

* * * * *

Visions of Eternity

Quest for Immortality!

by K.M.Young



Saving Truth Herein
for the Appetite of Lean Sheep
Abomination Removed

This is a magic book: read it,
pass it on, and get the blessing!
Or cast it away, and go without.

Golden Eggs Booklets
4~TARA's Little Leather Library &
M&M's Mission~StarNet Ministry

k.m.young (c) 2001~7~13
Library of Congress Catalogue #'s
TXu1-111-688(c)01~TXu1-356-631(c)07~
TXu1-848-909-2013

~All Rights Reserved~

8-14-15

4/30/16

* * * * *

49. Name on a White Stone

The Sacred Names of Elohim

He hath shown me His face, His name I can tell;
its Outside, and besides, Within me as well.
His name 'tis Compassion, 'tis Companion and Friend;
its Artist, its Here and There, Beginning and End!
His name is Forever, His name is a Wonder;
Wisdom Abundance and Terrible Thunder!
His name is Delight in His Son and His Daughter;
'tis Grief in the Loss of Sister or Brother!
O' I pray always, to stand by His side,
never to leave, in spite of my Pride;
To eat of His Bread and drink of His Wine;
to accept what He gives, so to call His name Mine!

In Greek there is no 'sh' sound, nor symbol for such. Also, the 's' at the end of the Greek name "Iesous" indicates a masculine noun, whereas an 'a' at the end (*as in "Yahshua"*) would indicate a feminine noun. And so the Greeks did not indicate the 'sh' sound in the middle of the Hebrew-Aramaic name Yahshua; and also, dropped the 'a' at the end of the word, putting an 's' in its place (*changing the name to Iesous*), indicating masculinity. Same with Latin, which came up with "Iesus" from the Greek "Iesous." Latin has the same difficulty with the pronunciation of the 'sh' sound, and also has awkward masculine and feminine indications on their nouns. Spanish likewise has this same difficulty in transliteration. This is how the linguistic corruption of the Hebrew/Aramaic name "Yahshua" originally came to be, in these languages. "Iesous/Iesus" was further linguistically corrupted by the recent introduction of the 'J' for indication of the Hebrew-Aramaic 'ia'/y sound, and so now we have this quite corrupted form "Jesus," which is not even remotely a Hebrew/Aramaic name, but only a tortured failure in transliteration.

Nevertheless English does not have these linguistic obstacles and is perfectly adequate to the task of correct transliteration (*phonetic sounding*) of our Savior's Hebrew name, having a 'y' for the 'ia' sound (*at the*

beginning of the word "Iahshua = Yahshua"), and an 'sh' sound and symbol; besides having no awkward masculine or feminine endings. And so therefore the more versatile English can have no difficulty transliterating the Hebrew name "Yahshua," which is a correct English phonetic rendition of that Hebrew/ Aramaic name (or *Yeshua* with a "vowel drift"). "Joshua," the dated old English and Jewish traditional version of "Yahshua," proves adequate enough (*especially in dated text*), even though the modern 'J' only symbolically represents the 'ia' sound, as the text follows through with the correct 'shua,' coming up with "Joshua," identified and used by Jews everywhere as a legitimate form of the Hebrew "Yahshua"; but "Jesus" is not even close. For the Greek and Latin speaking peoples who continue to struggle with this difficulty in transliteration and who cannot properly master the 'sh' sound and/or 'a' ending sound, "Iesus" perhaps must do until they become inspired to want to pronounce this Hebrew saving name correctly? But in English, "Jesus" may have been adequate to uninformed Faith, but certainly it never was nor will be adequate to scholarship and truth. "Jesus" is an English corruption of the Latin "Iesus," which is a corruption of the Greek "Iesus," which in turn is a corruption of the Hebrew "Yahshua": such are not English transliterations of (**uowby* = יהושע) at all, but "Yahshua" is a perfectly adequate and accurate transliteration of the Savior's true Hebrew name. (**uowby*-typewriter keys)

Hebrews 4:8 (*regarding the son of Nun*) helps Yahwist Nazarenes make the point for the complete discontinuation of the erroneous usage of the corrupt form "Jesus" (*KJV's errant text, "if Jesus had given them rest"; as opposed to the correct text "if Joshua had given them rest" in ASV update*); the ancient Aramaic Peshitta adds "the son of Nun" in this passage (*which is also indicative of the Peshitta's originality: see Lamsa's~1933,.. and Murdock's ~1851*). For if the 'original' Greek "Iesus" is transliterated into the Latin "Jesus" for the son of Nun, it must likewise follow suit that it should be transliterated thus for the Son of Yah who shares the same identical name as Moses' general, no? But instead, this faulty 1600's KJV passage

subtly indicates that "Jesus," not being the name of the son of Nun, can likewise neither be the name of the Son of Yah, and thus can only be a corruption of the original name "Joshua." And so during the time of the Protestant Reformation after 1611 at least, studious English speaking Nazarenes, by means of this 'oversight' of the name of the son of Nun by the translators of the KJV (*in Hebrews 4:8*), might discern the true sacred name of "Joshua" from the corrupted form "Jesus," using their Old Testaments. Therefore some English Nazarenes had, for centuries, the opportunity to here discern the true name of their Savior, by scrutinizing this oddly errant English text, in spite of the traditional form presented to them by their trusted scholars. Likewise English speaking Nazarenes could have discerned that this oversight concerning the sacred name "Joshua," by those errant scholars, may have been indicative of a subtle collective bias which has traditionally permeated Christianity, which bias seems to be reflected in this errant KJV text, as those translators evidently were quite able to discern, even from their own Hebrew Old Testaments, that the biblical Savior's sacred name was the Hebrew, "Joshua," but refrained from testifying thus, before all, solidifying this linguistic Latin profanity of "Jesus/lesus" in Christian tradition even unto these modern times. Though this particular singular error in KJV's Hebrews 4:8 may eventually have been corrected in a few later translations, nevertheless English Version translators henceforth refused to apply suchlike corrections throughout the rest of their later New Testament translations (*ex. where many were vigilant to attempt to restore the sacred name of the Father even as 'Jehovah,' few attempted to restore this sacred name of Joshua/Yahshua; even the astute JB Rotherham did not restore this correct name in his NT even though he went to great lengths to fully restore "Yahweh" to his Old Testament translation*). Thus all of these systematically transliterated ALL the names of "lesous" into "Jesus," even in spite of the glaring witness of Hebrews 4:8, their further supplanting the Hebrew sacred saving name of the biblical Messiah with the traditionally accepted but erroneous and thus unsacred and so unsaving and thus profane "Jesus." Still, this glaring old errant verse, to this day, remains a historical

witness, forever substantiating the original sacred Saving name "Joshua," in spite of any and all Latinized scholars who remain intent on validating the traditionally accepted errant form "Jesus (Iesus)" even at the entire expense of Saving Truth, which corrupt form has until recently thus survived in almost all English Bible translations, even in spite of that KJV's translators' accidental revelation of this most sacred name. And yet have English speaking Nazarenes the opportunity to determine Yahshua's true name as being the same identical name as Moses' general, the son of Nun, even by scrutiny of this errant text, without modern scholastic revelations, in spite of all the many compromising scholars who continue to betray the Word of El with their biased and traditionally erroneous supplanting of this singular Saving name. (*see Textus Receptus~kju*)

One can speak "Yahshua" in Aramaic, as well as write it in such, but not so in Greek. And so it is not difficult to deduce that the name of salvation was obscured and then corrupted to the masses of our world, from the time of the translations of the original Aramaic texts, into Greek, and thereafter. Considering Isaiah 42:8, I would expect Yah has His prophetic purpose in obscuring His own sacred name (*as well as His Son's name*), His declaring His own name would NOT be used in the profane practices of idolatry/nature worship, and so it is true. Neither Yahshua's nor Yahweh's true names, to my knowledge, have ever been used in the ritual practices of Nature/Sun veneration, even as "*names of baalim*." Those who use "Yahshua" ("Joshua") are quite correct and must be respected for their proper English rendition of this Hebrew name. To use the already corrupted forms, when we do in fact have the uncorrupted form available to us, is more respecting tradition and expediency than scholarship and Truth. For to perpetuate ignorance of this singular name of Salvation in which the Eternal Promise of Yah is granted, merely for the sake of sentiment, tradition, and expediency, carries responsibility that I would not willingly bear. Compassion and faith are not evidenced on or in a man who suffered and died in our place, when we can absolutely flatly refuse to acknowledge and honor his unique, precious, noteworthy name, which he will forever bear.

"Jesus" never was linguistically related to the original Hebrew name "Yahshua" (*"Iashua or Joshua"*) except as a corruption of a corruption of a corruption. The truth is that the Son of Yah's name is Yahshua, and his Father's name is Yahweh, "if thou canst tell" (*Proverbs 30:4*). Ask ANY Jew and he or she will tell you "Jesus" is not a Hebrew name, but "Yahshua" (Joshua) is. And as Holy Writ promises, "My people will know My name," thus the Hebrew Father Deity's name cannot be a 'lost' pronunciation, at least to His people, Israel. Ask ANY Jew, and he or she will acknowledge that the Creator's name is Yahweh. How can we honestly indicate the sacred name of our most high Creator to be unsacred, even when Messiah himself tells us to pray "Hallowed be Thy name?" Our being zealous for Saving Truth, compelled by the Spirit to embrace All Truth, thus are we desirous to know our Maker's and His Son's true names. The bottom line is, as true Nazarenes, we just HAVE to know, despite anyone's opinions or any other obstacle, because the Spirit compels us!

Now the sacred name "Yahweh" (*"Ever ~ living Creator"*) has rarely been obscured by a corruption, but typically by unsacred titles, fostered by an old Hebrew tradition which developed around the time of the Jewish "Captivity" in ancient Babylon, when the Jews adopted the Aramaic~Chaldean language (*or "tongue"*) which was the vernacular (*or common*) language of their captors, in Babylon and the "fertile crescent" lands of ancient Mesopotamia (*betwixt the Tigris and Euphrates rivers*). Thence, the sacred name of Yahweh was commonly obscured by a simple substituted title: "Adonay" in Hebrew; "Kurios" in Greek; and sometimes by "God"; (*and now, "LORD" in English*). Perhaps the captive Israelites did not wish to profane the sacred name of El by submitting it to the tortures of transliteration into 'profane' languages (*i.e. other than Hebrew, a sentiment which yet persists in Israel to this day*)? But for whatever reason, the tradition 'stuck.' Thus the sacred name YHWH-יהוה and its true pronunciation has not been lost so much as it has been obscured, or omitted entirely by means of unsacred titles (*God/LORD*).

The RSV's 1952 Preface (*Nelson & Sons, N.Y.*) indicates: (*quote:*) "... the Name was originally pronounced 'Yahweh': this pronunciation was not indicated when the Masoretes added vowel signs to the ... Hebrew text. To the four (letters)... of the name ... (are) attached vowel signs, indicating that in its place should be read the Hebrew word 'Adonai,' meaning 'Lord' (or 'Elohim,' meaning 'God'). The ancient Greek translators substituted the word 'Kyrios' (Lord) for the Name. The Vulgate used the Latin word 'Dominus (Lord).'" (*end quote*).

These titles: "LORD"; "Kurios"; "Adonai"; and "God" (*see below, Strong's*), are not names and are not original to the Old Testament Texts, but have been substituted in the place of the original name Yahweh (*i.e. the title 'LORD,' over the name Yahweh*), about 7000 times in the Old Testament, in errant translations whose traditional Jewish and Christian translators supplanted the sacred name with these unsacred titles.

Newberry's Bible~1959 (*Wyman & Sons, of London*) says (*quote*): "Elohim, plural of Eloah: 'God,' plural of Eloah, occurs about 2500 times (Eloah occurs about 56 times); first in Genesis 1:1, 'In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.' Here it is joined to a verb in the singular, 'God (Elohim, plural) created..'" (*end quote*). ...Here I perceive in the original Hebrew texts, that the word "Elohim" (*God/s*) may be used in a singular OR plural tense, depending upon whether it is attached to a singular or plural verb, and is occasionally used for BOTH singular and plural words (*Elohim = God/Gods, as in Joshua 24:19, below**). It may be easy to understand such linguistic subtleties in Hebrew, but it is lost in all of the English translations. This is probably where much if not most of the confusion regarding the singular "El/God" and the plural "Elohim/Gods" began, which confusion may lead to erroneous conceptions and false conclusions regarding the true nature of Deity, and misconstrues the relationship betwixt Yahweh and Yahshua. But Genesis 1:1 might rather be read in the English PLURAL, as "In the beginning, Gods (or) Elohim created the heavens and the Earth," as indicated in the following: (*good example of above note**)

Genesis 1:26; "And Gods/Elohim said, 'Let us make man in our image.'"

Genesis 3:22; "as one of us.";

Genesis 20:13; "When Gods/Elohim caused me to wander."

Joshua 24:19; "He is a holy Gods/Elohim."*

It is difficult to understand translations of Holy Writ clearly, wherever such original texts have been so awkwardly translated from the original Hebrew plural word for "mighty ones" (or 'Gods') as in "Elohim," to the English singular, "God" ("El = Eloah"). My revised versions of **John 1:1+** and **Genesis 1:1+** (*below*) exhibit how a clearer translation can effect a much better understanding of the true nature of Deity and His relationship with His Son Yahshua:

"In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with El(oah); and the Word was Elohim; this Same (Word) was with El, in the Beginning. All that Exists was made by and through him (through this Word), and without him was not anything made that exists." (*John 1:1+*)

and...:

"In the beginning Elohim created the heavens and the earth...; and Elohim said, 'Let us make man in our image, after our likeness'; And El created man in his image, in the image of Elohim He created him: male and female they created them." (*Gen. 1:1+*).

(My revisions, here, incorporate the old KJV texts).

Here, is better clarified, that Yahshua and Yahweh both created the Heavens and the Earth, together; and that Yahshua, though "the beginning of El's creation" (*Rev. 3:14*) and thus is created, nevertheless is exceedingly old, having been "in the beginning" **with** Yahweh but **not as** Yahweh, in the Creation of Cosmos.

Now the sacred name of Yahweh is written from right to left, with the tenth, fifth, and sixth letters of the Hebrew alphabet, as יהוה :

#10. yodh = י / (y);

#5. he or hay = ה / (h);

#6. waw or wow = ו / (w), ('vauv');

#5. he/hay = ה / (h) ;

This "Tetragrammaton" (hwhy = יהוה) is derived from the verb **hawah** (hwh=הוה), the old written form of **hayah** (hyh=היה), meaning (*hawah = hayah = haiah: prime root*) TO BE; to become; to exist; to cause; to breathe. Here, combined past--present--future into one word ("was ~ is ~ will be" = "I AM" ~ Revelation 1:1).

In "Biblical Hebrew ~1976" (David McKay Co., NY, 10017), the author, R. K. Harrison, says (*quote*): "The Hebrew alphabet comprises 22 letters, all of which are consonants..." (*end quote*). The 22 letters may be consonants, of course, but the vowel sounds "between" the consonants remain undisputed, as Harrison interestingly determines below (*quote-pg.14*):

"The Semites had a liberal sprinkling of vowel sounds in their words, and seem to have been almost unable to pronounce two or three consonants together. Thus a word like "rhythm" would probably have been broken up into three syllables by placing a very short vowel sound between the 'r' and the 'h', regarding the 'y' as an 'i' in sound, and placing a further vowel between the last two letters of the word."* (*end quote*)

note: this observation may apply to 'h(a)w(a)h ~ (hwh-הוה)' = old form; 'h(a)y(a)h ~ h(a)i(a)h ~ (hyh-היה)' = new form: which likely is why some English translators wound up with the three syllable Ya-ha-veh/Ya-ha-wah (*which probably was misconstrued to the common Jehovah*).

As Meyers reveals to us, this/the oldest form of the Tetragrammaton, with the 'waw' (וה-יה), is indicated on the ancient Moabite stone,

written by the Moabite king Mesha, without the Masoretic vowel pointing which came much later. As the "old form" of the verb 'hawah/הוה' is spelled with the 'w-ו' which the modern form 'hayah/היה' (haiah) indicates to be a 'y' or 'ia' sound, so the old way to say the sacred name's 'ו-w' (waw) is in vowel form (a soft 'oo' or long 'u' sound - ו = w = y = ia), even as Josephus indicated (*below*). These aforesaid observations substantiate the observant Jacob Meyers of Bethel, PA. (19507), who states in his free tract, "YHVH or Yahweh?" (*summarized*): 'the Tetragrammaton is correctly transliterated as Yahweh, pronouncing the 'ו-w' (waw) softly, as a Latin 'u', or 'w/long-u/oo' sound.' (*end quote*). Meyers (*and RSV*) mentions (*here, summarized*) that 'it was when the modern consonant "j" was introduced in the 1600's, that the confusion about the "w (ו)''-waw" being transliterated as a hard consonantal "v" started. Nevertheless Josephus had observed (*and recorded*) the sacred Tetragrammaton written upon the brow of the ancient Israelite Sanctuary's High Priest': (*quote*) "A mitre... of fine linen encompassed his head (high priest's), ...tied by a blue riband, about which ...another golden crown, ...graven the sacred name of EL: it consists of **four vowels**." (*end quote*).

Therefore the sacred name of Yahweh sounds as it reads in English **and** Hebrew vowel form, even with the 'w' (waw) being pronounced softly as a long 'u' or 'oo,' (הוהי), as vowels (= 'i - ya - oo - eh'). Thus I wholly agree the Tetragrammaton is correctly transliterated in this more commonly accepted vowel form, "Y-a-h-w-e-h= (הוהי)," with the 'ו' uttered as 'waw,' even as Josephus indicated the sacred name was originally written and spoken, and with due respect to many or all archeologists' and other noteworthy scholars' observations. The above says enough for me, but some yet insist "Jehovah" withstands scholastic scrutiny, about which I beg to differ.

JEHOVAH?

As for "Yahaveh" or "Jehoveh"; (1952) RSV's *quote*: "The form 'Jehovah' is of late medieval origin; it is a combination of the consonants of the Divine Name, and the vowels attached to it by the Masoretes but belonging to an entirely different word ('adonai'). The sound of 'y' is represented by 'j,' and the sound of 'w' by 'v' as in Latin. Thus some pronounce the 'v' as a consonant, as in 'Yah-vah' or 'Yehovah' (Young's names it Yahweh; Strong's names it Yehovah)." (*end quote*). Nevertheless the RSV further insists (*quote*): "the word 'Jehovah' does not accurately represent any form of the Name ever used in Hebrew." (*end quote*).

In the American People's Encyclopedia ~ 1952, under 'Jehovah,' (Volume 11 – page 599), is this *quote*: "Many critics contend for Hebrew Yahveh, some for Yahvah, and some for Yahaveh" (*end quote*). Considering all of the above, I would venture that the dated medieval latinized consonantal hybrid "Jehovah" is more correctly read without the additional modern 'J,' as in 'Ya-ha-wah.' I can see no 'long-o' in 'יהוה'/'hw-hy' ('hw-o-hy'), but the transliterated vowel sounds are rather 'u/oo': 'Yah-oo/u-eh, Yah-oo/u-ah, Yh-oo/w-h' (as Jacob Meyers clarifies). So it seems that 'Yahavah,' or rather the more accurate 'Yahaweh' is a long version of hwhy/יהוה (i-ah-ha-oo-eh), and thus is not a true corruption of this sacred name as is the entirely erroneous and dated "Jehovah," nor a persistent substitute as is the title, "LORD." In various stages of biblical Hebrew literary understanding, the faithful might come up with Yahvah, or Yahaveh, or Yahawah/Yahayah: these are not necessarily unsacred names and titles that purposefully supplant the sacred name of Yahweh with names and titles (*even of the baalim*), but are linguistically related though differing transliterations and pronunciations ascribed to the mysterious Tetragrammaton in an attempt to revere Yah's name, which striving for Saving Truth must not in due course remain unrewarded; the reward must be the eventual realization of the

correct form of this "hallowed" Hebrew name: respectfully embracing and applying the revealed correct form in spite of any stubbornly clinging errant traditions of various Nazarene sects, actually is more fully revering it.

Considering the Tetragrammaton is correctly transliterated in vowel form, therefore the well known and undisputed root verb form 'hawah=hayah=haiah' can only eliminate the post medieval hybrid form of pronunciation, "Jehovah," which technically cannot 'cut the mustard' with its modern 'j' and errant 'o' and 'v' sounds: as the 'j' is dated (*above*); the 'vauv' is really a 'waw'; and there is no long 'o' between the 'w-h.' Who may insist on using 'Jehovah,' would more accurately represent the Tetragrammaton and still remain within the bounds of acceptability, using the longer and linguistically acceptable variant form, Ya-ha-weh (Ya-haw-ah), enunciating "ia-ha-oo/w-eh," or "ya-ha-oo/w-ah," which includes the full unabbreviated verb for "existence." In Yah-weh or Y-ah-oo-eh, there are actually four subtle syllables: "i-a-oo-a" or "i-ah-oo-eh" (*written in consonants with/as silent vowels*). Some may insist on using English or Latin consonants for Hebrew vowel sounds, but the two Indo-European languages are not entirely relatable, and Semetic Hebrew is a whole other subject it may help some to better understand.

Yahweh or YaHUweh?

Everyone approaches the sacred name according to their experience and information, nevertheless, both Yahweh and YahUweh are really the same pronunciation, just different ways of spelling it with English letters, and different emphasis on the syllables-with YahUweh having that extra syllable in Hebrew as Harrison indicated above.*

One way of pronunciation emphasizes the central syllable, another way of pronunciation emphasizes the first syllable: the "i" creates three syllables, Yahweh is four (i-ah-oo-eh), but it is pretty much the same:

Yahweh is not two syllables as some may imagine (Yah-weh), it is actually four, i-ah-oooo-eh, with a **w** sound which manifests between the "oooo" and the "eh" (i-ah-**w**-eh).

The *y* represents the *i*, and can be illustrated in this way:

Y-ah-oooo (or 'HU')-eh.

I-ah-oooo-eh.

or even EEE-AHH-UUU-EH,

which also can be pronounced: Ya-hu-eh. or.. I-a-HU-eh. or.. Ia-Hu-weh.

So, there really is NO argument. But some might neglect this info as they may tend to use the three syllable form YahHUweh in order to differentiate themselves from other sacred name sects. (*chap. 50, #3068*)

What Nazarenes are supposed to be doing is 'chucking' the terms or titles of "baalim," removing the Abomination, "LORD," that supplants the sacred name of Yahweh (*as in the OT, 7000 times*). The term LORD is commonly applied to the Sun Deity of modern Babylon since antiquity (*the Sumerians referred to Enlil as Lord*), and thus as an identifying title of the baalim, can be perceived to be profane as a substitute name for Yahweh: Sun Worship is the "Abomination," to Yahweh. Nevertheless, how we pronounce the tetragrammaton, depends on the information we already have, as well as our biases.

As I made clear, above, the Hebrews had vowels, they just didn't write them with letters that represented vowels. Same with the Phoenicians. The Phoenician alphabet has four letters (aleph-ayin-vav-yud) that are consonants that are used as vowels also; these would be the same four letters in Hebrew, likewise: they use those four consonant letters as vowels too! Wonderfully, all four of these versatile letters make up the written name of Yahweh, (hwhy=) יהוה.

((In Heb. the "ayin" is a "guadal stop" and also used as a vowel in Heb.---this letter ayin is also used in Arabic but is never used as a vowel, therein))

The early Hebrew alphabet was taken from the old or proto-*(Greek, for "first")* Phoenician, that would be the PROTO-HEBREW alphabet, which is the same as the Phoenician from which most alphabets are derived. *((as I said above, Same there too, in Phoenician there are four consonants that are used as vowels, too.))*

Linguistics is a complex subject. I am happy when everyone just realizes that the old unsacred vague title LORD is supplanting the sacred tetragrammaton, in English translations, and so with that knowledge we reject LORD and start using the sacred name that "LORD" supplants, howsoever we pronounce it (lahweh). Its a big step, and puts us all in a whole other category, some Nazarenes being afraid to take that step because it sometimes gets them ostracized from their churches who are afraid of Religiosity often associated with Yahwism. Nevertheless that is the commitment Yahweh likes to see, in us. Remember, the important Name of SALVATION is simple and nobody is arguing much about that *(Iashua or Yahshua in its legitimate short form)*.

Now in the '76 version of Rotherham's, they sometimes use the entire tetragrammaton in the saving name of Yahshua, as YahwehShua; but Mr. Rotherham in his 1897 Original Emphasized version never used the name Yashua, but only "Jesus." It is important to discard the name Jesus which is not the name of salvation but the name applied to the "antichrist" tree spirit of ancient Babylon by modern Babylon: this tree spirit is significantly different than the Nazarene, Yahshua, though there may be superficial similarities in the lore of this tree spirit and in the reality of the Nazarene. As the pagan religion of Sun or Nature worship is Satan's original deception *(or 'red herring')*, even a counterfeit and mockery of Yahweh's Plan of Salvation, therefore we can expect suchlike similarities, which are quite superficial and insubstantial, Sun Worship being a religion of slavery and human sacrifice, but the Faith of the Nazarene is all about emancipation from Slavery: coming out of Babylon, coming out of slavery and overcoming human sacrifice, or making others expendable.

The important thing to remember is that no matter how many ways we may come up with, to pronounce the sacred name of Yahweh (lahweh), the sacred name of Yahshua is the name whereby we are saved. And nobody is arguing about how to pronounce Yahshua, much, as it is easy, even having the abbreviated form of the sacred name therein: lah=Y-ah/I-ah. That would be, I-ah- (two syllables) SHU-a, (two more syllables), thus four syllables all together. Now I place emphasis on the "i", pronounced as a long "e" in English: in Hebrew this first letter, **i**, pronounced as a long **e**, in English, is represented by one of the Hebrew consonants that are also used as a vowel = the yod-**y** = E-(ah-oo-eh). This is the Saving name that binds us together, in our Faith and the Holy Alliance of Cosmos' Freeborn (uvwhy = יהושע = Yah Saves).

Now my linguist consultant says that in Hebrew it is the LAST syllable which is stressed, most of the time, but in alot of Hebrew words this is not the case. He does not know which syllable of Yahweh (or I-a-hu-weh), is stressed. Some stress the middle syllable; some, the beginning; some, the end. He also adds to all this, that there is no contention about whether or not we should use the form Y**e**shua, as opposed to Y**a**hshua, the Yeshua form having, what is called by linguists, a "vowel drift." He uses Yeshua, and I use Yahshua, and we have no contention.

About the Letters of the Hebrew script,
with which the Tetragrammaton was originally penned

Paleo (-Hebrew) is Greek for OLD, so this would be the OLD Hebrew script: now, "old"/paleo-Hebrew is written in the Phoenician script: the Hebrew and Phoenician languages were like sister languages and mutually intelligible, and came from the same source language/ unknown (*Dialects thereof*); they are so closely related that the Hebrews easily adapted the Phoenician alphabet for their own language. The Canaanites WERE the Phoenicians. Their Phoenician alphabet is the first real alphabet: most if not all alphabets are descendants of the Phoenician alphabet. The Greeks got their alphabet from the Phoenicians, etc.

Aramaic (*also a semitic language*) script is likewise a descendant of the Phoenician alphabet. Aramaic and Hebrew are sister languages too, but are NOT mutually intelligible. Even the modern Hebrew alphabet is a takeoff of the Phoenician alphabet, but with very stylized characters so that we cannot easily see the connection. They are in the same alphabetical order, with the same letters, but each character looks quite different.

So whether or not the original or former script of the Tetragrammaton is "*puer*" than the latter, as some posture, is at least questionable, and at most, laughable.

There are some Yahwist sects that like to think these unique letters of the now long dead Phoenician script the Hebrews borrowed for their first alphabet, are somehow 'puer' than the latter Hebrew or English letters, for use of the Tetragrammaton or any other language, nevertheless just a little knowledge clears up all confusion.

What is the Name on a White Stone?

As for the mysterious "Name on a White Stone," Revelation clearly states this "new name" is the "WORD" of El, which name is not lost on Nazarenes in general, as those who figure it out, understand:

Revelation 2:17; "...and I will give him a white stone, and on the stone a new name written, which no one knows but he who receives it.":

3:12; "He that overcometh... I will write upon him my new name.":

19:12; "...He has ...a name written, which no one knows but he himself.":

19:13; "...His name is called the Word of El."

Original Greek, or Chaldean~Aramaic New Testament?

In "[Biblical Hebrew~76](#)," R. K. Harrison says, (*quote*): "Hebrew is one of the northwest Semitic group of languages which also includes Phoenician, Punic, Moabitic and Aramaic. It has considerable affinity with Arabic as well. Aramaic increased in influence particularly after the Exile, and towards the start of the Christian era it supplanted Hebrew as the spoken language of the Israelites." (*end quote*). By my own observations, I would project that the so called 'original' Greek Scriptures THEORY (*of the New Testament being originally written in Greek*) is doubtful, in light of scholarship and scripture, besides illogical. Considering much evidence, including the above, I must conclude that John's and Matthew's texts were originally written in their contemporary vernacular Aramaic, even considering their peculiar writings and language backgrounds. A good example upon which I can safely make this point is [Matthew 19:24](#), which uses the Aramaic word "gamia" (*according to Lamsa's translation of the Aramaic or Syriac Peshitta ~ page 974*) which in Aramaic means "camel" as well as "rope" (*no doubt rope was made from camel hair, thus the two objects named, are one word applied to both meanings*). And so when that word "gamia" was being translated into the Greek, evidently from the Aramaic texts, such an error could easily occur and evidently did, leaving us with the silly translation we yet perplex over today (*in our King James/other versions of the New Testament*), of "it is easier for a CAMEL to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter Yah's kingdom." ...heh! Anyone can only agree that "ROPE" is the more plausible translation, considering the metaphor, in spite of all the silly speculations for this simple translation error which evidently occurred when the early Mediterranean Nazarenes translated their Aramaic texts into Greek.

As Aramaic was the vernacular (*or common*) language in Israel in the Apostle's times, so it stands to reason that Matthew, a tax collector, had to be literate in this Aramaic, at least enough to perform his many tasks and communications in his vernacular language, and likely in Hebrew and

Latin, as well. Aramaic also was the language of Yahshua's disciples (*even Peter's, Acts 2:7*). Also does Holy Writ indicate that John, even with the witness of *Revelation 9:11*, was likely using Aramaic for his texts as well: this text seems to indicate that a third language was being referred to, also giving the meaning of the word "destroyer" in a Greek translation as well as a Hebrew translation ~ "whose name in the Hebrew tongue is Abaddon, and in the Greek, Appollyon," thus instructing in another language which is neither Hebrew nor Greek, and so can only be in the remaining vernacular Aramaic, and not likely in the Roman Latin, (*still, some may disagree, but that seems obvious enough to me*). Therefore it is likely that John's texts had been originally penned in the vernacular Aramaic, as well as Matthew's. Both Hebrew and Aramaic are Semitic languages, closely related (*though not mutually intelligible*), even having a common ancestor language before Abraham (*who was out of "Ur of the Chaldees"*). That would make them both dialects of a common ancestor language ("*Common Semitic, an unwritten language*"), and not dialects of each other as some presume. "Yahshua" is the same in Aramaic as in Hebrew. And so the name "Yahshua" was evidently obscured at the time of the translations of the original Aramaic texts into the Greek language and texts, and thereafter. With this observation it is evident that the Savior's true name was indeed originally written and spoken by his first disciples, even other than the Twelve, expectedly. And now we have this precious once-obscured name fully restored to us in modern times, in some modern updated English translations of the Sacred Scriptures. Yahweh's original name has been entirely restored to us in J.B. Rotherham's renowned and most excellent O.T., which he is said to have started publishing in 1868, finished in 1902.

I actually have little doubt at all that most if not all of the New Testament texts were firstly penned in Aramaic (*the Aramaic Peshitta is from their original Aramaic texts*), and then translated from those Aramaic texts, to the Greek texts. Having done a little more research into the Peshitta, online, I found some extremely interesting scholarship that illustrates the accuracy of the Aramaic Peshitta as opposed to the

accuracy of the Greek, and so forth, which I hope to make available off my websites at least. Nevertheless, the article also indicates the Greek is similarly accurate, as well.

Anyway, some claim there were Hebrew texts that preceded the Greek/Aramaic texts, which I doubt. I only here mention what seems obvious to all, how, whether in Hebrew or Aramaic, the original name of the Nazarene was used by his original witnesses and their converts, until the time/thereafter, of the Aramaic texts' translations into Greek; and that this unique and sacred name Yahshua (Iashua) was NOT denied by these original witnesses and their Hebrew/Aramaic converts, and theirs'; and thus we should likewise not deny the Savior's sacred Saving name, hallowed by his own innocent blood.

note: "Syriac" was the form of Aramaic spoken in Syria, and Aramaic and Syriac are the same language; it was a very widespread (*vernacular*) language spoken in the Middle East prior to the advent of Arabic which eventually supplanted Aramaic in most places. Very few speak Aramaic in Syria anymore, because of its replacement by Arabic.

As counterfeit truth never will be acceptable 'currency' in the Kingdom of Yahweh, I suppose that now is as good a time as any, for the Faithful to remove the "abomination" (*or corruption*) from the holy places of our minds and hearts: to remove the profane names from out of the holy Sanctuary of Truth. As the Contract or Covenant of Salvation is only to be claimed in the sacred and Saving name of Yah's Son, so it behooves the Devil to ensure that we have not this knowledge or name, that we might not lay legal claim to the promises of this contract. The Devil knows "Yahshua" is the only name given by which our contract with Yahweh can be legally validated and secured. The Devil knows he need do no more to ensure that we never rightfully claim our eternal inheritance, than to obscure that precious name by which this Birthright shall be secured. This is why it is stated in *John 3:18*, "he who believes in him will not be condemned," but, "he who does not believe has already been condemned for not believing in the name" of Yah's most precious

Son. Considering this scripture, thus it proves essential to us, personally, that we believe in and thus in due course apply ourselves to get these sacred names right (*especially Yahshua's Saving name*), and use them correctly, even faithfully omitting the obsolete and erroneous traditional forms. Though scholars may perplex and quibble over the multiple pronunciations of the name of Eloah, they may forget that the REAL controversy is about the singular and easily pronounced name of El's Son, Yahshua (Joshua), which name in fact clearly differentiates the Israelite Messiah from the ancient pagan Corn King, Tammuz (*who is presented as if a pseudo-savior of the World*), and strategically divides the camps of Nazarenes, in these Last Days of the prophetic 2000 year period of the "End Times."

Watching "The Nanny" on TV, I was perplexed to see her choose the name "Shlomo" for her firstborn son, until my linguist consultant told me that the name Shlomo was translated as "Solomon" in the English Old Testament. The great Solomon is really the great Shlomo, ...heh! I laugh to think, in the First Resurrection, when we all call David's son Shlomo, Solomon, he probably won't respond to this erroneous name until after he gets used to it. To be sure, he can only get weary of correcting this error, in that day? As Shlomo may answer to Solomon, who must correct us every time, in perpetuity, so likewise shall Yahweh and Yahshua correct us every time, if we call them 'Lord God' and 'Jesus,' and why shouldn't they? Many may yet protest, "what's in a name?" But the Biblically literate know Salvation is in the singular name of Yahshua of Nazareth, only.

note:

am given much assistance from my linguist consultants above; e3 my/Tami's hubbys