for God (See Gesenius, page 807).

Names advocates say Psalm 138:2 should be understood to mean " . . . for thou hast magnified thy word, above all thy name." By shifting the comma this text shows both His Name and His Word are magnified above all. The Hebrew text does not support this idea. It says, " . . . for you have magnified Your word above all Your name." So, the *Authorized Version* is correct here. Here is an outstanding example of perverting a text in order to support a preconceived doctrine.

Malachi 1:6 supposedly condemns the priests who despise God's name, a reference to those ministers today who refuse to give honor to God by not using the Sacred Name. Sacred Name advocates fail to read Malachi 1:7–14 which shows *how* the priests despise God's name.

Matthew 17:11 is used to support the concept that John the Baptist was preaching the Sacred Name. An examination of this text does not support the idea that John's message included the restoration of the Sacred Name. Another example of Scriptural perversion.

John 17:6, 26 is given as proof that Jesus revealed the Name to His followers and stirred up much controversy for doing so. Luke 11:52 is also used to show He attacked the Pharisees for deleting the Name from the Bible. There is no evidence that Jesus used the Sacred Name and Bible scholars state this very fact. The application by Sacred Name advocates in both the above texts demonstrates the Sacred Name penchant for *limiting* the word "Name" to the pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton only.

The execution of Stephen, recorded in Acts 7, was caused, according to Sacred Name advocates, by Stephen's use of the Sacred Name. The Jews stopped their ears and rushed upon him when they heard him pronounce the Sacred Name. An examination of the account here in Acts 7 does not support this idea and, if anything, verse 56 shows that Stephen used the substitute "Son of man" rather than the Tetragrammaton.

Acts 18:15 is taken by Names advocates to mean Jewish use of the Sacred Name. Their interpretation is that "names" in this verse obviously means the disciples insisted on using the specific name for the Almighty. There is no proof from this text that "names" is a reference to the Tetragrammaton.

The Sacred Name interpretation of Acts 26:11 is that Paul caused the Christian brethren to blaspheme by somehow making them use substitute words in place of the Sacred Name. This, of course, is strictly an interpretation of this verse.

Forcing the meaning of various verses in Scriptures is commonly seen in Sacred Name literature. For example, when God was asked His name by Moses in Exodus 3, God said, "I am that I am (Ehyeh asher ehyeh). Sacred Name advocates tell us "ehyeh asher ehyeh" is not God's name. They say His name is given in verse 15 as Yahweh. An examination of the Hebrew demonstrates that, if anything, His name in verse 15 is "Yahweh the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God and Jacob." God says, following this description of His name, " . . . and this is my memorial unto all generations." *The Interlinear Bible* by Jay Green, translates the Hebrew word "zecher" (name or memorial) as "title," and reads, " . . . and this [is] my *title* from generation to

generation." Gesenius says the Hebrew word for "name" (memorial) used in Exodus 3:15 means "a name by which any one is remembered . . . [literally, 'this is my memorial']". What this means is that Sacred Name advocates *force the meaning* of these passages to limit the name of God to Yahweh only. In Exodus 3:14, God says, " . . . I AM hath sent me unto you." "I AM" is "ehyeh" in the Hebrew and clearly *is* one of God's names.

The Sacred Name explanation for Isaiah 9:6, which lists five separate names for God, is that the Isaac Leeser translation states, "For a child has been born unto us, a son has been born unto us, a son hath been given unto us, and the government is places on His shoulders and His Name is called Wonderful, counsellor of the Mighty El, of the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace." Thus, we are told the Son is to be called by the wonderful Name (the name of the Father). He is to be the counsellor of the Mighty El, the Everlasting Father, and the Hebrew does not infer that the Son was the Mighty El or the Everlasting Father. This Sacred Name explanation of Isaiah 9:6 contradicts the Hebrew text and demonstrates the ignorance of Sacred Name advocates regarding the identity of the God of the Old Testament. We have already proven that the God of the Old Testament was the One who became Jesus Christ. So, indeed, the Son was the Mighty El of the Old Testament, contrary to the opinion of Sacred Name advocates. The *Authorized Version* is correct in its translation of Isaiah 9:6 and the Isaac Leeser translation is, in this text, grinding an axe.

Sacred Name advocates paraphrase Isaiah 42:8 which reads in the *Authorized Version*, "I am the Lord: that is my name: and my glory will I not give to another . . . " as "I am Yahweh, that is my Name, and my Glory I will not give to another [name] nor my praise to a graven image." As the reader can see, this *paraphrase* is strictly an interpretation of Isaiah 42:8.

Another example of Sacred Name interpretation is that of Isaiah 52:5. Accordingly, Yahweh's name is blasphemed by substituting names other than the Tetragrammaton in its place. The Hebrew word for "blaspheme," according to Gesenius, does not include the word "substitute" as one of its meanings (See Gesenius, page 525).

Psalms 83:18 in the *Authorized Version* states, "That men may know that thou, whose name alone is JEHOVAH, art the most high over all the earth." Sacred Name advocates paraphrase this text to read "That men may know that thou whose name alone is Yahweh art the most high over all the earth." This, of course, violates the *Hebrew text*. The Hebrew text here states, "And let them know—Your name (is) Yahweh [Jehovah]—that you alone (are) the Most High over the whole earth." The original clearly states that it is Yahweh alone who is the Most High over all the earth. It does not state that Yahweh is the only name for the Most High. The *Authorized Version* has the word order incorrect in this verse. The Hebrew text shows the correct order.

Psalms 138:2, which says, "... thou hast magnified thy word above all thy name," is summarily paraphrased by Sacred Name advocates to read, "For thou hast enlarged or uplifted thy Name, Thy Word of Promise." Thus, the thought is that both the Name and the Word are uplifted above all His creation. The Hebrew text however states differently. It says, "... for You have magnified Your word above all Your name."

Amos 4:13, which the *Authorized Version* translates as "... The Lord, the God of hosts, is his name," is taken by Sacred Name advocates to differentiate between the Name and a title. "The Lord" (Yahweh) is the Name but "The God of hosts" is the title. The Hebrew text does not contain punctuation here and there are no commas. It literally reads "Yahweh the God of hosts (is) His name." So, the original does not differentiate between a name and a title.

Amos 5:27 states, "Therefore will I cause you to go into captivity beyond Damascus, saith the Lord, whose name is The God of hosts." Sacred Name advocates say this text should be read "... the Elohim of Hosts, whose name is Yahweh." This is another example of violating the Hebrew text. The Hebrew says "... Yahweh, the God of hosts (is) His name." As such, Yahweh is *not* the exclusive name of the God of the Old Testament.

In the New Testament Sacred Name advocates insist Jesus came *with* His Father's name, Yah. Combining Yah with "shua" (salvation) the Messiah's name was Yahshua. John 5:43 and John 14:26 are quoted to "prove" this. Neither of these texts say Jesus came *with* His Father's name. They state He came *in* His Father's name. As we shall see, this is a reference to coming by the Father's authority, by the power of attorney. These texts do not prove Jesus used the name Yahshua.

The explanation of Sacred Name advocates for the miracle of hearing the "wonderful works of God" in many languages on the Day of Pentecost (Acts 2) is that while the people heard the works of God in many languages they heard Peter quote Joel 2:28–32. Peter used the name of Yahweh in his sermon, not a substitute name for God. Sacred Name advocates fail to read Acts 2 carefully where it is stated that Peter used the name Jesus several times in His sermon. If, according to Sacred Name advocates, Peter spoke in Aramaic the form for Jesus would have been Jeshua. Decidedly, Yahweh was *not used exclusively* in this sermon, if at all.

The Sacred Name argument that the name Jesus is a corruption and should be translated Joshua in the New Testament Scriptures, as demonstrated by Acts 7:45 and Hebrews 4:8, fails to consider the fact that the Aramaic form for Joshua was Jeshua. Jesus is the Greek transliteration of the Aramaic Jeshua. As such, it was as close to the Aramaic original as the Greek language would allow.

As to the final text to be covered in this section, Proverbs 30:4, Names advocates say there was a Father and a Son in the Old Testament. The Truth of the matter is the One who became the Christ of the New Testament was the spiritual Father of Israel in the Old Testament. One of His names is some form of the Tetragrammaton. In the New Testament He was known by the Aramaic name Yeshua and the Greek name Iesous. One fact is certain: To this very day the *specific, personal* name of the heavenly Father has *never been revealed!*

Why the Obsession to Use the Name?

To say that Sacred Name advocates are obsessed with the necessity of using the "Name" would be an understatement. They tell us the following:

Before this you have seen nothing compared to what you will see in the days ahead in the lives of the true saints who witness in the name of Yahshua. Now is the time for you to begin to know and use and understand the Sacred Name if you wish to be in the select group of people who will do exploits at the end times. Great and wonderful things are promised to the believers who are "in" the Name of Yahshua. There are great and wonderful things to be done in the closing days of this age. A blessing is pronounced upon those who think on His name. Thinking on the name will allow the believer to not only come to know Him better but will help him to come to define and understand his own position better. Those who declare that position will secure a special blessing from the deity. It is by this means that victory over Satan can be gained. There is only one Name given whereby the human race can be saved. That name is exclusive, holding salvation within itself. You will not be spared or protected during the coming tribulation unless you call upon the Name of Yahweh and Yahshua. This is the only way to salvation. Unless one calls upon the Sacred Name he cannot be saved. There is only one Name under heaven that offers salvation. Those who accept this name, which means "everlasting" or "eternal life," make it a part of themselves. No other name holds the quality of everlasting life within itself. To trust in another name will not save you. In order to be saved you will have to be in the body of the Messiah bearing the name "Assemblies of Yahweh." Phinahas Ben Jair, a learned Rabbi of the second century, said that the reason the Jews do not receive answers to their prayers is because they do not know the Sacred Name. When they call upon a substitute name during a time of tribulation He will not listen because, among other things, they have abandoned His covenant. The way we can be sure we will be delivered from the power of Satan and his demons is by using the correct name of the Supreme God. While the charge

is hurled against us that we ascribe some kind of mystical or magical power to the Sacred Name, this is not the case. There is no magic to be found in any name. However, Semitic culture has always understood the importance of a Person's name, that in some way the one who Pronounced it has a special avenue of communication with the individual spoken to.

So, according to Sacred Name advocates there is no magic to be found in any name. But what is the *ancient belief* concerning this?

There are some primitive societies which do not give a name to a child until a considerable period of time after birth. Also, often the real name is kept a secret because of the belief that any enemy who knew the name could gain power over the possessor. The "real name" was the one which must be kept secret because the ordinary name would not be used in the working of magic. To reveal the "real name" was considered intolerably dangerous. People, animals, gods, spirits, sacred places, and objects all had secret "real names." If discovered these would be placed under the power of the discoverer (*Man, Myth, & Magic*, Edited by Richard Cavendish, article, "Names").

To "*tap*" the divine power, magicians used various Biblical names and titles of God in their incantations. These included El, Elohim, Eloah, Adonai, Sabaoth, and Shaddai. *But the one name which came closer to the inner reality of the God of the Old Testament was the Tetragrammaton, the YHWH.* It was held in such profound awe that it was rarely pronounced for fear of profaning it and possibly for fear of the magic of enemies should they discover its pronunciation. But this led to a theological problem. If God could be coerced by the use of His name, then He was not omnipotent. A *magical explanation* was advanced to solve the problem. The invocation of God's name does not oblige Him to do the will of the invoker and He cannot be coerced by the recital of His name. Rather, *the Name itself is invested with the power to fulfill the desire of the man who pronounces it* (Cavendish, article, "Names").

The Tetragrammaton was considered to be connected with awesome mysteries. The "wonder-workers" of the Middle Ages, and later times, were believed to have known how to pronounce the Tetragrammaton. Such a wonder-worker was called a "Baal Shem" meaning master of the Name (*The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia*, Volume 10, article, "Tetragrammaton"). In the Cabala, the creation of the universe was regarded as the unfolding of God's name and the ten Sefiroth, being aspects of God's identity, constitute the Sacred Name of God. The letters of the Hebrew alphabet, used in various combinations and changes, came to be regarded as extremely powerful objects of meditation and magical tools—tools through which the universe was created and which contained the secret of the structure of all things. Thus, the object of *Jewish mystical contemplation* was the name of

God which reflects the hidden meaning and totality of existence. It is the name of God through which everything acquires its meaning. Who, therefore, can succeed in making this great name of God, which is the least concrete and perceptible thing in the world, the object of his meditation is on the way to true mystical ecstasy (Cavendish, article, "Names").

A gnostic work, entitled, "Pistis Sophia," referred to the Name which contains all Names and all lights and powers. One who knows the Name when he goes out of the material body will not be hurt by smoke, darkness, nor by archon, angel, or archangel (Cavendish, article, "Names").

The idea common to all magic is that words, names, and sounds have special powers and this applied particularly to names of gods, angels, and demons. *To know the name and how to pronounce it and use it* made it possible to utilize its power. It is an *ancient widespread belief* that a secret name can have power over everything in the universe. This belief is especially held by the Jews and the names of God are frequently used in the practice of magic. This is why the pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton is so important. The correct pronunciation is absolutely essential for the working of magic (*The Supernatural—Magic, Words, and Numbers*, Editorial Consultants: Colin Wilson and Uri Geller, page 68).

The Talmud makes no bones about the magic of the names of God. According to it, the divine names of God were used to perform miracles by those who knew their combinations (*The Jewish Encyclopedia*, article, "Names of God"). Various feats of power, might, and accomplishments found in the Bible were attributed to the use of the divine name. The view was held that *prayer would be more effective if the name of God were pronounced properly*. During the eleventh century A.D., the Jewish scholar, Hai Gaon, said this usage should be restricted to the Holy Land (*The Jewish Encyclopedia*, article, "Shem ha-Meforash"). Physicians even tried to learn the pronunciation of the Name because of its marvellous powers and it is in conjunction with magic that the YHWH was introduced into the magic papyri (*The Jewish Encyclopedia*, article, "Tetragrammaton").

According to Eliphaz Levi, the YHWH is the key to divine power and all magical science is comprised in the knowledge of this sacred name (*Transcendental Magic* by Eliphaz Levi, pages 17, 55). In sorcery, the magic circle is a must and *the names of Hebrew divinities* were often inscribed within the magic circle *including the Tetragrammaton* (*Witchcraft, Magic, and Alchemy*, by Grillo De Givry, page 104). When the Name was worn by the person it was regarded as an amulet for the purpose of protecting against danger, sickness, and evil spirits (*Morals and Dogma of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Freemasonry*, by Albert Pike, page 204). Under the Mosaic dispensation, the Hebrews did not use amulets. But eventually they did tacitly and unofficially adopt this pagan custom of using charms and amulets. Credence was given to the practice by using and writing the names of God or words from the Hebrew Scriptures on the charm. The real history of the use

of Hebrew amulets is derived from the Cabala, not the Bible (*Amulets and Talismans*, by Sir E. A. Wallis Budge, pages 217–219). The Samaritans, like the Jews, viewed the ineffable names of God as "words of power" and this was the foundation of all the power believed contained in their phylacteries. Like the Jews, the Samaritans believed that the YHWH should *not* be pronounced and Elohim should be substituted in its place. The ancient, mystical tradition of the Samaritan phylacteries is identical to that of the Cabalistic Jews. The source of power in all the amulets and charms is the ineffable YHWH as well as other names such as Ahyh, El-Shaddai, Adonai, and El-Sabaoth. The Syrian, Cabalistic, Arabic, Samaritan, Christian, Egyptian, and Abyssinian concepts of power follow the same tradition (Budge, pages 260–261, 268, 272–273).

The Talmudic explanation for the miracles of Jesus was that He had studied the profane mysteries while in Egypt (*A History of Magic*, by Eliphaz Levi, page 17). The Talmud relates a tale about a fight between Jesus and Judas. Both Jesus and Judas knew the pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton and used it to be able to ascend into the air. In the struggle Judas urinated on Jesus and both of them fell to the earth as they were now unclean. They could not use the Tetragrammaton until they had washed themselves. Jesus had acquired power by stealing the secret name from out of the sanctuary. The "Name" was engraved on the stone Jacob had anointed with oil and this stone was located in the sanctuary. Anyone learning the letters could have the power to destroy the world. Two dogs were placed at the entrance of the sanctuary whose bark was so fierce that anyone learning the letters would forget them because of fear of the two guard dogs. Jesus, however, wrote them down on parchment and inserted it into a hole he had cut in his thigh. When He pronounced the "Name" the wound was healed (*The Talmud Unmasked*, by I. B. Pranaitis, pages 34–35).

The Rabbis and the Cabalists, in their attempts to uphold and maintain monotheism, chose to recognize *only one proper name for God and the YHWH was chosen as this name*. This restriction came from Oriental (Babylonian) influence where even a teacher was not called by his name. Forty years before the destruction of the temple the priests ceased to pronounce the Name and it was declared that whoever pronounced the Name forfeited his portion in the future world. The YHWH was pronounced as Adonai and where Adonai and YHWH occur together in the Hebrew text the YHWH was pronounced Elohim. After the destruction of the Temple there remained no trace of the knowledge of the pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton. The YHWH alone was regarded as the proper name of God because all other names used for God were common to human beings. Thus, blasphemy was reserved for pronouncing the Tetragrammaton (*The Jewish Encyclopedia*, article, "Names of God").

It was *after the Babylonian exile* that the Tetragrammaton began to be held in special reverence. One suggestion put forth for this reverence may have been prompted by the idea that by using the YHWH the Lord might be put on par with pagan deities which also had personal names. Yet, Elohim, in the Bible, refers to Gentile deities as well as to powerful,

learned men and judges. At least on Jewish authority asserts that not even YHWH is limited to a divine name as seen by its usage in Judges 17:2–3, 13 (*The Jewish Encyclopedia*, article, "Names of God").

So, let us emphasize. The avoidance of the pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton may well have been the result of foreign influence—specifically Babylonian. Some authorities believe the refusal to pronounce the YHWH and substituting Adonai in its place occurred in the latter decades of the Babylonian exile (*The Jewish Encyclopedia*, article, "Tetragrammaton"). The idea that the YHWH should not be pronounced because of what is stated in Exodus 3:15 (where the word "forever" is taken to mean "concealed") came from Abima, a Babylonian amora (reader of the law) (*The Jewish Encyclopedia*, article, "Shem ha-Meforash").

Josephus said he knew the pronunciation but that religion forbade him to divulge it. Philo called it ineffable and stated that its use was lawful only for those whose ears and tongues were purified by wisdom. Various motives may have occurred to bring about the suppression of pronouncing the Tetragrammaton but probably *the most significant reason was the desire to prevent the abuse of the name in magic*. If so, the result was the opposite because one of the great names in Jewish magic, as well as Gentile, was the Tetragrammaton (*Encyclopaedia Britannica*, eleventh edition, article, "Jehovah").

At least as early as the third century B.C., the YHWH seems to have been regarded as ineffable and since Biblical justification was necessary an extreme interpretation of Exodus 20:7 and Leviticus 24:11 was proffered. The name was written only in consonant form and the true pronunciation forgotten (*The Jewish Encyclopedia*, article, "Names of God"). Both of these extreme interpretations of the above verses are found in Sacred Name literature today. It appears that at least one major reason for suppressing the Name was because its use should be limited to those who had "consecrated lips and ears." Thus, Adonai was substituted for the YHWH out of fear and not because of a misapplication of the third commandment (*The Jewish Encyclopedia*, article, "Adonai").

Today there is no authentic information as to the correct pronunciation of the YHWH. But the hope has been expressed that the knowledge and correct use of the name would be restored in the Messianic age (*The Jewish Encyclopedia*, article, "Adonai").

Perhaps Albert Pike is correct, after all, when he claimed that the ineffable name was concealed from the masses because the deity is not a personal god nor tangible within their reach (Pike, pages 700–701). What Pike is really saying by that statement is that the Tetragrammaton was applied to the En Sof and that the name is unknown because the En Sof is unknown!

That the Cabala was instrumental in this obsession with the Sacred Name there is no question. The Cabala was introduced into Renaissance thought by Pico della Mirandola in the fifteenth century. Pico believed that the Cabala could confirm the truth of Christianity and this was the beginning of the various schools of Christian Cabalists. Pico believed that by use of Cabalistic manipulation of letters and names it was possible to prove that Jesus was the correct name of the Messiah. Pico wrote seventy-two Cabalistic conclusions supposedly confirming Christianity's foundation to be that of "Hebrew wisdom." This "Hebrew wisdom" was mixed with other conclusions derived from Hermetic sources, Platonic and Neoplatonic texts, Orphic hymns, and Chaldean oracles. Pico was especially enamored by the writings of Hermes Trismegistus. He believed that Hebrew-Christian wisdom was the source of ancient wisdom and there is little doubt his teachers were Spanish Jews. Christian Cabalism became a religious movement which was believed to be compatible with Christianity. It was Pico's assertion that the name of Jesus was YHWH. By adding an "S" within the YHWH the ineffable name became effable. Yet, this strange belief was not new. It was found in the works of the Church Father, Jerome (fourth century), and brought into prominence by the later Christian Cabalists. Pico believed that Cabalistic methods and techniques of meditation should be employed by Christians and it was by this means that Christians began to accept *occult* philosophy, the result of the attempt by Christians to use sources of spiritual power recently made known to them by the Cabala (*The Occult Philosophy in the Elizabethan Age*, by Frances A. Yates, pages 17–22). It was these Cabalistic or Zoharic doctors who, according to their own legend, became a sect of Christian illuminati fully expecting to perform marvels by means of the *power contained within divine names*. All the magical power of Cabalism included the power contained within divine names (*The Brotherhood of the Rosy Cross*, by Arthur Edward Waite, pages 3, 56).

The later Christian Cabalist, Johannes Reuchlin, praised the Hebrew language by which God speaks to the angels and by which the true name or names of God and of angels are expressed. So, the earlier arguments, advanced by Jerome, were picked up by the Christian Cabalists—arguments which associated the name of Jesus with the Tetragrammaton. Reuchlin's writings demonstrate his preoccupation with the "*wonder-working power*" of the *Hebrew language*. He reasoned that Cabalistic magic eliminated the fear of operative magic because Cabalistic magic involved holy forces (angels and the names of God). So, the Christian Cabalists involved themselves in Hermetic-Cabalistic Neoplatonism as a philosophy. Reuchlin devoted much of his time to names, particularly the name of Jesus as the Messiah (Yates, pages 23–25). It was Reuchlin who was one of the first Christian Cabalists to advocate that the name of Jesus exceeded the Tetragrammaton in power if the letter "S" was added, making the YHWH into YHSWH. The letter "S" was regarded as very powerful because the numerical value of the Hebrew letters in "Rauch Elohim" (the Spirit of God) totals three hundred and the Hebrew letter "S" also has the numerical value of three hundred (Cavendish, article, "Names").

Another Cabalist, Francesco Giorgi, devised a process whereby the manipulation of the Hebrew letters in the name of God was believed to demonstrate that Jesus was the true name of the Messiah. Giorgi viewed miracles and magical power as the same and held that the invocation of divine names was highly magical (Yates, pages 29, 35). All the later Cabalists agreed that the Tetragrammaton is *the root and foundation of the divine names* (*A History of Magic*, page 99, footnote).

The supreme magician, Henry Cornelius Agrippa (1486–1535), believed that the name Jesus was all powerful and contained all the power of the Tetragrammaton. Cornelius Agrippa advocated the idea that he had *drawn close to the Creator Himself* and knew *how* to call upon the names of God. As Yates notes, this *occult religion* of Agrippa, which called itself Christian, claimed access to the highest power because it accepted the name of Jesus as the chief of the wonder-working names (Yates, pages 37, 46). It was the interest in the Cabala during the Middle Ages that supplied the mystical formulas found in the occult and the divine names were introduced into the ceremonies of magic and sorcery. Astrological talismans were coupled with Bible verses, Hebrew divine names, and various formulas borrowed from the Cabala (De Givry, pages 206, 339–340). Renegade priests performed rites (most likely black magic) which included reciting the seventy-two Sacred Names of God (*Witchcraft*, by Charles Williams, pages 242–243).

The reader may find it interesting to know that one of the peculiarities of the modern tongues movement is the belief in the value of words. We have already seen there was an ancient widespread belief that certain words and phrases contained magical power. Of these words, the best known was the Tetragrammaton. Among the Gentiles the reverence for words was displayed in oracles and ritualistic incantations (*Glossolalia in the Apostolic Church*, by Ira J. Martin, pages 22–23). So, one of the characteristics of those involved in the tongues movement today is the concept of the importance and value of words. A definite link, then, exists between the tongues movement and the Sacred Names movement.

The divine name is often spoken of as an equivalent to the divine presence, power, or glory. This concept is seen in the writings of Names advocates who tell us that in the original Hebrew the meaning of the name was the *reality of the person represented by that particular name*. Thus, when the true name of the Messiah was corrupted and lost, man lost contact with the spirit behind the name as well as the reality of the spirit.

Occult attachment to the Sacred Names movement is seen by comments which say there is a blessing pronounced upon those who think on His name. Sacred Name advocates say that while the name often stands for the person, the name helps them to understand the person. Thinking on the name is one of the ways by which believers in the deity can come to know the deity better and to be able to define and understand their own position better. Being able to declare that position before others enables such an one to secure a special

blessing from the deity. Those who give their attention to the name of the deity shall receive the richest blessing. Inquiry into the true meaning of the names of the deity is one of the methods by which victory over Satan will be gained. Sacred Name advocates tell us great and wonderful things are promised to believers who are in the Name of Yahshua. There is power in the Name, unlimited power promised to the flock. Those who do not repent and call upon the name of "Yah" through "Yeshuah" will go through the tribulation.

Yet, Sacred Name advocates fail to notice that it is God who named Himself. Names, therefore, are one of God's creations. Those who ascribe power to a name *ascribe power to that which was created rather than to the Creator*. Such practice is idolatry, according to the Apostle Paul (Romans 1:25). Creature in Romans 1:25 means "the created thing."

The Sacred Name obsession was carried to ridiculous lengths by the rabbis. They forbade the seven Biblical names for God—El, Elohim, Adonai, Shaddai, Zevo'at, Ehyeh asher ehyeh, and YHWH—to be written on any documents for fear that when the documents were discarded they would end up on a dunghill. Eventually, Orthodox Jews began using variations of these names even in speech. For example, Elohim became Elokim, Adonai became Ha-Shem. This led to the custom of using Ha-Shem as a substitute for Adonai even though Adonai was itself a substitute for the Tetragrammaton. During the first half of the seventeenth century A.D., Shabbetai B. Meir ha-Kohen, stated that the prohibition of erasing the divine name applied only to names in Hebrew and not in the vernacular (probably Yiddish). This rule was repeated as late as the nineteenth century by R. Akiva Eger. But other writers strongly protested against the practice of writing the Divine Name even in vernacular correspondence. This was called an "exceedingly great offense." As a result, the custom has become widespread among very conservative Jews who will not write the word God or any other name of God in full even in the vernacular. Medieval Jews were concerned with eliminating any suggestion whatsoever that God was not absolute unity. They began treating the name of God in a way that eliminated any suggestion of plurality in God's Being. They either reduced the multiple names to a single common meaning or showed that, among the numerous names for God, *one alone was the proper and exclusive name of God*. (This concept of unity, of course, goes back to Gnostic pantheism which the Jews had adopted with their En Sof). Saadiah Gaon held that the two most widely used Scriptural names YHWH and Elohim have a single meaning. Judah Halevi, Abraham ibn Duad, Maimonides, and Joseph Albo, all emphasized the *Tetragrammaton as the only proper name of God*. Judah Halevi held that all the other names were predicates and attributive descriptions derived from the way His creatures are affected by His decrees and measures. Maimonides declared that except for YHWH all other names of God are derived from actions and that *it is the Tetragrammaton only that gives a clear and unequivocal indication of His essence* (*Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Volume 1, article, "God, Names of").

In the course of time the fear of desecrating the divine name extended to *other names as well*. As noted, Elohim was changed to Elokim or Elodim. Adonai was changed to Adoshem. During the Talmudic period the rabbis also developed a number of substitute names for God to be used in ordinary speech. Hamakom (the place) was used in the sense of "the Omnipresent." Shechinah was used for "the Divine Presence," Hashem for "the Name" and Hashem Yithbarach for "the Blessed One." Certain descriptive adjectives gradually acquired the force of names, such as "the Holy One, blessed be He" and "the Compassionate." To these the Cabalists added one new name, the "En Sof" meaning "the Infinite." It was also given to the first of the Sefiroth or divine emanations (*The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia*, Volume 7, article, "God, Names of").

A brief history of the modern Sacred Names movement, written by a Names advocate, tells us that Paul Penn, a Jewish believer, and John Briggs were the first to pronounce and use the Name of Yahshua. Another Jewish brother was instrumental in the beginning of the modern Sacred Names movement. This was Israel Klar who knew Hebrew and used the name Yahvah. According to this recent Sacred Name advocate, who wrote the brief history on the modern Sacred Name movement in the United States, John Briggs and Paul Penn should be given honor of "having started people thinking on the Name Yahshua." The author also mentions a book written in 1857 by Alexander MacWhorter of Yale University which emphasized the Memorial Name or Yaveh Christ and a series of lectures given around 1900 by Dr. F. L. Chapell on the Names of the Deity.

So, what do we see in all this?

We see the same ancient ideas about the power and magic of a name carried right on down to our day. Sacred Names advocates would not like to admit it but the information contained in the above paragraphs demonstrates they are perpetuating an occult practice which goes back many centuries!

What Does "Name" and "Come in the Name of" Mean?

According to Sacred Name advocates it is the Name that is the all-important thing.

They tell us:

Healing, protection, and eternal life are all attributes embodied in the Savior's name [Note: but not in the Savior]. By trusting in the majestic Name there is eternal life according to 1 John 5:13. Salvation is offered in one name only—Yahweh. People who tell us we cannot call upon His Name because we

do not have a pure language are saying that no one can call upon His true name and, therefore, no one can be saved when He returns.

As noted earlier, Sacred Name advocates have some kind of fixation that the word "name" means the pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton only. The Hebrew authority Gesenius says that "shem" (Name) has *several meanings* and is not limited to the pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton. He lists "Name" to mean: in the name of Jehovah, by His authority; a celebrated name, fame; a good name, good reputation; the celebrated name of God—the glory of God, for my name's sake lest the glory of the divine name should suffer; Jehovah, as being called on and praised by men; the Deity as being present with mortals, for example, "for my name is in him" (the angel) and applied to the aid which God at present vouchsafes to men (Psalms 54:1, "Save me, O God, by thy name . . .").

New Testament usage of "name" (onoma) according to *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, translated and edited by W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich, includes five major categories: 1) name, of proper names, 2) title, category, 3) person, 4) the (well-known) name, reputation, fame, and 5) office. Of these, this Lexicon tells us that the name is often practically inseparable from the Being that bears it and appears nearly as the representative of the Godhead, as a tangible manifestation of His nature. It also means "thinking on" as in the case where two or three are gathered and thinking of me (gathered in His name). With God or Jesus, Name means, in the great majority of cases, with mention of the name, while calling on the name, using the name. Also, it means at the command (of), commissioned by (in this case granting the power of attorney).

To this, Sacred Name advocates reply:

It is true that a name can mean a reputation but when it does the reputation points specifically to one certain individual or a certain group of individuals and cannot be applied indiscriminately to just any person or group of people. Name can mean conspicuous position, an appellation, a mark or memorial of individuality, honor, authority, character, fame, name, renown or report. Only conspicuous position or a mark or memorial of individuality can pinpoint a definite individual. All others can be applied to anyone at any time.

The purpose of a name is to positively identify a certain individual. Those blind guides who say that the Hebrew word "shem" (name) can be used in a manner which would include the whole character and reputation of a particular being and not the pronunciation need to realize that we cannot refer to anyone as having a good name unless we pronounce his name. The Creator of the universe has many titles but only one name and that name is Yahweh.

What this means is that Sacred Name advocates refuse to accept the fact that the word "name" is not limited to the pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton.

An examination of a number of Biblical texts which show the use of the word "name" indicates the following applications:

1) *Label:*

Genesis 2:19; 26:33; 1 Samuel 25:25.

2) *Fame, Renown, Reputation:*

Genesis 6:4; 11:4; 12:2; Numbers 16:2; Deuteronomy 22:14, 19; Ruth 4:11; 2 Samuel 7:9; 8:13; 23:18, 22; 1 Chronicles 5:24; 11:20, 24; 12:30; Nehemiah 6:13; Job 18:17; 30:8; Proverbs 10:7; 22:1; Ecclesiastes 7:1; Ezekiel 16:14; 22:5; 34:29; Zephaniah 3:19–20.

3) *Authority, Power:*

1 Kings 21:8; Esther 3:12; 8:8, 10; Jeremiah 29:25.

4) *Representative:*

1 Samuel 25:5, 9; Esther 2:22.

5) *Attributes:*

Proverbs 21:24.

6) *Memorial:*

Isaiah 55:13; 56:5.

7) *Byword:*

Ezekiel 23:10.

8) *Person:*

Deuteronomy 7:24; 9:14; Joshua 7:9; 1 Samuel 24:21.

9) *Ownership:*

Deuteronomy 28:10; 2 Samuel 12:28; Psalm 49:11; Isaiah 4:1.

In the New Testament notice the following verses:

1) *Name, Label:*

Luke 1:26; Acts 10:1.

2) *Reputation:*

Mark 6:14; Revelation 3:1.

3) *Authority, Power:*

Matthew 10:41–42; Ephesians 1:21.

4) *Person, People:*

Acts 1:15; Revelation 3:4–5; 11:13.

5) *Character:*

Luke 6:22.

6) *Title, Category:*

Matthew 10:41–42; Mark 9:41.

Sacred Name advocates are so locked into a pattern of thinking that they refuse to examine the other side of the story. For example, the Sacred Name idea is that in order to be saved one must be baptized in the name of Yahshua. Without the use of this name there can be no salvation. Yet, forgiveness of sin is not an act of man. It is an act of God. The "Name" does not save us. It is the person of Jesus Christ that saves us. It is *His* action, not ours that makes the difference. This is why the word "name" in most cases of Bible usage designates the entire person, his individuality, and power. Receiving salvation through Christ's name means to believe in the Person, the pronunciation of the name is a secondary consideration. When we believe in His name, we believe in the entire person and all that He stands for. *Knowing a person's name does not guarantee that one really knows the person represented by the name.* So, the significance of a name is what it represents.

As noted earlier, a name is a created thing. With respect to God, we are not to worship a name but a Being. When we ascribe power to a name we are ascribing power to that which was created rather than to the Creator. A name has no significance or meaning without the person. The name serves to identify only. Names and titles applied to God describe His attributes, character, and Being. Believing in the name of Jesus involves a comprehension of all that should be considered with respect to salvation. Those who call on a name or title as the way to salvation would do well to read Matthew 7:21–22 and Luke 6:46.

The word "name" can come to have a reputation, fame, renown, or glory all its own. This is why the "Name of Yahweh" and Yahweh are often used interchangeably in the Bible (Deuteronomy 28:58; Job 1:21; Psalms 18:49; 68:4). At times, the Name of Yahweh functions almost like an appearance of Yahweh (Exodus 23:20–21). (See *Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible*, Volume IV, article, "Name.")

The word "Name" and the personality it represents are the same according to the closest meaning of the Hebrew word "name." The word "name" represents the total picture of a man's organized behavior, the sum total of a person's internal and external pattern of behavior. In the Bible, changing the name meant changing the character and mission of the person. This is why there are many places in the Scriptures where the Hebrew and Greek words for "name" actually mean the word "person" (Numbers 1:2, 18, 20, 43; 26:53; Acts 1:15; 18:15; Revelation 3:4; 11:13)—(*Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible*, Volume IV, article, "Name.")

The word "name," with respect to God, also means His authority. To "come in His name" means to come in His authority, much like "stop in the name of the law" means to stop, as ordered by the law.

Often, the name of God is used to indicate the whole system of divine Truth and doctrine revealed in the Scriptures (Psalms 22:22; Hebrews 2:12; John 17:6, 26). These texts demonstrate that the use of the word "name" refers to the declaration of the doctrine of God (*Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible*, Volume IV, article, "Name").

The phrases "cause his name to dwell," "place his name there," "put his name there," and "my name shall be there" (Deuteronomy 12:11; 14:23; 16:2, 6, 11; 26:2; Deuteronomy 12:5, 21; 14:24; 1 Kings 8:1–66; 16:29; 9:3; 2 Kings 23:27), all demonstrate that the meaning of "name" can mean to claim ownership. What God owns He openly possesses by placing His name upon it (*Toward an Old Testament Theology*, by Walter C. Kaiser, Jr., pages 134, 196–197).

There is reason to believe that such concepts as Ark, Angel, the face and glory of God, as well as the name of God are intended as a representation and pledge of God's presence. Thus, the name represents the presence of God Himself. Often, New Testament quotes, using the word "name," are taken from the Old Testament, so what was true in the Old Testament applies to the New Testament. Belief "in his name" means the acceptance or receiving of His Messianic person and mission. There was no magic in the name. It is when the believer exercises faith in all that the name represents that the glory of God's power is manifested (*Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible*, Volume IV, article, "Name").

If we are required to call upon "the Sacred Name" in order to be saved, then not even the Names people are saved. This is because not even they can agree on *how* the "Name" should be pronounced. According to their theology, no one has been saved up to the beginning of the modern Names movement since they are the ones who have restored the Name. Names advocates are quick to tell us that, according to Acts 4:12, it is by the name of Yahshua only that we can be saved. But what is obvious by Acts 4:12 is that this text is referring to the *person* of Christ, not the pronunciation of the name. Salvation does not come

by pronouncing a name. It comes by repentance and faith in the sacrifice of *the Person* of Jesus Christ. Remember, the false prophets of ancient Israel knew how to pronounce the Tetragrammaton, yet were condemned in spite of this knowledge. The vast amount of deceivers, Jesus said, were to come in the name of Christ, not in the name of Yahshua!

Further examination of the word "name" in the Old Testament reveals the following:

Exodus 23:13 tells us we are to make no mention of the name of other gods. These gods have specific names then. So, the word "god" is a noun, not a proper name.

Exodus 23:21 says His Angel as His name in Him. The Angel was not called by Elohim, Adonai, or YHWH, so this text means the Angel was sent *by the authority* of God.

Exodus 5:23, Moses spoke "in" God's name, not "of" God's name.

Genesis 32:28; Numbers 6:27; and Deuteronomy 28:10 say God's name was to be placed on the children of Israel. The *El* in Israel is God's name, so El is a name, not a title.

Isaiah 42:8, *one* of God's names is YHWH.

Psalms 68:4, His name is *Yah*.

Isaiah 47:4; 51:15; 54:5, *The Lord of hosts* is His name.

Isaiah 57:15, The lofty one . . . whose name is *Holy*.

Psalms 69:30, I will praise the name of God (Hebrew, Elohim), so Elohim is a name.

Isaiah 9:6, His name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty God (El), the everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace.

Exodus 34:14, YHWH, whose name is *Jealous*.

Proverbs 30:9, God's name taken in vain by stealing, not by failing to pronounce the Tetragrammaton.

Jeremiah 34:16, God's name polluted by breaking promises.

Ezekiel 20:39, God's name polluted by idolatry and gifts.

Ezekiel 43:8, God's name defiled by abominations.

Amos 2:7, God's name profaned by sexual misconduct.

Malachi 1:6, God's name despised by offering polluted sacrifices.

Are God, Jesus, Christ, and Lord Pagan Names?

Much is said in Sacred Name literature concerning the use of such names or titles as God, Jesus, Christ, and Lord. Names advocates tell us:

Names and titles commonly employed in worship are not acceptable because they were once attached to pagan idols. The name of God, for example, was originally the name of an idol once worshipped in ancient Babylon. The word "Lord" actually means Baal since Baals were lords over particular regions. God says He will take the names of the "Baals" out of the mouth of His people. All the "mighty ones" worshipped in the world today by any name other than Yahweh are derived from a heathen background. By using a Greek or Latin substitute for the Messiah's true name, people are denying His name. Instead of worshipping the Name of the Heavenly Father, people today are worshipping the names of mythological deities such as "god" and "lord" which are not even names by titles of office. Those who say they are worshipping "the Lord" are confused because they do not know which lord they are worshipping. Paul said there are many lords and many gods, so the same applies to the word "god." "Lord" and "God" are both pagan deities. All the names of national deities of the heathen such as Pan, Zeus, Theos, Deus, Dio, Dieu, and Dios were formerly applied to heathen idols and should not substitute names for the Almighty. Since multitudes of mighty ones are worshipped in the nations of the world, there is only one logical way to be certain that we are calling upon the true Mighty One. We must use the Name He originally placed in His word.

We must come out of Babylon which includes the use of the names of the mighty ones of the worldly nations. Yahweh says all who continue to use pagan names in worship are guilty of idolatry.

Sacred Name writers refuse to recognize the word "God" as the equivalent to the Hebrew Elohim. They believe the word "God" comes from the Hebrew GD and was the name of the Assyrian deity of good-luck. They admit that Elohim is applied to false gods in

the Scriptures as well as to the true God. But since Elohim is regarded as a title and not a name this is allowed in the Bible because what the Bible condemns is the use of the names of false deities being applied to God. The use of the word "God" is forbidden in Exodus 23:13 where it tells us it is a sin to pronounce it or to substitute it in the place of Yahweh or Elohim.

They say:

We object to the use of Adonai in referring to the Heavenly Father, even though it does mean Lord or Ruler, because it is the name of a pagan deity as well as the name of a heathen king (Joshua 10:1, 3) who was named after his pagan deity, Yahweh objects to being classified with pagan deities.

The word "god" is a common noun of pagan origin and was applied to heathen deities. Later, when the Teutonic people were converted to Christianity the word God was elevated to the Christian sense. So until the sixth century A.D., the Most High never heard Himself called "God" and there could have been no "Church of God" by that name. The *Encyclopaedia Britannica* traces the word "god" to a molten image. Gad (God) was the Chaldean sun-deity and Meni was the moon-goddess according to Isaiah 65:11.

According to *Greek and Roman Mythology*, Appendix 1, page 312, the god Zeus continues to live under the title "theos." It is " . . . a title so conveniently equivocal that the Christian can use it without heresy and at the same time square perfectly with the ancient pagan belief."

Any man who teaches the Bible and uses these names is either ignorant, dishonest or willfully disregards the instructions regarding the "sanctification of the Name" by which the Creator revealed Himself.

Are all these assertions made by Sacred Name advocates true?

For one thing, *Greek and Roman Mythology*, Appendix 1, page 312, simply states that "theos" (God) in some form is the *equivalent* of Zeus. It does not state "theos" is etymologically connected with Zeus.

Also, the attempts by Sacred Name advocates to prove that names such as God, Jesus, Christ, and Lord were used at some time as the *personal names of heathen deities cannot be substantiated historically*. But, as we shall see, this was not the case with some of the Hebrew names and titles.

The word "god" is another case in point. It is a common noun, *not* a proper noun. As such, it is a class name for things worshipped by human beings whether real or imaginary. God is not the name of the Heavenly Father, although this usage has come to be accepted. God is a word common to all Teutonic languages of which there are many derivatives but *it is not identified outside the Teutonic*. It is true the word "god" was applied to heathen deities and later elevated to the Christian sense upon the conversion of the Teutonic peoples. Its meanings include: 1) the one Supreme or Absolute Being, 2) in mythology, as a being superior to nature; a deity, as gods of the heathen, 3) figuratively, a person or thing that is made an object of extreme devotion, 4) an image or an idol, and 5) one of the audience in the upper gallery of a theatre, so called from the elevated position in allusion to the gods of Olympus (*The Century Dictionary*, under "god").

The question that needs to be answered is: Does the use of English titles for the Tetragrammaton lead to the worship of other gods?

The answer is no!

Bible usage demonstrates it was not the word used for God in the Hebrew which made it a sin but rather whether the object to which the name or title applied was being worshipped in place of the true God. Greek-speaking Jews prior to the time of Jesus Christ commonly used the Septuagint which included the Greek titles for Deity. Not even the original Hebrew writings of most of the Old Testament Scriptures were extant in Jesus' day. Bible examples which show it is *not wrong* to use the English word "god" because our pagan ancestors did so are found in many places. The word "Elohim," which is applied to Yahweh, is used in reference to false gods of one type or another *240 times* in the Old Testament—the reason, no doubt, why some Names advocates will not even use the word "Elohim" but prefer to say "mighty ones." The word "*El*" is applied to false gods *sixteen times* in the Old Testament Scriptures. The word "Eloah" is used *five times* to apply to heathen gods and in *sixteen places* the Aramaic "*Elah*" refers to heathen gods of the Aramaic-speaking people. So, what is clear by these *inspired examples* of Bible usage is that it is not the words, El, Elohim, Eloah, or Elah which are evil in themselves but whether or not the people were worshipping what the names represented. The much touted statement, by Names advocates, that Exodus 23:13 forbids the mention of the names of other gods overlooks three things: 1) "to make mention" in the Hebrew means to inscribe in the memory for the purpose of worship, 2) the prohibition is against using the *names* of these gods, not the word "god," and 3) God's prophets often mentioned the names of these false gods in their diatribes against idolatry.

Those who say it is wrong to use the title "god" because it was a Teutonic word that appeared many years after the time of Christ need to realize two things: 1) Paul tells us in Romans 1:21–23 that the heathen first knew the true God but then turned to false gods, and

2) words which Names advocates use in place of the word "God"—such English words as Creator, Savior, and so forth—also originated many years after the time of Christ and, no doubt, were applied to heathen gods. The truth of the matter is that the word "Jesus" is more Hebrew than Creator or Savior because "Jesus" is the Latin form of the Greek Iesous which is the Greek form of the Aramaic Jeshua. This Greek form resulted from the lack of a "y" and "h" in the Greek language. The final "s" was added to denote the singular number—a move made by the translators of the Septuagint to distinguish Hebrew monotheism from Greek polytheism. In fact, not one of the letters of the Tetragrammaton (YHWH) is found in the Greek alphabet—the reason the Tetragrammaton is not found in the Greek Scriptures.

The idea that the English word "god" came from Gad, the Semitic god of fortune, has no historical substantiation. The etymology of the English word "god" is disputed. *The Oxford-English Dictionary* says, apart from the *unlikely hypothesis* of adoption from some foreign tongue there are two Aryan roots of the word "gheu" which is believed to be the root for the English word "god." These are: 1) to invoke, and 2) to pour, to offer sacrifice. The most obvious definition deductible from the actual use of the word "gheu" is "an object of worship." Some scholars accepting the derivation of the root "gheu" to mean "to pour" have supposed the etymological sense to be "molten image" but this assumed development of meaning seems *very unlikely*. As the use of God as a proper name has throughout the literary period of English predominated it is only natural that the heathen usage should be sometimes understood as a transferred use of this. A "god" in this sense is a supposed being put in the place of God, or an imperfect conception of God in some of His attributes and relations. The meaning of the word God has been modified by the influence of the Christian use. In the original pre-Christian sense God referred to a superhuman worshipped as having power over nature and the fortunes of mankind; a deity, chiefly of heathen divinities. When applied to the One Supreme Being, this sense becomes more or less modified (*The Oxford-English Dictionary*, Volume IV, word, "God"). What we see by the definition of the word "god," by this authoritative English source, is that there is no substantiation to the idea that the word "god" was derived from a molten image and that it is the *use of the word, not the word itself which makes it good or bad*.

Regarding the matter that the English word "god" comes from the old Syrian deity Gad (pronounced Gawd) mentioned in Isaiah 65:11 (margin) in conjunction with Meni, Hislop tells us that Gad and Meni were the names that applied to Nimrod and Cush, the first great rebels in the post-Flood period (*The Two Babylons*, by Alexander Hislop, pages 94–95). It is generally understood today that many of the names of heathen deities had their origin in the post-Flood period with the beginning of the apostasy of Cush and Nimrod and are derived from these two arch rebels. There is no more authority for the statement that "god" is a derivative of God any more than saying that the Polish word "Bog" comes from the English word "bog." God, which is the common Teutonic word for a personal object of

worship, is like the Greek "theos" or the Latin "deus" which apply to all superhuman deities of the heathen mythologies who exercise power over nature and man. But, as the Bible demonstrates by the usage of El, Elohim, Eloah, and Elah it is the use the word is put to which makes it evil, not the word itself, as these words were applied both to the true God and to heathen divinities.

According to Names advocates, Iesous is a foreign word not applicable to the resurrected Messiah. To substantiate their arguments, Sacred Name advocates must repudiate the inspired Greek New Testament. We have already seen that this argument, like the rest of the Sacred Name arguments, is not based on any kind of real scholarly or historical proof.

Sacred Name advocates tell us:

The name Jesus from "Ie" and "Sous." In the trinity of the Babylonian gods was the god of healing names "Ie" (Ea). Zeus was the Greek Savior so "Ie" coupled with "Sous" (the Greek terminal) gives us "Ie-Sous" or Iesous, the healing Zeus. Jesus was for many years called Joshua and it was the Septuagint which covered up the Sacred Name of Yahweh. Joshua was translated by the Alexandrian Jews as Iesous. Hislop tells us that the Greeks worshipped the supreme deity under the title of Zeus the Savior. Iesous or Jesus was the name of a pagan deity worshipped many years before the time of the Savior as Ie-Sous or Ie-Zeus. According to the famous *Liddell and Scott Greek Lexicon*, Iesous is the Ionic masculine form of the name Iaso—the Greek goddess of healing. What we are opposed to is the substitution of man-made titles, or any title for the true name of the Creator.

Now, that is a case of the kettle calling the pot black if there ever was one. Sacred Name advocates tell us that Yahshua is a compound of Yah and Hoshua—combining Yah with the Hebrew "shua," the word for salvation. As such, the name Yahshua does not exist in the Hebrew language. As examination of any Hebrew Lexicon will quickly tell the reader that. *Yahshua is a man-made concoction if there ever was one.* It is not any kind of a "Sacred Name" and, in fact, it is not even a name. Jesus, on the other hand, is the Greek form of Jeshua, as has already been demonstrated. Jesus is not the name of a pagan god regardless of some supposed similarity. It did not originate with the Greeks. It originated with the Greek-speaking Jews who translated the Septuagint from the Hebrew Scriptures. The assertion that the name Jesus is derived from Ie-Sous is pure speculation without any kind of historical or etymological substantiation whatsoever. Sacred Name advocates rely on the *Larousse Encyclopedia of Mythology* and *The Two Babylons* for their supposed substantiation that the name Jesus is derived from Zeus. The line of reasoning is as follows:

the pagan deity Dionysus is etymologically the Zeus of Nysa. One of the well-known names of Bacchus was Dionysus of Dionusos of Greece. D'ion-nuso-s means "Sinbearer." Taking these statement, Sacred Name advocates link the "sus" in Dionysus with the "sus" in Jesus and tell us that Zeus was the Greek Savior when the Bible was translated into the Greek language. Therefore, we should shake all vestiges of paganism by ridding ourselves of the name Jesus.

While some Sacred Name advocates admit that all paganism of the Hebrew true worship is traceable to the worship of Nimrod and Semiramis, they fail to pay attention to what Hislop really says regarding "Zeus the Savior." Hislop says the Babylonian god (Nimrod) was commonly called "Savior of the world" and among the Greeks was known as "Zeus the Savior." Zeus the Savior, which had reference to deliverance in battle or some other temporal deliverance, was the title of Dionysus. Dionysus was another name for Bacchus. Bacchus is expressly identified with the Egyptian Osiris. Osiris is clearly revealed to be Nimrod (Hislop, pages 71–73, 46, 22–23). There is no relationship between the name Jesus and Zeus or any of the other pagan gods mentioned by Sacred Name advocates.

Authorities who have written on the subject have demonstrated that there is no etymological connection between the names Jesus and Zeus. Jesus is the Anglicized form of the Latin Iesus. Iesus is the Latin form of the Greek Iesous. Iesous is the Greek form of the Hebrew Yeshua. Zeus and Iesous are not cognates. Neither is there a connection between the name Jesus and the god "Yes." "Yes," one of the names of Bacchus, is not to be connected to the name Jesus by adding the Latin termination "sus." The reader is already aware that Bacchus was one of the names of Nimrod. So, there is no etymological connection between the name of the god "Yes" and Jesus.

Another point to consider is that when Paul preached to Greeks at Athens, he preached about Jesus (Acts 17:18, 31). The Greeks accused Paul of being a "setter forth of strange gods." They did not connect the name Jesus with the Greek god Zeus. This simply points out the fact there is not a single historical or scholarly source that etymologically connects Jesus with the god Zeus. All authorities state that Jesus is the Greek form of the Hebrew Joshua or Aramaic Jeshua. Pilate was well aware of the name Jesus and wrote it in Greek (John 19:19–20).

The idea that Iesous is the Ionic masculine form of Iaso, the Greek goddess of healing, is not substantiated in *A Greek-English Lexicon* by Liddell and Scott. An examination of both the abridged and unabridged editions of *A Greek-English Lexicon* shows no such word connected with Iaso, the Greek goddess of healing. Iesous is listed as the name of Jesus, which this Lexicon says is the Greek form of the Hebrew Joshua. Iesous is in no way related to Iaso, the Greek goddess of healing.

Now what about the title "Christ"? Sacred Name advocates admit they have been ridiculed in times past for suggesting that the word "Christ" is derived from the Indian deity "Chrishna." Their answer to this criticism is that in *The Two Babylons*, page 60, Alexander Hislop shows an illustration of the serpent Calyia slain by Vishnu in the reincarnated form of Chishna. This portrayal of Genesis 3:15 depicts Chrishna as the serpent-crusher of India. They add that Dr. Ignaz Goldhieser, writing in *Mythology Among the Hebrews*, links the deities of India and Greece together. So, what is obvious to Sacred Name advocates is that the name "Christ" is closely associated with pagan worship.

It is admitted by both proponents and exponents of the Sacred Name movement that the word "Christ" is the Greek translation of the Hebrew word Messiah. Eventually, the word "Christ" ceased to be a title and became part of the proper name "Jesus Christ."

Names advocates tell us:

The Greeks not only corrupted the pronunciation of the Names of the Bible but also corrupted the meaning and we should rid ourselves of all such pagan influence.

Christ is a substitute word for "Savior" and is derived from the Hindu savior Krishna. The Greeks used the word "Christos" (Christ) for this Indian god. Christ also comes from the Greek "krisma" (Chrisma) which means "to anoint" but not in any sacred sense. Chrisma closely resembles Krishna of the Sanscrit. So, the origin of the name "Christ" comes from sun-worship as Chrisna was the Hindu Sun-god named after Kris, the sun. Christ is the modern English form of the ancient name of the Sun-god Messiah—Chrisna. As such, the Greek word Christ is not the equivalent of the Hebrew word "Savior." The Greek equivalent would be Yah-Soter, meaning "God Savior."

Even the Name "Christian" is not legitimate. It was a name used contemptuously for the followers of the Messiah and was not applied by the disciples themselves. The phrase that "the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch" is a rank interpolation placed in the Bible by the Nicolaitans when they took over the Assembly of Yahweh at the Council of Nicea. Acts 26:28 is another interpolation added by these Greek heretics.

Knowledgeable sources agree that the Greek Christos (Christ) is the equivalent of the Hebrew Mashiah (anointed) from which the English word Messiah is derived (*The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia*, Volume 3, article, "Christ, The"). But, it is not the fact that the title "Christ" is the equivalent of the Hebrew "Mashiah" that upsets Names advocates. What upsets them is the belief that the title "Christ" comes from the Indian god Krishna.

Is this true?

Robert Taylor, in his *The Diegesis; Being a Discovery of the Origin, Evidence, and Early History of Christianity*, pages 168–179, attempts to prove that Chrishna was the first Christ and Jesus Christ is the imitation. It is this assumption that has confused so many Names advocates with respect to names and their equivalents.

It is the failure to understand what Hislop has to say regarding the application of the names of Nimrod and Semiramis, as the names of the gods of the heathen, that has led to many of the false notions of Names advocates.

All tradition from the earliest history attests to the apostasy of Nimrod and the success he had in leading men away from the Patriarchal faith, delivering them from the awe of God and fear of His judgments (Hislop, page 52). As the first despot in the post-Flood period Nimrod was well aware of the promises made by God regarding the future advent of a Savior (Genesis 3:15). Early pagans knew of the penalty of death for sin and of the promise of eternal life. God had clearly revealed to Adam and Eve, after they had sinned, that One would come to make it possible for mankind to have the opportunity for salvation. This was the Promised Messiah, the Savior. So, from that time forward mankind looked for the Promised Messiah. For Nimrod's apostasy to be successful it would be necessary for him to convince the world that he or his offspring would be the Promised Messiah. The promise God made to Adam and Eve and to all of mankind had to be counterfeited. Not only would it be necessary to counterfeit God's true way to salvation but the coming of the Messiah must also be counterfeited.

After Nimrod's untimely death, Semiramis, his wife, devised "the Mysteries" in order to continue this plan of deception and rule. The world was waiting for the Messiah. She palmed off one of her illegitimate offspring, Tammuz, as this promised Savior by convincing her followers that Tammuz was conceived miraculously by God and that he was the Savior the world awaited. She was successful in this deception. Nimrod was, in the new form of Tammuz, to continue to liberate the world from God's distasteful ways and to usher in a new way of life for mankind.

Since Nimrod had conquered the world as far as the straits of Gibraltar, he was well known. His exploits were prodigious. It did not take long for this movement to catch on. But, with the tower of Babel and the dispersion of the races by means of the confusion of the languages, the names of Nimrod, Semiramis, and Tammuz were preserved in many different forms and they were worshipped as gods. The Indian Chrishna was one of the names of Nimrod. Robert Taylor tells us, that according to Plutarch, Osiris traveled to India where he established a civilization and a religion and was worshipped there as the sun (Taylor, page 180). The reader is already aware that Osiris was the Egyptian name for Nimrod.

Many aspects of the life of Christ were counterfeited long before the advent of the true Messiah. Of eleven main deities from seven countries it was believed that all or nearly all of these were born on or near Christmas of a virgin mother in a cave underground, that they led a life of toil, were light bringers, healers, mediators, and saviors. They were vanquished by the powers of darkness, descended into the underworld, then were resurrected to become the pioneers of mankind to a heavenly world. Of these "Saviors" Khrisna, the god of India, closely paralleled the life of Christ (*Pagan and Christian Creeds*, by Edward Carpenter, pages 21–23).

What this means is that through Satanic influence, many of the events in the *life of Christ* were *counterfeited* by Nimrod, Semiramis, and Tammuz (mentioned in the Bible in Genesis 10:8–10; Jeremiah 44:17–19, 25; Ezekiel 8:14) and perpetuated worldwide by the confusion of the languages. There is no etymological connection between Jesus Christ and the Indian god Chrishna. It is the counterfeit parallel to the true Messiah that has confused Names advocates into thinking the title Christ is a derivative of Chrishna.

The Sacred Name assertion that Acts 11:26 and Acts 26:28 are interpolations has no scholarly basis. 1 Peter 4:16 specifically uses the appellation "Christian." The Sacred Name argument that the appellation "Christian" was a term of contempt placed upon the followers of the Messiah by non-Christians is disputed by Bible commentators. Bible commentators tell us that the Greek word for "called" in Acts 11:26 means appoint or nominate by Divine direction. The name "Christian" was therefore given by Divine appointment, most likely through Paul and Barnabas. The name "Christian" is from God and a name befitting the followers of Christ and the character represented by it.

Sacred Name opposition to the English word "lord" is predicated upon the following argument:

"Lord" is a contraction of "lawered" or "laverd" which is in turn derived from "hlafwerd" or "hlafwyrd." Hlafwerd is a compound word made up of "hlaf," meaning "lady" and "werd," the Old English name for the heathen supreme deity, a female controlling the fates of both gods and men of the past, present, and future. The word "loaf" is also associated with hlaf (lady) since the lady usually did the cooking and baking. "Hlafwyrd" was Lady Fate and "lawerd" (lord) is a modern contraction of hlafwyrd. Lord is a substitute word for Yahweh and should not be used. Hlafwerd is the equivalent of the Babylonian Baal and the Phoenician Adonay. The use of these three names is prohibited in the Bible. Hlafwyrd means "loafkeeper," a keeper of bread, and, as such, is a word meaning "god." Lord is merely a title. It is not the name of the Creator. Like "god" the word "lord" is the name of a pagan deity. The gods

of the heathen are getting the praise rather than Yahweh. These substitute names are the personal names of pagan gods.

Sacred Name advocates insist that the word "lord" is actually a translation of Baal, that the Jews substituted the name and title of the ancient Canaanite "mighty one," Baal or Adonai, to replace the name of Yahweh. By using the word "lord" we are supposedly following this practice today. Sacred Name advocates insist Hosea 2:16 proves that the English word "lord" is the equivalent of Baal (see Hosea 2:16, margin).

They say:

We have been calling our Heavenly Father Baal by using the term "the Lord." Baal (Bel) meaning Lord was the title of the supreme "mighty one" among the Canaanite peoples. Other titles were attached to this. The usual designation for Baal was Baal-Shemaim (Lord of the heaven). This title is the equivalent to Zeus. The true believer must not be guilty of using such pagan names. We must worship in the Name of Almighty Yahweh exclusively.

So much now for the Sacred Name argument regarding Baal. We will come back to that later, but first of all let us notice a number of facts about the English word "lord."

Sacred Name advocates tell us that, according to *Webster's Unabridged Dictionary*, the word "lord" is derived from the ancient pagan deity Lord, whose image was placed in the bake shops to guard the making of bread. This deity was a goddess called Lord, the keeper of the loaf. An examination of *Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language*, the most formidable of the unabridged dictionaries, as well as *Webster's New International Dictionary of the English Language* (unabridged); *Webster's New Twentieth Century Dictionary of the English Language* (unabridged); *Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language* (College Edition); *Webster's Dictionary of Proper Names*; *Webster's Biographical Dictionary* (First Edition); and *Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary* do not indicate such a derivation for the word "lord." In fact, the authoritative, *The Oxford Dictionary*, which contains twelve volumes, lists no such meaning or derivation for the word "Lord." Under the word "lord" in *The Oxford Dictionary*, Volume IV, the following information is given: In its primary sense Lord denotes the head of a household in his relation to the servants and dependants who "eat his bread." Etymologically, Lord means "bread-lord," and employer of labor. Other meanings include: 1) a master, ruler; a master of servants; the male head of a household who has dominion over others as his subjects to whom service and obedience are due; chief, prince, sovereign; one who has the preeminence; a feudal superior, the proprietor of a manor or lord of the manor, 2) a husband, 3) The Lord (God), 4) as a title of Jesus Christ, commonly our Lord, 5) as a designation of rank or official

dignity, the modern equivalent to Nobleman in its current sense, 6) the peers, temporal and spiritual, as constituting the higher of the two bodies composing the legislature (of England, Scotland, and Ireland), 7) applied with subjoined defining word or phrase, to the individual members of a Board appointed to perform the duties of some high office of state that has been put in commission; in ceremonies prefixed to the titles of bishops whether peers of Parliament or not; sometimes prefixed to the title of nobility, 8) the usual form of address in courts of law to two or more of the superior judges sitting together.

The problem with the use of the word "lord," which Sacred Name advocates fail to see, is identical with that of the word "god." It is not the word that is intrinsically evil but what is connoted by the person when he uses it. Sacred Name advocates refuse to use the word "lord" when the inspired writers of the Old Testament repeatedly used Adonai (Lord) which is identical in meaning and usage to the modern word "lord." Daniel, for example, one of the three most righteous men in the Bible (Ezekiel 14:14), in a single prayer used Elohim ten times, Adonai ten times, and Yahweh only four times. Sacred Name advocates are willing to substitute the word "Father" in place of Elohim or Adonai, yet the word "Father" has been constantly used in reference to pagan gods throughout history.

Sacred Name advocates are dead set against the use of the Greek words "theos" and "kurios," translated God and Lord in the English Bible. These words, *theos* and *kurios*, were the ones used by the translators of the Septuagint when translating the Greek from Hebrew. Aside from the claim that the present Greek manuscripts are only versions of the original Aramaic writings of the Apostles and, as such, do not reflect the inspired Sacred Name in their contents, the opposition to *theos* and *kurios* is based on the premise these two words have evolved from Zeus and Horus. Names advocates say *theos* and *kurios* are not the equivalent of Yahweh but of the Egyptian Horus, and Phoenician Adonai, the Babylonian Tammuz, and the Persian Kuros. Both these words—theos and kurios—like "elohim" can apply to the true God as well as to pagan divinities. But, again, as has been pointed out, it is the connotation that is employed by the user that makes their application sinful or good.

God's Names, Titles, as Well as the Tetragrammaton, Applied to Pagan Gods!

One of the major arguments of Names advocates for refusing to use such names or titles as El, Eloah, Elohim, and Adonai, when referring to God, is that these names have also been used for pagan deities. Names advocates tell us that if the nations worshipped idols by these names, how could the same names be applied to the Creator? Yahweh, the Heavenly Father, they say, has never accepted worship in any other name except Yahweh.

It would come as a shock, no doubt, to Names advocates to find out that the name Yahweh has also been used extensively, to refer to pagan deities! The truth of the matter is:

The entire argument Names advocates use to support the notion that all other names and titles for God except Yahweh are forbidden because these names or titles have been applied to pagan deities falls flat when it is realized that the name Yahweh is no exception to this rule. There was a reason Paul said the pagans had taken God's names and applied them to their idols (Romans 1:21–23).

Of the various names and titles applied to God in the Bible it is obvious that YHWH is identical with Elohim as seen by the joint use of the name Jehovah-Elohim (*A Dictionary of the Bible*, edited by William Smith, see under "Jehovah").

El, the "supreme deity," was common to all Semitic languages and it was El who presided over the Ugaritic—the ancient city of Ugarit—pantheon (*Larousse World Mythology*, edited by Pierre Grimal, page 87). This statement demonstrates how one of the names of God was appropriated by the heathen. El is the general Semitic term for a god. Elohim, which is a plural form, was often used to designate heathen gods and is the uniplural form for the true God. This uniplural form is approximately equivalent to the concept of "Godhead." When Elohim is used with the definite article (ha-Elohim) in the Scriptures, it always designates the true God. El Elyon (Most High), one of the ancient names of the true God was, according to Philo of Byblos, used as the name of a Phoenician deity. And as we shall soon see, the name Yahweh was not confined to the God of the Israelites but was known to mankind as early as the second generation after Adam (*The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia*, Volume 7, article, "God"). The reader is already aware that Elohim, in the Bible, is used 240 times to refer to pagan deities; in two places it refers to goddesses; and in one place it is rendered "idol." Elah, the Aramaic word for god, is used sixteen times to apply to heathen gods; and Eloah is used the same way five times. If it is wrong to use the word "God" because our pagan ancestors did so when referring to their gods, then it is wrong to use El, Elohim, Elah, and Eloah. Since the inspired word of God, in the Old Testament Scriptures, shows that it is permissible to refer to pagan deities with the same Hebrew words that are used for the true God, then it is *not* wrong to use the word "God" today. It is *not* the Name alone that identifies the true God. The Canaanites used the same Semitic words for their gods and El was used in one form or another by all Semitic peoples. In fact, one of the names of Nimrod was "El-Bar" or God the Son (Hislop, page 73).

It has already been called to the reader's attention that at least one authority believes the Yahweh referred to in Judges 17:2, 13 is a pagan god. Certainly, the entire incident covered in this chapter indicates gross idolatry. It should come as no surprise to know that most of the Hebrew terms employed for God in the Bible were also employed by the Canaanites to designate their pagan gods. The oldest Semite name for God is El, which corresponds to the Akkadian Ilu, the Canaanite El or Il and the Arabic El. As noted, in the Ugaritic myths, El is the head of the Canaanite pantheon. El Elyon, when referring to the true God means, as the Bible shows, "Most High" and since it is never used with the definite

article must be regarded as a proper noun, a name of God. In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries B.C. the Canaanites called El Elyon "the lord of the gods." The combined form El Elyon is found in inscriptions of Zeus Hypsistos. *When used in Israel*, El Elyon applied to the *one true God* but when it was used by the heathen it applied to the "supreme god" who was over all the other gods.

Another example is "El Berith" (God of the Covenant) which is found only in Judges 9:46. The sanctuary mentioned here is, no doubt, the one called the house of Baal Berith in verse 4. In the early time period of Israel, Baal was more or less a synonym of Adon and, as such, was used as a legitimate title for Yahweh. This is seen in the names of Saul's sons. Even one of David's sons was named Beeliadi (the Lord knows). It was not until after the time of Solomon that the name Baal was recognized as a specific title for the Canaanite storm-god Hadad and thereafter avoided by the Israelites as a title for Yahweh. Eloah, in a later period (Daniel 11:37), also came to be used in reference to a pagan god (*Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Volume 1, article, "God, Names of").

The two supreme gods of divination in Babylonia and Assyria were Shamash and Adad. It should not be surprising, then, to know that among the Aramaeans Adad, Ramman, Ilumer is often confused with the Sun-god Malak-Bel; or that Yaw (Yah) of the Hebrews completely absorbed the character of the Sun-god El (*The Mythology of all Races*, edited by Canon John Arnott MacCulloch, Volume V, page 63).

At Gebal, Agrotos was the greatest of the gods. Since Agrotos also means "Hunter," the name was applied to the Sun-god El of Gebal. The principal male deity of the West Semitic peoples included the Sun-god El (*The Mythology of all Races*, Volume V, pages 39, 54).

Let's take another look at Baal. In spite of all the verbalization by Sacred Name advocates, the word Baal is translated as "lord" only two times and in both cases the reference is to men. The application of the word Baal to deity is secondary. Its primary meaning is "possessor" or "owner." For a considerable period of time Baal was a title which was applied to Yahweh (*The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia*, article, "Baal"). It was not until the time of Ahab that the worship of a distinct god called Baal became a problem. This "Baal" or Lord was Melkart (Bruce, page 34). Some Sacred Name advocates are willing to admit that 2 Samuel 6:2 shows that Yahweh was known as the Baal (Lord) of Judah. They fail to see the real significance, however—completely glossing over the fact that the word "Baal" was not evil in itself. Its *use* determines whether a name is evil or good.

Baal, which means owner or possessor, was used of *both* men and gods. When used with men it implied possession; that is, the owner of house, land, cattle, and so forth. When

applied to gods it meant owner or possessor of land rather than ruler of men. While it is commonly held that there was a supreme deity known as Baal, frequently identified as the sun, the evidence is far from convincing. The most that can be demonstrated is that the sun was sometimes regarded as Baal. There is a serious objection to the view that Baal was the name of the supreme deity of the Canaanites. The word Baal cannot be found as a proper name standing by itself on monuments. Bible usage, apart from the name of a place or quality, is precluded from being a proper name because it is always used with the definite article and should be translated "the Baal." Baal meant the divine owner or landlord of the particular district in question. The "Baal" of one district was a different god from the "Baal" of another district. Baalim were regarded as the producers of fertility and were credited with making corn, wine, and oil available. The Israelites, upon their entry into Canaan, referred to Yahweh as Baal. There was no stigmatism attached to this practice, since Baal was not a proper name but an appellative only. All that the word signified was that Yahweh was the divine owner of His people and the possessor of Israel. But, in time, this usage did tend to produce confusion between Yahweh and Baal and, no doubt, made the lapse into idolatry easier. But, as noted, with Ahab a new phase began. He established Melkart of Tyre, the home of Jezebel his wife, as the Baal of Israel (*A Dictionary of the Bible*, edited by James Hastings, Volume I, article, "Baal"). Since it was not wrong to use the word Baal among the early Israelites, Saul named one of his sons "Yahweh Gives" and another "Man of Baal" (*The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia*, Volume 2, article, "Baal"). Even David named one of his sons after Baal. This name, mentioned previously, was Beeliada and it last appears in 2 Samuel 5:16 as Eliada which shows that El was regarded as the equivalent of Baal. It is also seen in 1 Chronicles 12:5 that the name Be'aliaha means "*Yahweh is Baal*." What this demonstrates is that Baal was originally a title and not a proper name (*Encyclopaedia Britannica*, eleventh edition, article, "Baal"). It was not until the time of Elijah that the assimilative process of Baal worship met with opposition from God's prophets. This was because, under Ahab, the cult of Baal became an independent and aggressive movement within Israel. The word Baal is used in the Talmud and has found its way into Yiddish where it is used to form numerous compound words (*The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia*, Volume 2, article, "Baal").

The only similarity between the English word "Lord" and the Semitic "Baal" is that the meaning is identical. While Lord is an equivalent of Baal it is not the only equivalent. "Master" and "Ruler" are also equivalents, but Sacred Name advocates do not seem to mind using these words, which displays their inconsistency. Take the appellation "Father." Judges 17:10; 18:19 show its usage in idolatrous practices; yet, Jesus said to call the God in heaven, Father (Matthew 23:9). So, Jesus makes it plain that the misapplication of a name does not exclude its usage for Christians. Lord, as an equivalent of Baal, does not mean that the word Lord is evil and wrong to use. All titles which show subjection to God are proper. But to use these titles in idol worship is wrong. If we are required to abandon the usage of

"Lord" because it is the equivalent to some pagan god, then we must give up all similar equivalents such as Master, Ruler, Husband, Possessor, Owner and so forth. What is clear is this: *It is the application of a word that brings about its condemnation, not the word itself.* To eliminate every name that is the equivalent to some pagan deity would be an endless task. Names advocates, to be consistent, should do this very thing and not stop with words like Lord and God. They should eliminate all such words as Father, Master, Ruler, Sovereign, Son of God, and Husband. Take the word King, for example. The Hebrew for "king" is Melech. The Ammonite form of Melech is Moloch. So, according to Sacred Name reasoning, Melech is the equivalent of the Ammonite Moloch. Therefore, we must never use the word King. "King of kings" is a Babylonian appellation (Daniel 2:37).

Yet, "King of Kings" is used for Yahweh in both the Old and New Testaments. What the inspired Scriptures clearly reveal is that titles and names are not evil in themselves. Applying them to false gods is evil. Idolatry, among other things, constitutes the act of applying these names to false gods.

The interpretation which Sacred Name advocates give to Hosea 2:16 is the result of *this backward application* of names. They explain this text by saying God is going to remove all such titles as "Lord" and "God" out of the mouths of His people. They fail to understand the context. The context shows this event will happen after the return of Jesus Christ when the New Covenant is ratified. At that time Israel will call Him "my husband" and no longer "my Lord." This is because under the terms of the Old Covenant YHWH was their Lord or Master. But in the New Covenant He will marry them and will be their husband (2 Corinthians 11:2).

Sacred Name advocates know that "Adonai" is also the equivalent of the English word Lord. They say the Greeks borrowed the name "Adonai" from the Phoenicians and changed the name to the Greek god "Adonis." Likewise the Hebrews. They borrowed it from the Phoenicians and left it intact as Adonai. Yet, the Bible shows this appellation for God was used *long before* the time of the Greeks. Abraham and Lot used the word Adonai when speaking to God (Genesis 15:2, 8; 18:3; 19:18). And in Genesis 18:12 the word "Lord" is applied to Abraham. Adon is frequently used in apposition to Yahweh or as a substitute (See Exodus 23:17; 34:23; Isaiah 1:24; 3:15; 10:16; Amos 8:1; Psalms 90:1; 114:7; Isaiah 6:1, 8, 11; Malachi 3:1). According to Gesenius, Adonai is used exclusively for God. Furthermore, there is no mythological connection between "Adonis" and the Hebrew Deity Yah (*The Mythology of all Races*, Volume V, page 77). The form "Adon" is used by YHWH when *He calls Himself ha-Adon* (Exodus 34:1, 10, 23).

The concept of eternity was connected at an early date with the name YHWH. Semiramis, "the queen of heaven," had engraved on one of her temples in Egypt, "I am all

that has been, or that is, or that shall be" (Hislop, page 77). The Bible tells us that the name Yahweh was known to mankind during the time of Enos, the grandson of Adam (Genesis 4:26). So, again, we see an example of the pagans, in this case Semiramis, misappropriating the meaning of the name of Yahweh.

For some unexplainable (or misunderstood) reason, the original name of God—Yah—was extended into a verbal form, apparently Yahweh (or some similarity). Any attempt to derive the word from a trilateral root is misleading because Yahweh was not the original name (*The Mythology of all Races*, Volume V, pages 43, 388, footnote). All mythological references to the principal Deity of the twelve tribes of Israel indicate He was identical to the Amorite and Aramaean deity Hadad or Adad or Ilumarru, as well as the Sumerian Mer. The name was originally written Yaw (Yah). An Aramaic deity of Yah occurs in the name of a king Hamath who was captured by Sargon in 729 B.C. The name was written Ya-u-bi-'di (God Yah is my help).

One theory, which has considerable currency, is that Yahweh (or the variations Yahu or Yaho) is the name of a God worshipped throughout all of the vast majority of the Semitic world. It is highly probable that the name Yahweh was compounded in names of non-Israelites. Tablets relating to the first dynasty of Babylon show Ya-a'-ve-ilu, Ya-ve-ilu, and Ya-u-um (Yahweh is God) and it is believed that Yahweh was known in Babylonia *before* 2000 B.C. (The Bible demonstrates this in Genesis 4:26). A tablet assigned to the fourteenth century B.C. contains the name Ahi-Yawi. If this is correct, it demonstrates that Yahweh was worshipped in central Palestine *before* the Israelite conquest. Scholars are now agreed that, so far as Yahu and Yah is found in Babylonian texts, it is the name of a foreign god (*Encyclopaedia Britannica*, eleventh edition, article, "Jehovah").

There have been many scholars who have sought to trace the name Yahweh from Phoenician and Canaanitish tribes. This is because of the occurrence of Jehovah as a compound form in the proper names of many peoples who were not Hebrew. It is contended that the name must have been known (and used) among the heathen people (*A Dictionary of the Bible*, edited by William Smith, word, "Jehovah"). This explanation is quite feasible because of the early date of its usage. It is not likely these heathen people used the Name because of their contact with Israel as a singular reason for doing so.

A letter found in a mound northwest of the modern town of Ta'annek, written in the fifth century B.C., proves that Yah was a deity of the Canaanites. Yah is associated with the Canaanitish Mother-goddess Ashtart-Anat as seen by the Father-Mother titles of the deity of the Jews at Elephantine. There the title of Anat-Yaw is seen as well as Ashim-Bethel and Afat-Bethel where the titles of Astarte are combined with the Sun-god Bethel. At Gaza, Yah appears as a Sun-god on a coin and coins frequently were inscribed with the figure of

Ashtart-Yaw, Anat-Yaw, and Anat-Bethel which corresponds to the Phoenician Melk-Ashtart and Eshmun-Ashtart (*The Mythology of all Races*, Volume V, page 44).

Yah was identified with the Aramaic Thunder-god Adad. A coin from Gaza in southern Philisti, of the fourth century B.C. period, when the Jews were in subjection to the Persian kings, has the only known representative of the Hebrew Deity. The letters YHW were inscribed just above a hawk or some similar bird which the god held on his arm. The most likely identification of the God Yah of Gaza is that of the Hebrew, Phoenician and Aramaic Sun-god El, or Elohim whom the Hebrews had long since identified with Yah (*The Mythology of all Races*, Volume V, pages 42–43).

The name of the Hebrew God is also encountered in the cuneiform literature of the Assyrians and Babylonians. The name of the king of Hamath (eighth century B.C.), as noted, was found on an inscription of Sargon II and reads Ya-u-bid-di. This is the divine name because the determinative for "god" precedes it and this same king is called Ilu-bi-di, Ilu being the Assyrian word for "god" (*The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia*, Volume 7, article, "Yahveh").

The collection of ancient manuscripts found at the Jewish colony at Elephantine demonstrates the use of Canaanite religious terminology in conjunction with the name of Israel's God—Yahu. Such compound names as Anath-Yahu, Anath-Bethel, Ishum-Bethel, Herem-Bethel are found there. These names all represent the syncretism so prevalent in the centuries following the Israelitish conquest of Canaan. Anath, for example, was the ancient Canaanite goddess, the sister of Baal (Bruce, page 53). Baal was one of the ancient names for Nimrod (Hislop, page 232).

It was from the divine name Yah that the Greeks took their Ie in the invocation of the gods, especially the god Apollo. Like the Hebrews, this name Ie was written from right to left and inscribed over the great door of the temple of Apollo at Delphi (Taylor, page 183). Iao, a variant of the Tetragrammaton, was applied to the Graeco-Egyptian god Harpocrates or Horus. Horus was called Harpocrates by the Greeks (Cavendish, articles, "Names" and "Horus"). The ancient Greeks had an acclamation similar to Hallelujah (Praise ye Yah). They used Hallulujee in the beginning and ending of their hymns in honor of Apollo (Taylor, page 183).

It was the habit of the heathen nations, from the earliest times, to apply the appellations "Savior," "Redeemer," and "Physicians of souls" to their gods, demigods, and heroes. The appellation "Our Savior" was the usual designation of the god Aesculapius as well as of Bacchus, Jupiter, and Hercules. "Son of God" and "Savior of the world" were expressions with which the heathen were quite familiar. Mercury was distinguished in the

pagan world by the title of Logos or "The Word" (Taylor, pages 8, 153, 156, 183). Taylor is correct in his observation that the heathen used such appellations but is incorrect when he assumes the Christians copied these expressions from the heathen. The Bible reveals it was the other way around!

Orpheus, the earliest poet in Greek legend, stated that Bacchus was a lawgiver. He calls him Moses and says he was the one who gave the two tables of law. In all the ancient forms of invocation to the supreme being, similar expressions are found—expressions such as Io Terombe, Io Baccoth, Hehovah Evan!, Hevoe!, Eloah!, Io Nissi! It was from Nissi ("my banner"; one of the names of JHWH was JHWH-Nissi) that the Greeks formed Dionysius (Taylor, pages 188–189). Here is an open admission by Taylor that the heathen took the names of the true God and applied them to their deities! Much of the confusion regarding the appropriation of names has been generated by writers such as Robert Taylor, who in recognizing the absorption of paganism into what is called Christianity today, assumes the Hebrews did the same thing in the "development" of their religion. But history and the Bible demonstrate the opposite. It was the heathen, during the Old Testament period, who absorbed the names of the true God into their paganism! That the name Zeus is a corruption of the true God is seen in the Aramaean account of the Flood. When Deucalion (Noah) entered the Ark with his wife and family all the beasts came to him in couples because Zeus (Adad) had ordered it (*The Mythology of all Races*, Volume V, page 38).

Informed Bible students are aware that both the names of the Greek Zeus and the Roman Jove are derived from the Hebrew YHWH. As Paul stated, the heathen did not like to retain God in their knowledge and applied the names of God to their idols.

Result of Sacred Name Doctrine

What should be obvious to the reader is this: The various arguments advanced by Sacred Name advocates to support the notion that Yahweh is the *exclusive divine name which must be used* in order to gain salvation *cannot be substantiated*. There is no valid tradition which verifies the proper pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton. Yahweh is not an exclusive name which applies to "the Heavenly Father." Names advocates, confused as to the identity of the God of the Old Testament, assume it was the Father. The Bible clearly reveals the God of the Old Testament was the One who became Jesus Christ. The name Yahweh, or some form of this name, applied to both the Father and the Son and, as such, is a family name much like Elohim. The Bible nowhere commands the use of the Tetragrammaton as a requisite for salvation. Scriptures which Names advocates advance to support this idea are either forced or given a private interpretation. There is no historical or Biblical support for the idea that Hebrew/Aramaic is some kind of sacred language, and that the New Testament

was originally written in Aramaic and all we have today are faulty Greek translations. The obsession to use the Sacred Name had its origin in occultism and witchcraft, a fact which is absolutely proven by history. Sacred Name advocates are absolutely locked in to the concept that the word "name" in the Bible can mean one thing only—the proper pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton. The word "name" has many meanings which are not related to the proper pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton and, therefore, must not be confused with this limited interpretation. There is neither scholarly nor historical support for the Sacred Name assertion that names such as God, Lord, Christ, and Jesus are pagan in origin. What is really demonstrated by history is that *the pagans appropriated the names of the true God and applied them to their pagan deities*. This decidedly includes the Tetragrammaton.

What then is the harm in fostering such a doctrine as the exclusive use of the Sacred Name?

Sacred Name advocates tell us:

We Yahwists know that we have met Yahweh's standard of righteousness. We have seen that we were worshipping in the pagan names and have acknowledged our sins and have forsaken the names of Baalim, such names as Lord, Adonai, God, Theos, Zeus, Deus, Kurios, Pan, Dios and what other false idols there are. It is the use of these pagan names that makes the King James version of the Bible a false translation.

We of the Assemblies of Yahweh are preaching the kingdom message to the nations of the world. It is imperative that we preach whose kingdom it will be. The name is that of the Almighty Heavenly Father and Yashua the Messiah. Right now you are reading the last warning message to go out to the world just before the Savior returns. The saving message of the Sacred Name will be heralded to all the earth as a witness. We must begin to call upon the Sacred Name if we wish to find salvation. Our purpose and goal of life is to declare the Name of Yahweh as a witness to all the world in these last days. Now are the closing days of this age when the Name must be restored. It is obvious that the Savior's Name will be of vital importance. This is why the Sacred Name message is being preached once again at the close of this age. There is a great work to be done, "my people shall know my name." It is our duty to preach this witness. It is so vital that prophecy cannot be fulfilled until it is done. The Name was the issue in the days of the Messiah and it will be the issue as this age comes to a close. We are the modern day extension of the pure worship offered by Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob to Yahweh.

It should not take the reader long to recognize that many of the comments in the above paragraph or two are based on prophetic assumption. Prophetic assumption is the result of exclusiveness. The exclusiveness of the Sacred Name movement, with regard to the fulfillment of prophecy, is based on the faulty concept that it is those who know and use the Sacred Name who are the true people of God. The material presented in this article clearly disproves such claims about the knowledge and exclusiveness of the "Sacred Name." What the Bible reveals about prophecy is that it cannot be understood *in advance* except by means of direct revelation from God in the form of a dream, vision, angel, or God Himself speaking. Otherwise, prophecy can be understood only after it happens and even this is a revelation. The entire concept that the Sacred Name movement is fulfilling the prophecies about preaching the end time message is prophetic assumption. Sacred Name advocates will most surely be disappointed, as have others who have preceded them with similar notions. In their pursuit to fulfill prophecy the Scriptures are forced and literalism is used excessively. The result is that the Scriptures are forced beyond the limits of context.

Since there is no divine command or instruction to use the Sacred Name, the only logical conclusion that can be drawn is that there is no basis for the assertion that we must use the Sacred Name exclusively in our worship. Those who attempt to force prophecy should realize Revelation 19:12 tells us the specific personal name of the Son has *not yet been revealed*. And this is clearly the case with the Heavenly Father, also. Neither Yahweh or Yahshua constitute the specific personal names of God, the Father, and Jesus Christ. Psalm 138:2 clearly says in the Hebrew text that His Word is magnified far above His name. Even when Josephus wrote his history of the Jews and made a copy in Greek he did not use any other form for the Messiah than Jesus. During Christ's ministry, He did *not* preach against the omission of the Tetragrammaton, contrary to what Sacred Name advocates try to infer.

Since it is God who is responsible for the various languages which exist today, it is His responsibility to correct the situation when He is ready. This will not be done by the efforts of men who view God as being so feeble that He must employ their service. Those who try to force prophecy in their self-righteous attempts to "do God's Work" are destined to bring only confusion and trouble upon themselves. God is quite capable of doing His own work and does not need well-meaning but misguided people to "muddy the waters." All prophecies relating to a pure language and the correct knowledge of God's Name relate to the Millennium when Jesus Christ returns, a time which the Bible says man will not really experience until the event happens.

Unless one accepts the premise that the New Testament was written in Hebrew/Aramaic and not Greek, the rest of the arguments advanced by Sacred Name advocates have little significance. The real result of the Sacred Name movement is that it

leads to disbelief in the inspired Word of God. Since, according to them, there are no inspired Scriptures of the New Testament but only faulty Greek translations, only the Old Testament can be relied upon. Yet, Sacred Name advocates do not really believe the Old Testament. If they did, they would readily see the inspired Old Testament usage of the Names of God completely shatters their concept of the exclusive use of the Sacred Name. According to them, righteousness is obtained by knowing and using the Sacred Name. Salvation is the result of what *they do*, and not what God is doing through Jesus Christ. To Sacred Name advocates there can be no reliance upon the New Testament. This assumption leads them to the same dismal end—a lack of faith in God and in the preservation of His inspired word. To accept the belief that there is no inspired New Testament, of necessity, requires the view that the early Christians were so indifferent and careless that they allowed the original writings of the Apostles and others to be completely replaced without a word of protest. Such an assumption is preposterous. God is looked upon as some kind of weakling while Satan has, by means of his great power, managed to pervert and corrupt the sure word of God. The end result of accepting the Sacred Name doctrine is complete disbelief in the inspiration of the New Testament. The Sacred Name doctrine is a dangerous doctrine. The idea that we do not have the "God-breathed" text of the New Testament must be viewed in the light of the fact that we do not have the original Old Testament text either. With this line of reasoning, we have no inspired Word of God at all.

If God went to the trouble to inspire the New Testament in Aramaic, as Names advocates say, then why would He allow it to become a corrupt and unreliable Greek text? Surely, such a concept is an open denial of the power and love of God! If God is as concerned about the world as Sacred Name advocates say He is, we can be sure He did not let His word "fall to the ground."