|27| And Hashem said to Aharon, Go into the midbar to meet Moshe. And he went, and met him in the Har HaElohim, and kissed him.
|28| And Moshe told Aharon

הַשֵּׁם

"Who is HaShem"?

Larry and June Acheson

the Shaalbonite,
34 The sons of Hashem the Gizonite,
Jonathan the son of Shage the Hararite,

הַשֵּׁם

Who is "HaShem"?

by Larry and June Acheson

First Printing, December 7 , 2006
Revised May 1 , 2016

A Truth Seekers Publication
Seekutruth@aol.com

This study may also be accessed online at:
www.ponderscripture.org/

Table of Contents

Introduction: Examining the Jewish custom of referring to the Creator as "HaShem" 1

Part I: Response to Kevin Geoffrey's "HaShem" Article 3

1. Who is "God"? 3

2. Response to Part I of Kevin Geoffrey's article: What is the "Sacred Name"? 7

3. Concern about Blaspheming the Name 11

4. Response to Part II of Kevin Geoffrey's article: Historical Avoidance of Pronouncing the Name 15

5. Is the Pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton Lost? 20

6. Response to Part III of Kevin Geoffrey's article: Is Speaking the Name a Biblical Command? 22

7. Misrepresenting the Hebrew Text 26

8. Who Do We Call Upon for Salvation? 28

9. Is Our Salvation Jeopardized by Not Pronouncing יהוה? 31

10. Did Moses Not Consider it Important to Speak the Name יהוה? 36

11. Did Yeshua Not Consider it Important to Speak the Name יהוה? 39

12. Response to Part IV of Kevin Geoffrey's article: Is יהוה His Only Name? 45

13. His Name is "I AM" (ehyeh ahsher ehyeh)? 49

Part II: The Online Forum Discussion 53

15. So Who is HaShem? 53

16. Replacing the Tetragrammaton: A Case of Denial 61

17. Will the Messiah Restore the Name When He Returns? 69

18. Is Mispronouncing the Name a Salvation Issue? 76

הַשֵּׁם

Who is "HaShem"?

by Larry and June Acheson

Introduction: Examining the Jewish custom of referring to the Creator as "HaShem"

Our son attends a Messianic assembly whose leadership defends referring to the Creator as "HaShem[1]" or "G-d" instead of the name He gave to Himself, which is *Yahweh*.[2] A question I frequently ask those of this particular persuasion is, "Can you think of a better name to use in reference to the Creator besides the name He gave to Himself?" In the course of over 20 years of asking this question, no one has offered me a better alternative. Nevertheless, June and I have encountered seemingly endless explanations in defense of such terms as "God" and "HaShem," none of which hold up when examined under the light of Scripture. When the leader of the Messianic assembly gave our son an article entitled "HaShem" as their answer to those who believe we dishonor Yahweh by referring to Him as "God" or "HaShem," we weren't surprised at what we read, as it is much the same rhetoric that we have encountered from various individuals over the years. However, it is presented in such a scholarly fashion, complete with Hebrew text and commentary, that anyone not bent on fully investigating the

---

[1] "HaShem" (הַשֵּׁם) is a Hebrew word meaning "The name," which Judaism traditionally uses in place of the Creator's name as given in Scripture (YHWH, rendered יהוה in Hebrew). Rabbi Hayim Halevy Donin, in his book *To Be a Jew*, Basic Books, 1972, p. 174 explains the Jewish tradition as follows: "So that God's name is not used in vain, it is customary to refrain from saying *Adonai* (the Lord) except in prayer and during the actual recitation of blessings. When reference is made to God in the course of conversation, even when quoting passages, the term *HaShem* (The Name) is used instead."

[2] For more information regarding the name *Yahweh* (also referred to as the "Tetragrammaton," rendered יהוה in Hebrew), we invite you to review our study entitled *Sticks and Stones May Break My Bones, But Names Will Never Hurt Me: A Look at the Name We Call Our Heavenly Father*.

author's information might easily be persuaded that his perspective lines up with the position outlined in Scripture. The article I'm referring to was written in 2002 by Kevin Geoffrey and appeared in issue 75 of the magazine *Bikurei Tziyon* (First Fruits of Zion).[3] Mr. Geoffrey is, in fact, identified as a former university professor who is also one of the founding leaders of *A'm Segulah*, a Hebraic congregation in Phoenix, Arizona. Certainly, then, with such a scholarly background, we shouldn't expect a sloppily-written article in defense of his position. Nevertheless, I believe a thorough review of Mr. Geoffrey's article will reveal that each of his points is either outright false or else based upon half-truths, which in turn will lead to some misleading conclusions on the part of his reading audience.

Before we proceed with our review of Mr. Geoffrey's article in Part I of this study, I would like to establish that we only approach this matter from the perspective of individuals who consider ourselves to be truth seekers with no malice towards him, nor do we question his motives as one who himself pursues the truth from the Almighty's Word. We trust that Kevin Geoffrey, like us, is aware of the deception that has engulfed our world as a result of the adversary's scheming, and like us, is striving to "come out of Babylon." In our quest to pursue scholarly inquiry, none of us have as yet made a complete exit from Babylon. Nevertheless, because we disagree so strongly with some of Mr. Geoffrey's points, we address each one head-on, not intended as an attack on his person, but as a refutation of the teaching itself. Nothing is left out of Mr. Geoffrey's commentary, even though we periodically interrupt his commentary with our own response.

In Part II, I share excerpts from an internet forum discussion in which I participated between February and April 2005. In this discussion, I found myself debating a couple of Jews over such issues as whether or not the name of the Israelite mentioned in I Chronicles 11:34 is pronounced *Hashem* and whether or not we should be waiting around for the Messiah's return to restore the knowledge of the pronunciation of the Creator's name before diligently researching this matter for ourselves. We also address a form of denial wherein certain folks don't believe *HaShem* is a replacement for the Creator's name, as well as a belief that, unless we pronounce the Tetragrammaton exactly right, "there is no forgiveness." We can see, then, that the issue of *HaShem* is way bigger than most people realize! If you haven't searched this issue out for yourself yet, we believe this is an excellent place to begin.

[3] Although this magazine is not available online, back issues may be purchased online at the First Fruits of Zion website: https://ffoz.org/store/product_info.php?products_id=89

Part I: Response to Kevin Geoffrey's "HaShem" Article

1. Who is "God"?

The first item we need to address from Mr. Geoffrey's article involves a name/title that is common to both Christianity and Judaism. Mr. Geoffrey freely refers to the Almighty as "God," a name that can be traced to the Canaanite idol named "Gad," whose name in Hebrew is actually pronounced "gawd."[4] This idol's name (גָּד) actually appears in the Hebrew text of Isaiah 65:11, but the translators chose to translate that name in various forms, such as "that troop" (KJV), "Fortune" (NIV & NRSV) and "Luck" (New JPS translation). By ***translating*** the name "Gad" instead of transliterating[5] it, the actual name was, as the saying goes, "lost in the translation." As a result, most worshippers in the world today are unaware that "God" is in fact the name of an idol whose worship was ***condemned*** by YHWH. To give an illustration of how sinister this practice really is, try to imagine how the average Jew would feel if our society were to eventually translate Adolf Hitler's name as "loyal friend," with the name "Adolf" meaning "loyal" and the name "Hitler" meaning "friend."[6] As time progressed, people would come to address each other as "my hitler" with the intended meaning of "my friend." Would you appreciate someone addressing you as their "hitler"? If not, why not?

Please keep in mind that any protests aimed at pointing out the name of the man from which this term originated would be met with resistance. You might hear someone answer, "But I'm not interested in what 'hitler' ***used*** to mean, I'm interested in what it means in *today's society*."

Or perhaps they might reply, "But you cannot ***prove*** that 'hitler' is traced to Adolph Hitler!"

We're sure some folks will protest this line of reasoning as being offensive. However, please consider the facts here: Did YHWH condemn the worship of an idol whose name is pronounced "God"? Yes, He did. For Yahweh to ***specifically*** condemn the worship of a certain idol, even to the point of "naming names," makes this a serious matter indeed. The name of one of the idols whose worship is condemned in Isaiah 65:11 is pronounced ***God***, regardless of how our English-speaking society chooses to spell it.

---

[4] We invite anyone interested to read our study entitled "Do We Honor Yahweh by Referring to Him as 'Our God'?" We believe this study successfully demonstrates that the Hebrew "Gad" is pronounced "gawd," and that it is no coincidence that this is the name/title commonly used for the Creator. Furthermore, we cite numerous references in tracing the English "God" to the Canaanite idol of fortune, whose name is pronounced identically.

[5] *Transliteration* is an attempt to depict the pronunciation of a word in one language by using the alphabet of another language. In other words, we transliterate a word when we carry its pronunciation over from one language to another. A quick and easy way to distinguish between "transliterate" and "translate" with regard to name usage is to examine the following French name: René Blanc. If we were to *transliterate* this name into English so as to facilitate a reader's more accurately pronouncing the actual name, we might write it like this: "Ruhneh Blahnk." However, if we were to *translate* this name into English, we would write "Reborn White."

[6] At first glance, it may appear quite a stretch to imagine the word "hitler" evolving into a word meaning "friend." However, as the development of languages proves, it would not be all that unlikely. For example, the English word "villain" began as an innocent word meaning "an inhabitant of a farm." *Cf.*, Shipley, Joseph, *Dictionary of Word Origins*, Philosophical Library, New York, NY, 1945, p. 379.

The typical first response we receive from folks who prefer to retain their "name of choice" is, "But 'God' is not the name of that idol! It's Gad! It's not the same pronunciation, and it's not the same name!"

We invite those who offer this type of response to do a little further study into the Hebrew language. In fact, we recommend contacting Hebrew scholars. Even so, it is true that even among Hebrew scholars, there is uncertainty as to how this name was originally pronounced. Some lean towards believing that it could only have been pronounced "gawd" in its original form. Others lean towards believing that it had the "short a" pronunciation, as in "sad." Notice what Dr. V. Steven Parrish of Memphis Theological Seminary has to say:

> The typical anglicized pronunciation is "gad" – like "had." The Hebrew seems usually to have the vowel *a qames*, which, in Hebrew, has more of an "aw" sound than a short "a." Not everyone, though, makes that distinction.[7]

Thus, while Dr. Parrish leans more towards the "aw" pronunciation, he recognizes that not all Hebrew scholars would necessarily agree with his assessment. Regardless of whether or not the Canaanite idol of fortune's name is pronounced the same as "God," the inescapable truth of the matter is this: They are both spelled exactly the same in Hebrew (גַּד).

Of course, if we make this particular issue a pronunciation debate, we may lose sight of the ***other*** issue: The connection issue. Is the English "God" ***connected*** to the Canaanite idol whose name is commonly rendered ***Gad***? We can certainly understand how someone who refers to the Almighty as "God" would go to great lengths in order to disprove any connection. As individuals who once referred to the Almighty as "God," we did the same thing, but we ran into dead ends with each attempt, as even the etymologists admit that they cannot ascertain where "**God**" comes from. Consider the conclusion reached by Dr. Wilfred Funk. Dr. Wilfred Funk, by the way, is a noted lexicographer who authored such books as *Six Weeks to Words of Power*, *30 Days to a More Powerful Vocabulary*, and *Word Origins: An Exploration and History of Words and Language*. In another of his books, *Word Origins and Their Romantic Stories*, he wrote the following:

> The central word of all faiths is *God*, and the history of the title *God* is a tangle of guesses. The word *God* itself is related to similar words in Danish, Saxon, Old High German, Scandinavian, and other languages, and may even be related to an ancient Lithuanian word that referred to someone who practiced magic.[8]

If a noted lexicographer of Funk's credentials can only offer up ***guesses*** as to the origin of the title "God," how is it that other folks (without credentials) are so certain that it cannot possibly have any connection to heathen worship?

Interestingly, there are scholars out there who are persuaded that, indeed, there ***is*** a connection between the English "God" and the Canaanite idol of fortune. June and I recently came across a dictionary that we believe adds yet more weight to our conviction that the English name/title "God" is ultimately traced to the Hebrew root word GD (pronounced "God"). The name of this dictionary is *The Word: The Dictionary That Reveals the Hebrew Source of English*, published by SPI Books, New York.

---

[7] From an e-mail I received on July 12, 2004.

[8] From *Word Origins and Their Romantic Stories*, Wilfred Funk, Litt. D., Grosset & Dunlap, New York, 1950, page 279.

It was compiled by Isaac E. Mozeson and originally published in 1989. We found some very compelling information in Mozeson's dictionary – information that we believe further establishes the connection between the English "God" and the Hebrew "God."

Although Mozeson doesn't offer a separate listing under the heading "**God**" in his dictionary, he does mention it under the heading of "**Good**." What follows is Isaac Mozeson's listing under the heading "**GOOD/GUD**," as found on page 80 of his dictionary:

> **ROOTS:** Anglo-Saxon *god* and German *got* go back to the IE root *ghedh* (to unite, join, fit). The IE root echoes גד / (O)GUD (to unite, fit together), but גד / GUD (fortune, success — *Genesis 30:11*) fits the common use of GOOD well enough. Good in Arabic is gayid.
>
> **BRANCHES:** That GOD is GOOD (and really TOGETHER) ought to be implied by the similarity of these Germanic terms. The same גד / GUD (good fortune) above is the name of a deity mentioned in *Isaiah 65:11*. The given IE root for GOD is *Gheu(a)* (to call, invoke).[9]

As shown in Isaac Mozeson's dictionary, both "good" and "God" are very likely traced to the Hebrew **GD**, which is the name of an idol whose worship YHWH condemns, a point that we have made repeatedly … and a point that we believe cannot be over-emphasized. As if this information isn't already alarming enough, it can ***also*** be demonstrated that down through history, this same word evolved into a word meaning "reptile" in Russian and "snake" in ancient Gaelic.[10] Moreover, a Russian word containing a form of the word "gad" (*gadalka*) means "fortune-teller." Is this a coincidence, a "lucky guess," or evidence of a connection? Remember, *Gad* is the idol of fortune, as recognized above by Isaac E. Mozeson, as well as such scholarly references as *A Dictionary of the Bible*:

> GAD (גַּד, *δαιμόνιον*, *δαίμων*, *Fortuna*; also, probably, גָּד, *τύχη*).—Properly, the word should be used with the article הַגַּד 'the gad,' *i.e.* 'the (god of) good luck'; that being the meaning of the word, which is apparently the same as גָּד *gād*, 'fortune,' Arab. *jadd*, Aram. גַּדָּא *gaddâ*, Syr. *gāda*. Gad was, therefore, originally an appellative, and its use as a divine name is due to its meaning. Examples of its appellative use are ביש גדא 'the unlucky' (Buxtorf, 387); גדעתא 'the fortune of Athe' (de Vogüe, *Palm*. 143); גדנעמת and נעמגד, etc., in Carthag. inscriptions. The god Gad as Τύχη, 'Fortune,' seems to illustrate the origin of the Old Pers. word for 'God,' *baga*, which may be traced back to the Sanskrit *bhaga*, 'forutne,' and Baethgen quotes in this connexion the Syr. phrase 'I swear by the Fortune (גדא) of the king' (P. Smith, *s.v.*), 'fortune' becoming thus a protective divinity, to whom temples were built and statues erected. The worship of this divinity became greatly extended in ancient times, and numerous Gr. inscriptions in the Hauran give the Gr. equivalent word (Τύχη), the identity of which with Gad, notwithstanding the difference of gender (Gad being masc., Tyche fem.), does not admit of doubt. A trace of the Syr. worship of Gad is regarded as being indicated by the exclamation of Leah when Zilpah, her maid, bore Jacob a son (Gn 30[11]). The expression used is בגד, which is translated in AV (following the *Kerê*, בָּא גָּד *bā gād*) 'a troop cometh,' or 'fortune is come.' If, however, the *Kethîbh* be followed (with pointing בְּגַד *bĕgad*), the word may be translated 'with Gad' (in RV 'fortunate,' m. 'with fortune'), a rendering favoured by many scholars. As the name of Gad

[9] Mozeson, Isaac E., *The Word: The Dictionary That Reveals the Hebrew Source of English*, SPI Books, New York, NY, 2000, p. 80.

[10] This is a point that June and I address in greater detail in Part III of our study "Do We Honor Yahweh by Referring to Him as 'Our God'?" It is also available online at the following URL: http://www.search-the-scriptures.org/artic-98.htm

> is not met with in Bab. literature, it would seem to have been a native Can. word, retained by the Israelites in consequence of the tendency to polytheism which existed among them as late as the time of the Bab. captivity, when they 'prepared a table for Fortune [לַגַּד],' and filled up 'mingled wine unto Destiny [לַמְנִי]' (Is 65[11] RV), as did also the Babylonians and Assyrians for their gods (cf. Bel, also Jer 51[44]). By the astrologers Gad was identified with the planet Jupiter, called by the Arabs 'Great Fortuna,' and the question naturally arises whether the Assyrian *Manu Rabû*, 'great Manu,' identified by Lenormant with Meni or 'Destiny,' may not in reality be identical with Gad, Meni being, with the Arabs, 'Lesser Fortuna.' The Assyrians also worshipped a god named Kibî-dunki, a name meaning 'Bespeak thou my good fortune,' with whom Gad may also have been identified. The identification of Gad with the star of good fortune (כּוֹכַב צֶדֶק *kûkab ẓedeḳ*), the planet Jupiter, is regarded as being of late date.
>
> Further testimony to the worship of Gad in Canaan is to be found in the place-names Baal-gad (Jos 11[17] 12[7] 13[5]), where Baal was worshipped as god of fortune, and Migdal-gad (Jos 15[37]), 'the tower of Gad.' The Hebrews were also so accustomed to regard the worship of Gad as a natural thing, that the words addressed by Esau to Issac his father, 'let my father arise' (Gn 27[31]), are explained in *Bereshith Rabba*, p. 65, as an invocation to Gada or Fortune.[11]

The above reference is one of many offering irrefutable evidence that *Gad* (pronounced *God* in Hebrew) is ultimately traced to the name of the idol of fortune. Is it possible that the English word *God* hails from this same idol's name? Many, without offering supportive evidence, will answer "no"; however, it is interesting that, elsewhere in Mozeson's dictionary, he addresses the fact that Noah Webster's etymologies were full of English words traced to "Shemitic" sources. Is the word "God" one of them? He believes so, and we have seen nothing that would serve to refute such a connection. With this in mind, if the author of the "HaShem" article is so certain that it isn't necessary to call upon the Creator with the name that He gave to Himself, then we would at least expect him to come up with something better than "God." Regrettably, however, he repeatedly uses this name/title in reference to the Almighty. It is clear that he finds it more acceptable than the name Yahweh gave to Himself.

---

[11] From *A Dictionary of the Bible*, edited by James Hastings, M.A., D.D., Vol. II, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1899, p. 76. **Note:** Other references could have easily offered much the same information. For example, the *New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge* explains that *Gadde*, which is a plural form of *Gad*, is a reference to ***demons***. Here is an excerpt from the *New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, Volume IV, Funk and Wagnalls Company, New York, 1908, p. 418: "Gad-melek, "Gad is king," is an inscription on a stone found in Jerusalem, possibly due to Canaanitic influence. In Arabic the proper name Abd al-Gadd is found, certainly a deity's name (Wellhausen, Heidentum, p. 146). Isaac of Antioch (Opera, ed. Bickell, ii. 210, Giessen, 1877) reports that tables were prepared on the roofs by his countrymen for Gadda or (pl.) Gadde, and he mentions a "demon" Gadlat as belonging to the city of Beth-hur. Jacob of Sarug speaks of a female goddess of Haran named Gadlat, while by the plural gadde he means demons."

2. Response to Part I of Kevin Geoffrey's article: What is the "Sacred Name"?

Kevin Geoffrey's "HaShem" article begins on page 22 of the *Bikurei Tziyon* magazine. On the first page of his article, Mr. Geoffrey explains what he terms the "personal name of God":

> As the restoration of the Hebraic roots of our faith persists in gaining momentum, much fervor and zeal continues to characterize the study of even the most minute of details in the Scriptures. One such area of popular interest—and by no means a minute detail—is the use and pronunciation of what is commonly referred to as "The Sacred Name." You may have noticed that this publication often refers to the Name by various methods—such as HaShem, G-d (God), L-rd (LORD), ADONAI, YHVH, or יהוה—yet does not attempt a transliteration or encourage its utterance. This article is primarily intended to give a perspective on this practice.[12]

The above introduction simultaneously offers a brief introduction to the Jewish practice of not vocalizing the Creator's name. Although we will address this custom in greater detail later in this study, we would at least like to point out how the above admission contradicts the very tenets of Scripture that the Mr. Geoffrey claims to uphold. Throughout the Torah, it is made abundantly clear that the early believers called upon the name YHWH[13]. We read, for example, that Abraham called upon the Name (Gen. 12:8, 13:4, 21:33), as did his son Isaac (26:25). How can one call upon a name without uttering it? Moreover, Yahweh (through His servant Moses) told the pharaoh of Egypt that he had been raised up for the express purpose of causing the Almighty's name to be declared *throughout all the earth* (Ex. 9:16). How can a name be "declared" without uttering that name? Finally, in Psalms 79:6, King David asked the Almighty to ***pour out His wrath*** on those who have not called upon His name:

> [6]Pour out Thy wrath upon the heathen that have not known Thee, and upon the kingdoms that have not called upon Thy name!

We are about to find out that many within the ranks of Judaism do not believe that "calling upon" a name necessarily means that one must speak that name. We will address this argument in chapter six of this study.

Another protest often raised involves the belief that the "true pronunciation" has been lost. My response to this argument is, "Well, I may not know precisely how His name is pronounced, but I do know how it ***isn't*** pronounced … and it ***isn't*** pronounced 'God' or 'HaShem'!" We will address the "lost pronunciation" argument in detail in chapter five.

When we really consider the ramifications of believing that "calling upon" or "praising" a name doesn't really mean pronouncing it, one can only wonder how the ancients could have read aloud any of the Psalms without pronouncing His Name.

---

[12] Geoffrey, Kevin, "HaShem," from the magazine *Bikurei Tziyon*, issue 75, B'reisheet / Genesis | Year 5763 (2002), p. 22.

[13] While there is not 100% agreement among scholars as to the precise pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton, the majority consensus is *Yahweh*. We lean towards this pronunciation, primarily because this is how 2nd century theologian Clement of Alexandria (ca. 150-210 CE.) transliterated it in the Greek language (*Iaoue*).

Psalms 99:5-6 -- "Exalt ye Yahweh (יהוה) our Almighty, and worship at His footstool; for He is holy. Moses and Aaron among His priests, and Samuel among them that call upon His name; they called upon Yahweh (יהוה), and He answered them." NOTE: These men called upon, i.e., ***spoke*** the name of the Almighty.

Psalms 116:17 -- "I will take the cup of salvation, and call upon the name of Yahweh (יהוה)!" NOTE: King David also spoke the name of the Almighty!

Once we get beyond answering how the ancients could have read the above text without uttering the divine name, the next question is, "How would they have answered the question, 'Who is your Almighty? What's His ***name***?'" How would ***you*** answer this question?

Mr. Geoffrey recognizes that the Tetragrammaton (יהוה) is the "personal name" of the Creator, and mentions that it is found in Scripture over 6,800 times:

> "The Sacred Name" is a term used to refer to the widely accepted "personal name" of God: יהוה. It is the most prolific name for God, found in Scripture over 6800 times.

With this brief allusion to the Tetragrammaton, Mr. Geoffrey by-passed an excellent opportunity to expound upon a major Hebraic understanding: Repetition signifies *emphasis*, which in turn denotes *significance*.[14] The Creator's name is repeated, not once, not twice, not thrice, but ***over 6,800 times***. Can anyone deny, in view of so many times the Tetragrammaton is repeated, the significance and importance of this name? Can anyone justify substituting mere titles for this name over 6,800 times? In view of the fact that Scripture so consistently testifies that His name is Yahweh (יהוה), replacing that name with substitutes can only be regarded as bringing it to nothingness, rendering it ineffective or useless, something that we are about to read is something that even Mr. Geoffrey agrees should not be done.

As we just pointed out, Scripture repeatedly emphasizes that the Almighty's name is יהוה. Here are a few of those places[15]:

Exodus 15:3 -- יהוה, the Warrior—יהוה is His name!
Jeremiah 10:16 – Not like these is the Portion of Jacob; for it is He who formed all things, and Israel is His very own tribe: יהוה of Hosts is His name.

---

[14] This understanding is brought out by numerous Jewish and non-Jewish sources, including Rabbi David–Seth Kirshner, Senior Director of Institutional Advancement, Jewish Theological Seminary, in his online JTS Torah Commentary. He writes, "Throughout the Bible, repetition of words typically connotes emphasis." This commentary may be read in its entirety by accessing the following URL: http://www.jtsa.edu/community/parashah/archives/5766/ekev.shtml. However, I believe Michal Elizabeth Hunt said it best in her online Bible study entitled "ABOUT AGAPE BIBLE STUDY," where she wrote, "Word repetition in Scripture is like underlining. It denotes emphasis and importance." Hunt's study can be read in its entirety by accessing the following URL: http://www.agapebiblestudy.com/About%20Agape%20Bible%20Study.htm.

[15] Each of these translations is based upon adaptations from the JPS (Jewish Publication Society) translation known as *Takakh: The Holy Scriptures*, The Jewish Publication Society, 1988. We have taken the liberty of restoring the Tetragrammaton (יהוה), as well as replacing the title "God" with the English transliteration of the original Hebrew *Elohim* (or a form thereof).

Jeremiah 16:21 – Assuredly, I will teach them My power and My might. And they shall learn that My name is יהוה!
Isaiah 42:8 -- I am יהוה! That *is* My name! I will not yield My glory to another, nor My renown to idols!
Deuteronomy 32:3 -- For the name of יהוה I proclaim; give glory to our Elohenu [Mighty One].
Isaiah 26:13 – O יהוה our Elohenu [Almighty]! Masters other than You possessed us, but only Your name shall we utter.

Clearly, the name יהוה, even if it only appeared in the above-listed verses, would have to be regarded as very special and of great significance … the name that identifies the Creator of the universe! It is not some trivial name that any of us should feel free to deal with as we please. Indeed, even the author of "HaShem" goes on to underscore how important it is that we ***not*** render His name "null and void." Here is what he writes:

> In no less than three places, the Torah warns us how to regard the name of יהוה. In Exodus 20:7 (and its parallel passage in Deuteronomy 5:11), the "third commandment" is often rendered as follows:
>
> > *"You shall not take the name of the LORD your God in vain, for the LORD will not leave him unpunished who takes His name in vain." (NAS)*
>
> The JPS Tanach renders the same verse:
>
> > *"You shall not swear falsely by the name of the LORD your God; for the LORD will not clear one who swears falsely by His name."*
>
> The word "(in) vain" or "falsely" translates the Hebrew שׁוא, *shav* which means emptiness, nothingness, vanity. The NIV renders the word "misuse." So the person guilty of rendering the Name null and void is to receive punishment.[16]

Ironically, although the author of "HaShem" would on the surface seem to understand the severe consequences of misusing or otherwise bringing the name יהוה to "nothingness," he nevertheless demonstrates a proclivity for removing that name from Scripture, replacing it with such titles as "HaShem," "the Lord" and "God." In fact, in the very quotes he supplies, the name יהוה is rendered "null and void," for it doesn't even appear! It is utterly removed! No one would even know "who" is being referred to with Mr. Geoffrey's rendering of Exodus 20:7!

Regrettably, Mr. Geoffrey doesn't seem to recognize that, in quoting Scripture, he is guilty of the very thing he warns us against practicing! We are reminded of the Biblical story involving King David and the prophet Nathan following David's sin with Bathsheba. Of course, until Nathan pointed out David's sin, the king was apparently content that he had done nothing wrong. But along comes Nathan, who tells him the parable of the rich man and the poor man.

The rich man had an exceedingly large herd of cattle and flocks of sheep. The poor man, however, only had one little ewe lamb which he had bought and raised. This lamb was so precious to the poor man that he shared his own food with it, and allowed it to drink from his own cup. He even slept with it in his arms. One day a traveler came to visit the rich man, and the rich man decided to prepare a sheep for his

[16] Geoffrey, Kevin, "HaShem," from the magazine *Bikurei Tziyon*, issue 75, B'reisheet / Genesis | Year 5763 (2002), pp. 22-23.

guest. However, instead of selecting a prize sheep from his own herd, he took the one sheep from the poor man, robbing him of all he owned. The poor man's sheep thus became a meal for the rich man and his guest.

When Nathan the prophet was finished telling this story to King David, the king was enraged, even to the point of demanding the death penalty for the rich man as recompense for his sinister deed. Even with Nathan relating this story to him, King David was not able to see himself as the guilty party. Few people, it seems, are.

Now don't get us wrong. We're not saying that Kevin Geoffrey is deserving of death, nor are we in any way insinuating that we are on the same level as the prophet Nathan. We may not be prophets, but we *are* truth seekers, and all we are doing is point out that Mr. Geoffrey ***agrees*** that anyone guilty of rendering the Creator's name "null and void" is deserving of punishment. Yet this same man has no qualms or reservations about leaving the Creator's name completely out of the very Scripture he quoted … and by leaving it out, he the same as renders it "null and void."

To make matters worse, Mr. Geoffrey's entire article is aimed at *justifying* his practice of substituting the Tetragrammaton with "HaShem" and "God"! I'm curious as to what the prophet Nathan would have to say to Kevin Geoffrey? How do we justify teaching against bringing a name to nothingness while simultaneously substituting it with names and titles? Perhaps Mr. Geoffrey would argue that he is not guilty of substituting anything for the Creator's name. If so, we cover this argument in chapter 16. For now, however, we will address Mr. Geoffrey's concern regarding blaspheming the Creator's name.

3. Concern about Blaspheming the Name

Mr. Geoffrey goes on to express concern with regard to blaspheming the Name, citing Leviticus 24:15-16. He writes:

> *"You shall speak to the sons of Israel, saying, 'If anyone curses his God, then he will bear his sin. Moreover, the one who blasphemes the name of the LORD shall surely be put to death; all the congregation shall certainly stone him. The alien as well as the native, when he blasphemes the Name, shall be put to death.'" (NAS)*

> The word "blaspheme" is the Hebrew נָקַב, *nakav*, which means to pierce or bore. In tandem with the instructions given in verse 15 about "if someone curses his God," the idea of blaspheming the Name seems to be something akin to doing violence to it, essentially abusing it, hence, rendering it ineffective or useless.[17]

The above commentary by Mr. Geoffrey does nothing to establish a case in favor of not speaking the Tetragrammaton. Rather, it serves to underscore the seriousness of the repercussions for ***blaspheming*** the Creator's name. Just by speaking the Creator's name, one is not guilty of blaspheming it, and this is critical to the point that Mr. Geoffrey should have made in his commentary, but he chose not to.

Certainly, the ancients understood this point, as evidenced by the 6,823 times the Tetragrammaton appears in the *Tanakh*. One such place is found in Isaiah 26:13, a verse we cited earlier. The following translation is taken directly from the Jewish Publication Society's translation:

> [13]O LORD our God!
> Lords other than You possessed us,
> But only Your name shall we utter.

As mentioned above, this verse is taken directly from the Jewish Publication Society's translation – a version frequently cited by Kevin Geoffrey, although he chose to not address the above verse. It should be pointed out that if the above verse had been translated properly … leaving the Creator's name intact instead of emptying it from the text, it would read as follows:

> [13]O YAHWEH our Sovereign!
> Lords other than You possessed us,
> But only Your name shall we utter.

Apparently the prophet Isaiah had a vastly different understanding of Yahweh's name than that expressed by the author of "HaShem" in his article. Isaiah had absolutely ***no problem*** with speaking … uttering … the name Yahweh.

However, Mr. Geoffrey isn't finished with his thought process concerning the term "blaspheme." He goes on to express that it was out of ***fear*** of accidentally blaspheming the Name that Judaism began the (unscriptural) practice of avoiding the speaking of the Name:

---

[17] Ibid, p. 23.

> Given the seriousness of the mishandling of such a Name and the penalty of death associated with it, this eventually gave rise to a practice within Judaism to greatly limit its use—the practice of avoiding the literal speaking of the Name. This is reflected in the JPS translation of the above passage [Lev. 24:15-16]:
>
> > *"And to the Israelite people speak thus: 'Anyone who blasphemes his God shall bear his guilt; if he also pronounces the name LORD, he shall be put to death. The whole community shall stone him; stranger or citizen, if he has thus pronounced the Name, he shall be put to death.'"* —Leviticus 24:15-16 (JPS) [emphasis mine][18]

There are several flaws, not only with the above commentary, but with the Scripture quotation as well. I will address them one at a time:

1. Mr. Geoffrey states that the seriousness of mishandling the Name "***eventually***" gave rise to the practice of limiting its use. Exactly when did "eventually" occur? Was it during the time of Moses? No, it couldn't have been during Moses' lifetime, for he is recorded as having spoken the Name in such verses as Deuteronomy 33:7:

> [7]And this he [Moses] said of Judah: Hear, O LORD [YHWH, יהוה] the voice of Judah and restore him to his people. Through his own hands strive for him, help him against his foes. (JPS Translation)

Since Moses very clearly uttered the name Yahweh, we can be certain that the practice of pronouncing His name was still in vogue during Moses' lifetime.

2. Furthermore, if the JPS translation of Leviticus 24:15-16 truly represents the original intent of that verse, then Moses should have been put to death for speaking the Name in Deuteronomy 33:7! This one verse, in and of itself, reveals the spurious JPS translation of Lev. 24:15-16. Shown below is a literal, word-for-word translation of Leviticus 24:15-16, as taken from *The Interlinear Bible*:

> [15]And to the sons of Israel shall you speak saying, Any man when he curses his Eloah, then he shall bear his sin.
> [16]And he who blasphemes name Yahweh's surely shall be executed. Surely shall at him cast stones all the congregation as an alien so a native; When he blasphemes the Name, he is executed.

As we trust the reader is able to discern from the reading of the Hebrew text, there is absolutely nothing in Leviticus 24:16 to justify the JPS translation, which calls for the execution of anyone who ***pronounces*** the Name. According to the Hebrew text, the death sentence is for those who ***blaspheme*** the

[18] Ibid, p. 23.

Creator's name. There is a big difference between ***pronouncing*** a name and ***blaspheming*** a name. Regrettably, many within Judaism do not seem willing or able to recognize that difference. Mr. Geoffrey did nothing to clarify the issue. For those who would prefer to review the actual Hebrew text of Leviticus 24:16, it is displayed below[19]:

5712 3605 7275 7275 4191 4191 3068 8034 5344

וְנֹקֵב שֵׁם־יְהוָה מוֹת יוּמָת רָגוֹם יִרְגְּמוּ־בוֹ כָּל־הָעֵדָה

congregation the all stones cast him at shall surely :executed be shall surely YHWH's name blasphemes who he And ם

4191 8034 5344 249 1616

כַּגֵּר כָּאֶזְרָח בְּנָקְבוֹ שֵׁם יוּמָת

.executed is he ,Name the blasphemes he when ;native a so ,alien an as ם

As displayed above, the Hebrew word translated "blasphemes" is word #5344 (*nâqab*), which corresponds to #5344 in *Strong's Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible*. *Strong's* listing of this word is shown below:

> **5344. נָקַב nâqab**, *naw-kab´*; a prim. root; to *puncture*, lit. (to *perforate*, with more or less violence) or fig. (to *specify*, *designate*, *libel*):— appoint, blaspheme, bore, curse, express, with holes, name, pierce, strike through.

The Hebrew word *nâqab* can have different meanings, as shown above, but the general understanding is that of its negative sense: *puncture, perforate with more or less violence, blaspheme*. We can see how someone might wish to apply some of the other meanings listed above, such as "**names** the name of YHWH" instead of "**blasphemes** the name of YHWH." However, we have already determined that ***if*** this were the originally intended meaning, then Moses should have been put to death when he spoke the Creator's name in Deuteronomy 33:7. We can be certain that if Moses spoke the Name, treating it with great reverence, then this same accommodation was granted to all of mankind. Thus, as we seek to answer the question of when did "eventually" occur, we reiterate that it could not have been during Moses' lifetime.

3. Did "***eventually***" occur during the lifetime of Boaz and Ruth? Boaz and Ruth were born around 100 years after Moses died, so certainly they should have understood the severe penalty for pronouncing the Creator's name … or so one would <u>think</u>. But no, the righteous Boaz apparently did not, for he, too, is recorded as audibly speaking the Creator's name, as we can see from reading Ruth 2:4:

> [4]Presently Boaz arrived from Bethlehem. He greeted the reapers, "Yahweh be with you!"

[19] This and other Hebrew reproductions from Scripture are taken from *The Interlinear Bible*, 2nd ed., Jay P. Green, Sr., General Editor and Translator, Hendrickson Publishers, Peabody, MA, 1986. The numbers displayed above the text correspond to the numbering found in *Strong's Exhaustive Concordance*.

> And they responded, "Yahweh bless you!"

The above Scripture quotation is taken from the JPS translation, with one major exception: We restored the name "Yahweh" in its rightful place in lieu of the JPS substitute "The LORD." The Hebrew text most certainly contains the Tetragrammaton (יהוה).

Abraham Cohen, in his book *Everyman's Talmud*, expressed the understanding that there never was any Biblical prohibition against pronouncing the name Yahweh:

> In the Biblical period there seems to have been no scruple against its use in daily speech. The addition of *Jah* or *Jahu* to personal names, which persisted among the Jews even after the Babylonian exile, is an indication that there was no prohibition against the employment of the four-lettered Name.[20]

It should be noted here that "Jah" is more accurated rendered *Yah*, a fact confirmed by any reliable reference, and a fact readily affirmed by the pronunciation of the word *Hallelujah*. Cohen goes on to document the fact that there really wasn't ever any mandate against speaking the Creator's name:

> On the other hand, there was a time when the free and open use of the Name even by the layman was advocated. The Mishnah teaches: 'It was ordained that a man should greet his friends by mentioning the Name' (Ber. ix. 5). It has been suggested that the recommendation was based on the desire to distinguish the Israelite from the Samaritan, who referred to God as 'the Name' and not as JHVH, or the Rabbinite Jew from the Jewish-Christian.[21]

It appears, based upon the above information, that it was anciently the *Samaritans* who referred to Yahweh as "the Name" (rendered הַשֵּׁם, pronounced "HaShêm," in Hebrew). Today, "HaShêm" is the form generally embraced by ***all*** of mainstream Judaism, including Messianic Judaism, as in the case of the author of "HaShem." While I do not believe it is fair to comprehensively label all Jewish traditions as being contrary to Scripture, I cannot in this instance recommend following the tradition of substituting Yahweh's name with titles such as "HaShem," "the LORD," or "God." It is a tradition of men, not one supported or even ***implied*** by the Almighty in His Word.

---

[20] From *Everyman's Talmud*, by A. Cohen, Schocken Books, New York City, 1975, p. 24. Originally published by E. P. Dutton, New York, 1949.
[21] Ibid, p. 25.

4. Response to Part II of Kevin Geoffrey's article: Historical Avoidance of Pronouncing the Name

We have thus far addressed Mr. Geoffrey's paradox of on the one hand presenting the name YHWH as a name that must not be "rendered ineffective or useless," while simultaneously seeking to justify substituting that same name with "HaShem." As we demonstrated, the substitution in and of itself renders the name useless, as the result is virtually the same: No one recognizes the Almighty's true name.

We have also reviewed Mr. Geoffrey's apparent justification of the JPS translation of Leviticus 24:15-16, which issues a death sentence for *pronouncing* the Creator's name. This paradox centers around the fact that Moses himself, as well as a host of other righteous Biblical characters, violated this alleged mandate. Of course, it can be demonstrated that the JPS translation misrepresents the Hebrew text.

With this backdrop, the author of "HaShem" adds to the confusion by presenting historical evidence that the Tetragrammaton was indeed in regular use within Judaism until the 3rd century B.C.E. The confusion here involves the question of why all those who were guilty of pronouncing the Creator's name prior to the 3rd century B.C.E. weren't put to death for "blasphemy." Notwithstanding, in turning to the historical record, Mr. Geoffrey cites the *Encyclopædia Judaica*:

> *At least until the destruction of the First Temple in 586 B.C.E. this name was regularly pronounced with its proper vowels, as is clear from the Lachish Letters, written shortly before that date. But at least by the third century B.C.E. the pronunciation of the name YHWH was avoided, and Adonai, "the Lord," was substituted for it, as evidenced by the use of the Greek word Kyrios, "Lord," for YHWH in the Septuagint ....*[22]

As presented by the *Encyclopædia Judaica*, it would appear that, indeed, it wasn't until the third century B.C.E. that Judaism began the practice of no pronouncing the Tetragrammaton. Upon quoting the encyclopedia article, Mr. Geoffrey goes on to write:

> It was this avoidance of pronouncing the Name that led to writing the Name with special vowels by the Jewish Scribes, the Masoretes, during the Middle Ages.[23]

Sadly, Mr. Geoffrey has once again distorted the facts, albeit unintentionally. While I appreciate his quoting a credible source such as the *Encyclopædia Judaica*, it can be shown that Jews were still pronouncing the Name at least one hundred years ***later*** than the time frame listed by the *Encyclopædia Judaica*. This information comes from an ancient Jewish source known as the Talmud, and curiously the information from this source is even mentioned in the *Encyclopædia Judaica*. The time frame in question occurs during the time of the Maccabean revolt, between 168 B.C.E. and 165 B.C.E. By using the very same reference utilized by Geoffrey, we can discern that Judah Maccabee, the champion of the Hanukkah

---

[22] Louis F. Hartman, "YHWH," *Encyclopaedia Judaica* – CD-ROM Edition Version 1.0 (Keter Publishing House Ltd., 1997): God, Names of. Note: Kevin Geoffrey's quote from this reference appears on page 23 of the magazine article he authored.
[23] Geoffrey, Kevin, "HaShem," from the magazine *Bikurei Tziyon*, issue 75, B'reisheet / Genesis | Year 5763 (2002), p. 23.

festival, supported pronouncing the Tetragrammaton. The following information is found on page 683 of the 1971 edition of the *Encyclopædia Judaica*:

> The Talmud gives an interesting historical note with regard to one aspect of this. Among the decrees of the Syrians during the persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanes was one forbidding the mention of the name of God. When the Hasmoneans gained the victory they not only naturally repealed the decree, but demonstratively ordained that the divine name be entered even in monetary bonds, the opening formula being "In such and such a year of Johanan, high priest to the Most High God."[24]

The Talmud reference is from Rosh Hashanah 18b - 19a, where we read the following:

> R. Aha b. Huna raised an objection [from the following]: "On the third of Tishri the mention [of God] in bonds was abolished: for the Grecian Government had forbidden the mention of God's name by the Israelites, and when the Government of the Hasmoneans became strong and defeated them, they ordained that they should mention the name of God even on bonds, and they used to write thus: 'In the year So-and-so of Johanan, High Priest to the Most High God', and when the Sages heard of it they said, 'To-morrow this man will pay his debts and the bond will be thrown on a dunghill', and they stopped them, and they made that day a feast day.'"[25]

As we can see from the above sources, the initial decree to not speak the Creator's name was directed *AT* the Jews by a heathen nation. Although modern Judaism embraces this heathen directive, ancient Judaism very clearly did not. So what's the big deal about speaking or not speaking the Creator's name? To answer this question, we need to understand that we are dealing with a very crafty adversary -- an adversary who definitely does not want anyone calling upon the Creator by His name. He would not want you to believe the Creator's name is important.

Yet our Creator, in His Word, plainly reveals that His name is ***very*** important to Him. According to Isaiah 52:6, His people will know His name. His people cannot know His name if no one teaches it to their children, and that is what Antiochus Epiphanes sought to accomplish. I believe it is very likely that the Romans did the same thing, as it was their practice to remove the names of the idols from the temples of the nations they conquered so they could replace them with the names of ***their*** deities. They even changed the name of Jerusalem to Aelia Capitolina, and only allowed the Jews to enter the city one day per year to mourn the destruction of the Temple.[26]

How many of us can visualize the fear that parents living in those days must have had, knowing that if they taught their children to speak the Creator's name, it could be their death sentence? It is recorded

---

[24] From *Encyclopædia Judaica*, published by The Macmillan Company, Vol. 7, 1971, by Keter Publishing House, Ltd., Jerusalem, Israel, p. 683.

[25] From *The Babylonian Talmud*, Seder Mo'ed, translated into English with notes, glossary and indices under the editorship of Rabbi Dr. I. Epstein, published by The Soncino Press, London, 1938, pp. 76-77.

[26] For more specific details regarding first century Roman practices, we refer you to chapter five of our *Sticks and Stones* study, entitled "The First Directive to Not Speak the Name is Given by a Heathen Nation."

that some 80,000 Jews were massacred during Antiochus Epiphanes' reign of terror.[27] How many of them were killed for refusing to abide by the decree to not speak the Creator's name? Only Yahweh knows.

Regardless of the consequences of that chain of events, we know that by the time Yeshua the Messiah completed His ministry, He declared (spoke) His Father's name, as He Himself testified in John 17:6, 26. We thus see that, historically-speaking, Judaism freely spoke the Creator's name at least until the days of Judah Maccabee. However, with a death penalty looming for those who spoke the Name, it is easy to understand how and why Jewish parents may have taught their children to not speak it. Moreover, in order to more persuasively coerce their children to avoid speaking this name, they may have even gone so far as to teach that, according to Leviticus 24:15-16, there is a death penalty for ***pronouncing*** that name. Interestingly, that particular translation is found in the Septuagint, the Greek translation of the Torah in use during the days of Antiochus Epiphanes.

Did the Ancients Know the Name YHWH?

Some who minimize the importance of learning, using and calling upon the name YHWH teach that the ancients didn't know the name YHWH. However, as we are about to see, the name *Yahweh* was important to righteous believers of Old. We know from Exodus 6:3 that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob knew Yahweh's name. Actually, the way Exodus 6:3 is worded in most English translations, one would be led to believe that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob ***didn't*** know the name Yahweh. Here is how this verse reads in the King James Version:

> [3]And I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by *the name of* God Almighty, but by my name JEHOVAH was I not known to them.

Please notice, first of all, that the words "the name of" are in italics. The translators put those words in italics to indicate to the reader that they added those words to the text. In other words, the words "the name of" do not appear in the original text. Secondly, we know that all three of the above-mentioned individuals did indeed know the Almighty by the name YAHWEH, as can easily be proven by simply citing the texts:

Abraham knew the name *Yahweh*:

> Genesis 13:4 - Unto the place of the altar, which he had make there at the first: and there Abram called on the name of YHWH.

Isaac knew the name *Yahweh*, as evidenced from the blessing he gave to his son Jacob:

---

[27] *C.f.*, II Maccabees 5:13-14, where we read, "Thus there was killing of young and old, making away of men, women, and children, slaying of virgins and infants. And there were destroyed within the space of three whole days fourscore thousand, whereof forty thousand were slain in the conflict; and no fewer sold than slain."

> Genesis 27:27 - And he came near, and kissed him: and he smelled the smell of his raiment, and blessed him, and said, See, the smell of my son is as the smell of a field which YHWH hath blessed:

By reviewing the text preceding Genesis 27:27, we understand that Jacob also knew the name *Yahweh*:

> Genesis 27:20 - And Isaac said unto his son, How is it that thou hast found it so quickly, my son? And he said, Because YHWH thy Almighty brought it to me.

Not only did these righteous men of Old call upon the name Yahweh, but so did all the saints mentioned in the Tanakh, as evidenced by the 6,823 times the name Yahweh appears there. It wasn't until a heathen nation imposed a decree prohibiting the mentioning of the name Yahweh that Judaism began the tradition of replacing it with substitutes.

How, then do we explain the apparent understanding brought out in Exodus 6:3 that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob did not know the Almighty by name? To begin with, we find it difficult to believe that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob would speak the name Yahweh and still not "know" Him by name. With this as our premise, let's examine Exodus 6:2-3 from another perspective: *Hebrew punctuation*. In Biblical Hebrew, no question marks ever appear at the end of questions, whether the questions are obvious questions or not-so-obvious ones. This is a fact that is very important in our review of Exodus 6:2-3, and this lack of Hebrew punctuation is cited by translator Jay P. Green, Sr. as one of the difficulties involved in translating the Hebrew text into English:

> The original manuscripts lacked any punctuation. The Hebrew text used in this volume incorporates the punctuation supplied by the Masoretes, and the interlinear English translation generally follows this punctuation. The English translation on the side, however, adheres to the principles of punctuation advocated in *A Manual of Style* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969). It should be noted that a question is often indicated in Hebrew at the beginning of a sentence, by other interrogative words, or sometimes only by the context.[28]

If the experts who translated the Hebrew text into English recognized the lack of punctuation (including question marks) as a "special difficulty," it should be obvious that they will concede that they may have missed some questions as they worked on translating the text from Hebrew to English! This, then, is one place where we believe the translators missed an obvious question. With this in mind, let's read Exodus 6:2-3 again, only *this* time with a question mark placed in a key spot:

---

[28] From *The Interlinear Bible: Hebrew, Greek, English*, 2nd ed., Jay P. Green, Sr., General Editor and Translator, Hendrickson Publishers, Peabody, Massachusetts, 1986, "Special Difficulties in the Translation," Preface.

[2] And the Almighty spake unto Moses, and said unto him, I am Yahweh:
[3] And I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by El Shaddai, but by My name Yahweh was I not known to them?

When regarded as a rhetorical question, we know the answer to whether or not the patriarchs knew Yahweh by name is an obvious "Yes." As we have established, translators are left to place question marks at the end of what ***they*** feel are actual questions. However, translators are not perfect, and they are bound to miss a verse or two where the original Hebrew sentence was actually framed as a ***question***. We believe Exodus 6:3 is one such verse, which alleviates any need for us to question as to whether or not the patriarchs really "knew" Yahweh by name.

It is clear that our Creator wants us to know, use and love His Name! It does not follow that we love His Name if we choose to call upon Him by substitutes. We demonstrate our love for His Name by using *the name He gave us to use* when we call upon Him and when we speak about Him to others, just as the believers of Old did. We *seal* our love for His Name by obeying Him in other areas as well, but that's another topic!

5. Is the Pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton Lost?

The author of "HaShem" seems to lean towards believing that the pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton (יהוה) has been lost, even though he does at least offer his readers a quote from the *Encyclopædia Judaica* in which the author says otherwise. In spite of the evidence that's available, Geoffrey concludes, "So, while 'Yahweh' remains the scholarly transliteration (and apparent pronunciation) of choice, there is no way to know for sure."[29] His attitude seems to be, "Since I don't know for ***sure*** how it's pronounced, I won't even try." He goes on to quote an author named Tim Hegg, who echoes the same sentiment:

> … the attempts (both ancient and modern) to derive the vowel sounds which must have originally attached to the four letters of the Name, while interesting and (in some cases) innovative, lack any solid historical verification and must be left to the realm of speculation. If verifiable data is the sure foundation for truth, we must admit that we do not know, for sure, exactly how the four-letter Name of God was pronounced in ancient times.[30]

The irony of this situation as described by Tim Hegg would almost be considered hilarious if it weren't for the gravity of the situation. First of all, Kevin Geoffrey has already cited the Jews' claim that there is a death penalty for pronouncing the Name, but now Hegg offers yet ***another*** reason for not pronouncing it: No one knows "for sure" how it's pronounced! The irony here lies in the fact that if the Jews had worked at retaining an indisputable pronunciation, there would not exist an argument aimed at not speaking the Name because of the reasoning that no one knows "for sure" how it's pronounced!

Historically-speaking, there is ample scholarly support for the pronunciation ***Yahweh***. Clement of Alexandria was a second-century theologian who wrote that the Creator's name, in Greek phonetics, is pronounced *Iaoue*.[31] This phonetic rendering, transliterated into English, produces the pronunciation *Yahweh*. Some folks, such as Tim Hegg, dismiss Clement of Alexandria's testimony as not being "solid." I would be very hesitant to do such a thing. Clement was a renowned scholar of his day. A native of Athens, Clement was converted to Christianity by Pantaenus, founder of the Catechetical School at Alexandria (a city which at that time was the intellectual capital of the Mediterranean world). Clement later succeeded his teacher as head of that school (about 180 CE).

The following biography of Clement of Alexandria is taken from an online source:

> For over 20 years he labored effectively as an apologist for the faith and catechist of the faithful. He regarded the science and philosophy of the Greeks as being, like the Torah of the Hebrews, a preparation for the Gospel, and the curriculum of his School undertook to give his students both a

---

[29] Geoffrey, Kevin, "HaShem," from the magazine *Bikurei Tziyon*, issue 75, B'reisheet / Genesis | Year 5763 (2002), p. 24.

[30] Ibid, p. 24. The actual quote from Hegg comes from his article "The Priestly Blessing," *Bikurei Tziyon* (Israel: First Fruitrs of Zion, 2001).

[31] *Cf.* Clemens Alexandrinus, the *Stromata* Book V, Chapter 6:34, where he writes, "The mysterious four-letter name, which is put around the one (the head-band), who alone (the high priest) is allowed to enter the most holy: this name was Ιαουε , which, when translated, means, 'the one, who is and who was.'" For more information, the above quote and more may be accessed at the following URL: http://hanskrause.de/HKHPE/hkhpe_28_01.htm. Also, an in-depth discussion regarding this topic may be read by accessing the article *Iaoue* at the following URL: http://encyclopedia.laborlawtalk.com/Iaoue

> knowledge the Gospel of Christ and a sound liberal education. His speculative theology, his scholarly defense of the faith and his willingness to meet non-Christian scholars on their own grounds, helped to establish the good reputation of Christianity in the world of learning and prepare the way for his pupil, Origen, the most eminent theologian of Greek Christianity. Clement is not on the present Roman calendar, but is on the Eastern calendar and many modern revisions of the Anglican calendar. His influence has been considerable.[32]

Regardless of the negative manner in which authors such as Tim Hegg may choose to regard the scholarship of Clement of Alexandria, the fact remains that he was an eminent scholar of his day, over 1,800 years ago—1,800 years closer to the time Yeshua walked among humanity. Clement of Alexandria was no slouch! While we may not agree with all of his beliefs, this should not influence our view of his credibility nor the validity of the facts he presents, especially since there is no record of a differing viewpoint among the scholars of his day. Certainly, we can agree that Clement of Alexandria correctly rendered the pronunciation of the ***first*** syllable of the Name (*Yah*). It is not unreasonable to conclude that he correctly offered the pronunciation of the ***second*** syllable as well.

You might wonder what makes us so certain that *Yah* is how the first syllable of the Creator's name is pronounced. Please consider the word *Hallelujah*. This is perhaps the most universally-known word, and is in fact a Hebrew word that literally means *Praise ye Yah*. The first part, *Hâllel* (Heb. הָלַל, word #1984 in *Strong's Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible*), means *Praise*. The second part of this word is, of course, *Yah* (Heb. יָהּ, #3050 in *Strong's*), which is the short form of our Heavenly Father's name, יהוה (#3068 in *Strong's*). Even the King James Version retained the short form of our Creator's name in Psalms 68:4. The full form (הַלְלוּיָהּ), pronounced *Halleluyah*, is found in the Psalms, such as Psalms 104:35. The Hebrew scholars who, in the 3rd century B.C.E., translated the Septuagint from Hebrew into Greek, also confirm the understanding that the first syllable of the Creator's name is pronounced *Yah*, as they render this word *Alleluia* (Αλληλούια). The "ia" ending, in Greek, is pronounced "*Yah*." Thus, scholars living in the 3rd century B.C.E. understood the *Yah* form of the Creator's name, which in turn validates the first syllable pronunciation offered by Clement of Alexander.

We are left to conclude that the "We just don't know how it was pronounced" reasoning offered by the author of "HaShem," as well as Tim Hegg, falls far short of being compelling enough to persuade us that there can be a valid justification for substituting the Tetragrammaton with "HaShem" or any other replacement. Hegg has determined that insufficient verifiable data exists to satisfy him of the correct pronunciation. Therefore, he isn't even going to ***try***! Rather, he will settle for substitutes. Mr. Geoffrey agrees with him. We find their reasoning to be unacceptable.

---

[32] From *Biographical Sketches of Memorable Christians of the Past,* "Clement of Alexandria, Teacher and Apologist," by James E. Kiefer. The entire commentary may be read by accessing the following URL: http://justus.anglican.org/resources/bio/298.html.

6. Response to Part III of Kevin Geoffrey's article: Is Speaking the Name a Biblical Command?

In the next section of his article "HaShem," author Kevin Geoffrey presents the notion that "calling upon the name" doesn't necessarily require ***speaking*** it. He writes:

> The idea of calling upon the Name, proclaiming the Name, praising or blessing the Name or anything like that does not mean that one must pronounce the Name, that is, to speak it audibly. It has to do with making known the person and works of ADONAI, proclaiming His character, His fame, promoting His great reputation. We see this in the parallelism of Deuteronomy 32:3, "For I proclaim the name of יהוה, Ascribe greatness to our God!" where proclaiming the Name is parallel to ascribing greatness to God. Proclaiming or calling upon the Name of ADONAI means to rely upon or declare His attributes as He has revealed to us through covenant relationship.[33]

The above commentary, in summary, states that calling upon a name does not require speaking it. Moreover, Mr. Geoffrey here attempts to equate "proclaiming" the Name with "ascribing greatness," as though the one expression defines the other. As we will demonstrate shortly, his premise is simply not valid. There is a definite and distinct difference between proclaiming a name and ascribing greatness to it. For example, we might ascribe greatness to Abraham Lincoln's name, but we are not out to proclaim Mr. Lincoln's name to anyone. The Hebrew word for "proclaim" is *qara* (קָרָא), a word that properly means "to address by name." It can also mean to pronounce, publish, make proclamation.

Even with two separate definitions of "proclaim" and "ascribe greatness," each expression demands that the name be either spoken or revealed in written form. To reuse the above example, it would not make sense to simply "ascribe greatness" to the name of the 16th President of the United States without somehow *mentioning* the name Abraham Lincoln, whether it be orally or in written form. And if we proclaim the name of the 16th President, why (and *how*) would we avoid pronouncing it? By teaching that a name should not be spoken, the result we achieve is forgetting that name. This is something that the Almighty did not want His children to do, as can be seen from Jeremiah 23:25-27:

> 25 I have heard what the prophets
> say, who prophesy falsely in My
> name: "I had a dream, I had a
> dream." 26 How long will there be
> in the minds of the prophets who
> prophesy falsehood—the prophets of
> their own deceitful minds— 27 the
> plan to make My people forget My
> name, by means of the dreams which
> they tell each other, just as
> their fathers forgot My name
> because of Baal?[34]

---

[33] Geoffrey, Kevin, "HaShem," from the magazine *Bikurei Tziyon*, issue 75, B'reisheet / Genesis | Year 5763 (2002), p. 24.

[34] At some point in history, Judaism began to teach that we should not speak the Creator's name. The result they have achieved, sadly, is that they have given themselves an additional excuse to not speak it. The excuse? "We must admit that we do not know, for sure, how the four-letter Name of God was pronounced in ancient times." As we have shown, however, this excuse is invalid.

In addition to his unsustainable attempt to equate two differing terms (ascribing greatness versus proclaiming), Mr. Geoffrey failed to address such matters as how one can forget a name if it never needs to be used or if it is never taught in the first place. Our Creator has a name, and He makes it clear that He doesn't want it to be forgotten. The Almighty has a name that can be proclaimed, ascribed with greatness, … and a name that can be forgotten. Common sense dictates that one cannot forget a name he never learned in the first place. Interestingly, we read in the above verse that Yahweh's name was forgotten because of Baal, an idol worshipped in Canaan during that time period. The word "Baal" was originally a common Hebrew designation meaning "master," "lord" or "husband," and was even a title ascribed to the Almighty, as He referred to Himself as a "Baal" (husband) in Jeremiah 31:32. Did a word meaning "lord" that was originally a title ascribed to the Creator come to be used as a name? And did that newly-invented name further degenerate into the name of an idol? Is this one of the steps in the chain of events leading from pure worship to Baal worship? As we just mentioned, the word "Baal," translated into English, means "LORD." This is the word that has been substituted for the Creator's name in 6,823 places. Is Yahweh pleased?

According to the explanation offered by Kevin Geoffrey, Yahweh is indeed pleased with having His Name substituted 6,823 times. Yahweh is indeed pleased, according to Mr. Geoffrey, that His people have forgotten His name … to the point that a controversy exists over how it "may have been pronounced anciently." After all, if we forget the name, we can't speak it, and we thus avoid the penalty outlined in Leviticus 24:15-16. According to Mr. Geoffrey, the important thing is that we "declare His attributes." In fact, according to Mr. Geoffrey, "declaring His attributes" is what "proclaiming His name" <u>really</u> means.

Of course, we completely disagree with Kevin Geoffrey's reasoning. For a name to do what he suggests (i.e., declare the Almighty's attributes), it would have to be so long that it would be totally impractical to use it. The Almighty's name (by his standard) would be something like "TheForgiverHealerDelivererShepherdKing ... ShieldCreatorAlmightyAllknowing ... AllwiseLovingJustRighteous ... EverlivingOne". (The "..." is for everything we may have left out). Can you imagine vocalizing the above monstrosity every time you encountered the simple Name "YHWH" in the Scriptures? Of course, neither can Mr. Geoffrey, which explains why he resorts to substitutes such as "HaShem" and "G-d." In the meantime, the name "Yahweh" is suppressed.[35]

The name "Yahweh," when translated/demoted to a mere title, only describes ONE of the Almighty's attributes, albeit a very important one - He Who Lives Forever. But to express that attribute, it must be vocalized. This vocalization, achieved by uttering the phonetic resonance producing the pronunciation *Yahway*, carries the "sound" that ***personally identifies*** the Almighty, implicitly describing ALL of His attributes (like the lengthy "Name" given earlier). His Name means Him, including everything we know about Him. And the more we learn about Him, the more His Name "Yahweh" means (to us). The various nations may have different words for all of Yahweh's titles, but His Name is the same for all of them (or at least will be when they are educated).

---

[35] We borrowed the reasoning presented in this paragraph, and the one that follows it, from a posting submitted to a web site forum board on June 30, 2005 by Chuck Baldwin. His complete commentary may be read by accessing a forum thread entitled "**replacing and restoring words in translations**," located at the following URL: http://www.eliyah.com/forum2/Forum10/HTML/002412.html

The argument that proclaiming the Creator's Name means "proclaiming His character" becomes all the more futile when examined under the light of Scripture. Throughout the *Tanakh*, Yahweh's character is revealed, but it doesn't do any good to describe someone's character if we have no means of identifying the Person we're describing! In Psalms 116:5, we learn about someone who is "gracious, benevolent and compassionate." But ***who*** is being described? Whose ***character*** and ***attributes*** are being described? Without a name, we would be left to guess. However, King David didn't leave us to guess. He gave the Name of the One to Whom he was referring: **YAHWEH**.

According to Kevin Geoffrey's reasoning, King David didn't need to list Yahweh's Name, as King David "proclaimed His Name" just by using the words "gracious, benevolent" and "compassionate."

Mr. Geoffrey is so certain that his reasoning is "on the mark" that he refers his readers to a separate one-page article he inserted, authored by Tim Hegg. In his article, Hegg simply reiterates Geoffrey's words. Here's an example:

> But in the context of worship and service, "to call upon the name of the L-rd" means to proclaim one's trust in Him and to praise His revealed character. This becomes evident when the phrase is encountered in the Psalms:
>
> *Oh give thanks to the LORD,*
> *call upon His name;*
> *Make known His deeds*
> *among the peoples.* Ps 105:1
>
> Here the parallel structure of the stanza alerts us to the fact the "call upon His name," is being paralleled and amplified by the next line, "make known His deeds among the peoples." In this way the Psalmist is telling us that "calling upon His name" means "making His deeds known among the peoples." Thus, calling upon the Name of the LORD does not mean simply pronouncing His name, but it means making known His character. This, of course, is the whole point of the Name from a Hebrew perspective, namely, that the various names by which God reveals Himself help us to know His true character. It is His character, known by His actions, which are encapsulated in His name. Thus, for the Psalms, the Name of ADONAI forms the central core of Israel's beliefs or theology.[36]

In response to Hegg's commentary, we would like to point out a few inaccurate statements. In addition to making the same mistake that Mr. Geoffrey makes in allowing a description of someone's attributes to equate to "proclaiming their name," it needs to be pointed out that "making known His deeds" is not the same as "calling upon His name." Rather than having found a "parallelism," Mr. Hegg simply found a verse where we are not *only* told to call upon Yahweh's Name, but we are ***also*** directed to make His deeds known! Without a name, how can we accomplish this directive? If we were to make *your* deeds known to others, how could we effectively do so without supplying your name?

[36] Ibid, p. 25. The one-page article is entitled "Proclaiming the Name" by Tim Hegg.

A "parallelism" is where different words are used to convey the same thought. For example, if I were to write, "Yahweh is compassionate; He loves us in spite of our sinful nature," I have just expressed a *parallelism*. There is a parallel between *compassionate* and *loving in spite of sinful nature*. There is not a parallel between proclaiming a name and declaring that person's attributes, even though the one action very aptly complements the other.

If Mr. Hegg would like a truly fitting parallelism from Scripture illustrating how calling upon a name involves *pronouncing* that name, here's one from Psalms 116:4:

> [4]and I invoked [called upon] the name of YAHWEH, "O YAHWEH, save my life!"[37]

In the first clause of Psalms 116:4, the psalmist states that he invoked the Name. In the ***next clause***, he tells the reader precisely <u>how</u> he called upon that Name! Make no mistake about it: Calling upon the Name Yahweh doesn't mean "declaring His attributes" or "describing His character." It involves ***speaking*** that Name! King David understood this principle!

The next inaccurate remark issued above by Tim Hegg involves what we consider to be the use of a clever smokescreen. He attempts to convey the thought that his method represents "*a Hebrew perspective*." As we illustrated with the quotation from Psalms 116:4, he could not be more mistaken. When Moses invoked the name of Yahweh, he literally spoke the Name. This was not Moses' expressed description of Yahweh's "character." By attempting to steer his readers into believing that he is offering them a "Hebrew perspective," Mr. Hegg's words might indicate that he has a special "inside track" into the "ancient Hebraic ways." We need to be careful of persuasive statements designed to draw us into a particular understanding due to an author who claims insight into a "Hebrew perspective." Even from the Hebraic perspective, proclaiming or invoking the Almighty's name includes ***speaking*** that name.

[37] Taken from the JPS translation, except we took the liberty of restoring our Creator's Name.

7. Misrepresenting the Hebrew Text

Regrettably, in his quest to justify disuse of the Tetragrammaton, Tim Hegg grossly misrepresents the Hebrew text of Exodus 33:19, as well as Exodus 34:6-7. In his separate commentary, offered in conjunction with Kevin Geoffrey's article, he misquotes the Hebrew text, which in turn might mislead the innocent reader into thinking that the name "Yahweh" doesn't appear in Exodus 33:19. What follows is Hegg's commentary, which is contained within Kevin Geoffrey's article:

> It is not difficult to see, even from the "Name theology" of the Psalms, that to proclaim the Name of ADONAI means to make known His person and works. The phrase has nothing whatsoever to do with the pronunciation of the Name itself. In fact, the Name is a way of referring to ADONAI Himself, for it is ADONAI Who performs all of the wonders, yet this is attributed to His Name. Thus, the Name of ADONAI simply means ADONAI as He has revealed Himself to His people.
>
> This is confirmed in the famous text from Exodus 33:19ff. Here, after Moses requests to see the glory of ADONAI, He informs Moses that He will "*proclaim His Name*" to him. We are to understand that the proclamation of the Name is equivalent with the revelation of His glory. Yet when we listen for the promised proclamation, what we hear are the Names of God defined as the revelation of His attributes:
>
> > *Then ADONAI passed by in front of him and proclaimed, "ADONAI, ADONAI, God, compassionate and gracious, slow to anger, and abounding in lovingkindness and truth; who keeps lovingkindness for thousands, who forgives iniquity, transgression and sin; yet He will by no means leave the guilty unpunished, visiting the iniquity of fathers on the children and on the grandchildren to the third and fourth generations." (Exodus 34:6-7)*
>
> Rather than simply hearing the Name pronounced ..., to "proclaim the Name," here modeled by HaShem Himself, means to make His glorious deeds known. The same may be said of the Aaronic Benediction in which the Priests are commanded to "place the Name upon the people" (Num 6:27). Here, in the proclamation of the Name, once again His attributes are what is pronounced or spoken, not merely ... saying the Name.[38]

At first glance, upon reading the above commentary, the casual reader might think that Yahweh didn't declare His own name in Exodus 34:6, at least not by reading the passage as cited by Mr. Hegg. Mr. Hegg would leave the reader with the impression that the "name" being proclaimed is "Adonai." Thankfully, elsewhere in the article, Kevin Geoffrey correctly translates the verse, retaining the Tetragrammaton. Anyone reading the actual Hebrew text of Ex. 34:6 can plainly see that Yahweh

[38] Geoffrey, Kevin, "HaShem," from the magazine *Bikurei Tziyon*, issue 75, B'reisheet / Genesis | Year 5763 (2002), p. 25. The one-page article on this page is entitled "Proclaiming the Name" by Tim Hegg.

proclaimed His own name, and that name was ***Yahweh***, not "Adonai." What follows is the Hebrew text of Exodus 34:6 as it appears in *The Interlinear Bible*[39]:

2587	7349	410	3068	3068	7121	6440	3068	5674
וחנון	רחום	אל	יהוה	יהוה ויקרא		על־פניו	יהוה	ויעבר
gracious and	**merciful**	**El**	**Yahweh**	**Yahweh**	**proclaimed and**	**face his before**	**Yahweh**	**by passed And** ם

In view of Tim Hegg's misleading rendering of Exodus 34:6, we believe it is important for the reader to understand that the Tetragrammaton does indeed appear in that verse. Thus, when Yahweh said He would proclaim His own Name, *that is precisely what He did*. What we find confusing is how Kevin Geoffrey, in his separate commentary, correctly identifies the Tetragrammaton as being in the above text, whereas the author he quotes (Tim Hegg) leaves his readers with the impression that it is missing.

Furthermore, both Hegg and Geoffrey seem to promote the notion that because Yahweh's attributes appear in this verse, this must somehow mean that the "declaration of attributes" equates with "proclaiming His Name." This is simply a false notion. Certainly, Yahweh is merciful and gracious, but that doesn't make "merciful and gracious" His name! Even in English, when introducing someone, it is not uncommon to list some attributes of the person who is being introduced. For example, "I would like you to meet my good friend Bill, who is the most gracious and caring person I've ever known." We doubt that anyone would question the fact that the name of the individual being introduced is "Bill," ***not*** "The Most Gracious and Caring Person." Nevertheless, this is the sort of reasoning that Tim Hegg promotes with his commentary. We would like to believe the average person knows better!

Mr. Hegg concludes the commentary cited above by alluding to the understanding that the name *Yahweh* does not appear in the Aaronic blessing found in Numbers chapter six. While we cannot be certain that this is what he attempts to imply due to the vagueness of that particular point, we would like to make it very clear that Yahweh's name (יהוה) *does* appear in the text of Numbers 6:24-26. In the verse that follows, after having His name mentioned three times, the Almighty states, "So they will put My name on the children of Israel and I will bless them." We find it absurd that this text would be included with any rationale designed to teach that the name YHWH should not be uttered.

[39] *The Interlinear Bible*, Jay P. Green, Sr., General Editor and Translator, Hendrickson Publishers, Peabody, MA, 1986.

8. Who Do We Call Upon for Salvation?

Tim Hegg concludes his one-page commentary by assuring his readers that "calling upon the name" of the Almighty does not mean "pronounce the Name." Of course, even on the surface, this remark is not credible. We're curious as to what "name" it is that Mr. Hegg would call upon when faced with certain death. In the documentary *The Iceman: Confessions of a Mafia Hitman*, the notorious killer-for-hire by the name of Richard Kuklinski described giving one of his victims a half-hour for his "God" to save him. If Mr. Hegg had been that victim, which name would he have called upon? Would it have been Zeus? Hermes? Apollo? Baal? God? HaShem? One thing seems certain: It would not have been the name Yahweh, especially since he believes there is a death penalty for speaking it! Nevertheless, as we have demonstratively shown, the ancient believers held no such view.

I am reminded of a friend who attended a carnival, and as part of the festivities he rode one of the more challenging rides, the *Kamikaze*. During the ride, there was a sudden mechanical problem that brought the cage he was riding in to an abrupt halt. My friend quickly found himself suspended upside-down some 30 feet in the air. He was certain that he was about to die, especially when he overheard one of the workers below shout, "***Cut the chain! Cut the chain!***" In desperation, he screamed, "**YAHWEH!!**" at the top of his lungs. He didn't cry out the name of Zeus or any other name assigned to heathen idols, including the name "God." Nor did he immediately recite all the characteristics of the Almighty. No, he *literally* called upon the name of the Heavenly Father, using the best pronunciation that he knew of. I don't know about you, but I would do the very same thing if I found myself in such a predicament![40]

As we have previously mentioned, we simply cannot think of a better name to call upon than the one our Creator gave to Himself, and to date, not a single person has ever offered a better choice, or even one that is "just as good," for that matter. Nevertheless, it appears that Mr. Hegg believes it would be better to "confess and praise the character of God" than to call upon the Creator of the universe by the Name He gave to Himself.

In offering his Scriptural rationale for believing that "calling upon the name" doesn't mean to literally speak the name, Tim Hegg attempts to cross-reference Joel 2:32 with Romans 10:13. Joel 2:32 is the verse wherein we are told that "Whoever will call upon the name of YAHWEH will be saved." Here is an excerpt from that portion of Mr. Hegg's commentary:

> A final proof that by "calling upon the Name" the writers of Scripture meant "to proclaim or confess one's faith in and praise of the self-revealed God of Israel" is the quote from Joel 2:32 [Heb 3:5] in Romans 10:13. Paul is describing how one comes into a righteous standing before HaShem, and he emphasizes that this is by faith. As proof of his position, he quotes from Joel: "Whoever will call upon the name of the LORD will be saved." Here, the phrase "call upon the Name of the LORD" is used by Paul to mean "confess one's faith in the Messiah Yeshua." It is ludicrous to interpret this as meaning that if one correctly pronounces the Sacred Name he will be saved!

[40] By the way, we are pleased to report that our friend survived this harrowing experience and lived to tell the story!

> It can be seen, then, that "calling on the name of the LORD" does not mean to "pronounce the Name" but to confess and praise the character of God which all the names of God reveal.[41]

As expressed above by Tim Hegg, he believes that "the LORD" in Joel 2:32 is the same as Yeshua the Messiah. To best illustrate how we believe Mr. Hegg misunderstands "Who" is being referenced in Romans 10:13, we will display Romans 10:8-13:

> [8]But what saith it? The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth, and in thy heart: that is, the word of faith, which we preach; [9]That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Yeshua, and shalt believe in thine heart that the Almighty hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. [10]For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation. [11]For the scripture saith, Whosoever believeth on Him shall not be ashamed. [12]For there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek: for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him. [13]For whosoever shall call upon the name of Yahweh shall be saved.

In the above text, we restored the name "Yahweh" in verse 13 simply because we understand that Paul was directly quoting Joel 2:32, and the name "Yahweh" appears in that verse. We strongly doubt that Paul would have substituted for the Creator's name.[42] Tim Hegg expects us to believe that Romans 10:13 is a reference to Yeshua, when nothing could be further from the truth. Moreover, in verse 9, reference is made to the Almighty, who raised Yeshua from the dead. The name of the Almighty who raised Yeshua from the dead is *Yahweh*. Even verse 11 is a clear reference to Yahweh. The scripture verse that Paul was referring to is Isaiah 28:16. We call upon **Yahweh** … in Yeshua's name. We do not call upon Yeshua. Yeshua Himself instructed His followers to pray to ***the Father***, not to Him (Matt. 6:9).

In spite of Tim Hegg's best efforts to express the concept that "calling upon the Name" doesn't really ***mean*** "calling upon the Name," each of his arguments collapses when examined under the light of Scripture. As we have demonstrated, the Apostle Paul, in Romans 10:13, made a reference to the Heavenly Father, not to His Son. The Name we call upon for salvation is the ***Father's*** Name, not the Son's.

---

[41] The one-page article on this page is entitled "Proclaiming the Name" by Tim Hegg.

[42] There is evidence that, at least in the Scripture quotations found in the New Testament, the authors retained the Tetragrammaton without substituting for it. We know from the Tosefta and Talmuds that certain New Testament manuscripts contained the name YHWH in their text (t.Shab. 13:5; b.Shab. 116a; j.Shab. 15c). Moreover, the Münster Hebrew text of Matthew actually preserves the name of YHWH where it belongs. Cf., *The Hebraic-Roots Version Scriptures*, translated by James Scott Trimm, published by The Society for the Advancement of Nazarene Judaism, Hurst, TX, 2004, p. lii.

Furthermore, we have shown that there is a difference between "calling upon the Name" and identifying the character and attributes of the One upon Whom we call. Unlike the message Tim Hegg attempts to convey, calling upon the Name of the One we worship involves reverently *speaking* His name. Otherwise the Name isn't being called upon! For this expression to mean anything else opens a proverbial "Pandora's box," making it possible to "call upon the Name" while reflecting upon the Creator's loving, merciful character … yet simultaneously referring to Him as "Zeus." Mr. Hegg's approach also fails to address how it is possible for His people to "forget His Name" (Jer. 23:27).

9. Is Our Salvation Jeopardized by Not Pronouncing יהוה?

The big question folks seem to bring up during discussions of this sort is, "Are you saying I won't be saved unless I call upon that name?" This is reminiscent of the questions we were asked by our Sunday-keeping friends back when we decided to observe the weekly Sabbath.

"Are you saying my dear Aunt Mabel, who faithfully went to church every Sunday, taught Sunday School for 35 years, and so unselfishly gave of herself to help those in need … are you saying she won't be saved because she didn't obey the fourth commandment?"

These are questions that no human can answer, and very likely those who ask the questions know this in advance. We will not pretend to be anyone's judge. We can only act upon what we believe to be true based upon our own study of Scripture, and according to what we read in Scripture, the weekly Sabbath was never "done away," as taught by nominal Christianity. In the same way, just as the ancients called upon the name יהוה by literally pronouncing that name, we intend to do the same, not because it makes us any better than anyone else or because we believe it is necessary for salvation, but because we ***want*** to call upon the name of our Heavenly Father, in imitation of those faithful who have gone before us. With this in mind, we will now address the next portion of author Kevin Geoffrey's commentary:

> While many champions for audibly pronouncing the Name will concede to this understanding [that calling upon the name יהוה means to rely upon or declare His attributes], the pervading perception is that it fails to address the rudimentary concept of the purpose and use of having a name at all. Hence, it seems incomplete to say that proclaiming or calling upon the Name does not contain the element of pronunciation. Indeed, there are a multitude of Torah commands that we do not know exactly how to do—why should saying the Name be any different?[43]

First of all, as we have previously covered in this response, we do not in any way concede that calling upon the name יהוה includes relying upon or declaring His attributes. Calling upon His name simply involves speaking His name. Any other interpretation can only be construed as a "cop-out" – a means of excusing oneself from speaking that name.

Secondly, we find it curious that Mr. Geoffrey now admits that it at least "seems incomplete" to conclude that calling upon the Name does not involve the element of pronunciation. Indeed, this is a significant concession on his part. However, he immediately excuses himself by deducing that there are a multitude of Torah commands that we do not know exactly how to do … so he concludes that speaking the name יהוה shouldn't be any different. In other words, his reasoning becomes, "If we don't know ***for sure***, then why worry about it?"

Finally, in a bizarre twist, Mr. Geoffrey's very next comment completely undermines his weak excuse. He asks:

---

[43] Geoffrey, Kevin, "HaShem," from the magazine *Bikurei Tziyon*, issue 75, B'reisheet / Genesis | Year 5763 (2002), p. 24.

> Shouldn't we simply do the best we can to speak the name of יהוה?[44]

Of course, we concur that the answer to the above question is a resounding, "YES!" This is why June and I call upon the name *Yahweh*, not because we believe it is the only possible pronunciation of the Creator's name, but because, in keeping with our own personal research, it is the pronunciation that best reflects the original pronunciation. Not everyone agrees with our conclusion, and that is their prerogative. So long as they are doing the best they can, we believe the Almighty understands. It's the same with our own names. In my own case, I have a Spanish-speaking friend who simply cannot pronounce my name correctly, although she tries very hard to do so. I appreciate her efforts and I would in no way dictate that our friendship is dependent upon her enunciating my name 100% correctly. I cannot imagine a friendship based upon such terms. Conversely, however, what kind of a friend would she be if she never even ***tried*** to correctly pronounce my name?

Sadly, instead of answering his own question above with the obvious answer, Mr. Geoffrey goes on to downplay any importance of speaking the Name of יהוה. He writes:

> As important as the Sacred Name is to God's redeemed, it was apparently not so vitally important in the lives of some key Biblical characters that the pronunciation of the Name overshadowed the importance of the relationship between the Creator and the created.[45]

What? Mr. Geoffrey, after having strongly suggested that we should do our best to speak the Name, immediately pulls a reverse maneuver by *minimizing* the need to do so! And how does he do this? By stating that this issue wasn't important to "some key Biblical characters," or as he puts it, it wasn't as important as the relationship itself. Just to make certain we are not misunderstood, June and I are in no way stating that the pronunciation of the Name overshadows the importance of the relationship between the Creator and the created. Rather, we *are* stating that the pronunciation of the Name is an important *part* of that relationship. Why should we seek to attach a certain "level" of importance to *any* part of a meaningful relationship? When analyzing the various components of a relationship, we don't say, "This aspect is more important than that one." Instead, we understand that *everything* is important in its own way, intricately working together to contribute to the intimacy that makes the relationship so special, and that includes knowing the *identity* of the one with whom we share that relationship. It is clear from the above-cited comment that, to Mr. Geoffrey, speaking the name of the person with whom we share an intimate relationship is *not* as important as having a meaningful relationship with that person. We counter by asserting that if the relationship is meaningful, speaking that person's name will be a *very* important part of that relationship.

According to Mr. Geoffrey, then, speaking the Creator's name wasn't all that important to some "key Biblical characters." That, from all appearances, is the gist of what he attempts to convey to his reading audience in the commentary cited above. Which "key Biblical characters" is Mr. Geoffrey referring to? Although he cites no compelling examples supporting his generalization, he does bring Moses and Yeshua the Messiah into the picture as the examples illustrating his point. Regrettably, his examples are weak, and we will soon see how inadequate his attempt is. Certainly, though, if speaking the Creator's

---

[44] Ibid.
[45] Ibid.

name was not important to either Moses or Yeshua, then it shouldn't be important to us, either; at least this is how Mr. Geoffrey believes we should approach this matter. This is the type of persuasive tactic that Mr. Geoffrey attempts to impose upon his reading audience. In fact, in his attempt, Mr. Geoffrey actually employs a device that is common among those who distort Scripture so as to make it fit their theological views. This device is simply known as "Inadequate Evidence," as explained by James Sire in his book *Scripture Twisting*. He describes this ploy as follows:

> **12. INADEQUATE EVIDENCE:** A hasty generalization is drawn from too little evidence. Example: The Jehovah's Witnesses teach that blood transfusion is nonbiblical, but the biblical data that they cite fails either to speak directly to the issue or to adequately substantiate their teaching.[46]

In utilizing this "Inadequate Evidence" device, Mr. Geoffrey draws a hasty generalization without citing any compelling evidence in support of his claim. First of all, let's address his expressed rationale that "there are a multitude of Torah commands that we do not know exactly how to do—why should saying the Name be any different?" (see p. 31). This is a seemingly authoritative remark, but he fails to cite Scriptural examples of Torah commands that we do not know exactly how to do. And even if he would have cited some valid examples, would this justify not doing our best to ***try***? This approach to justifying one's desire to not call upon the name YHWH may persuade those who seek pretexts to not obey Torah, but to those whose hearts are turned towards living by Yahweh's every Word, it is a hasty generalization drawn from *far* too little evidence. Secondly, Mr. Geoffrey fails to list balanced examples of "key Biblical characters" for whom the matter of speaking the Creator's name was not important. He cites Moses and Yeshua, but as we will demonstrate later, his examples are *unbalanced* and therefore flawed, for both Moses and Yeshua certainly spoke, declared and called upon the name יהוה. In fact, in the case of Moses, Mr. Geoffrey fails to address how the Creator's name could *not* have been important to the man who flat-out *asked Him* His name. Shown below is the word-for-word reading of Exodus 3:13-15 as it appears in the JPS (Jewish Publication Society) translation:

> [13]Moses said to God, "When I come to the Israelites and say to them 'The God of your fathers has sent me to you,' and they ask me, 'What is His name?' what shall I say to them?" [14]And God said to Moses, "Ehyeh-Asher-Ehyeh."[a] He continued, "Thus shall you say to the Israelites, 'Ehyeh[b] sent me to you.' [15]And God said further to Moses, "Thus shall you speak to the Israelites: The LORD,[c] the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, has sent me to you:
>
> This shall be My name forever,
> This My appellation for all eternity.

[46] From *Scripture Twisting*, by James Sire, Inter-varsity Press, Downers Grove, IL, 1980. Excerpt may also be read by accessing the following URL: http://www.apologeticsindex.org/b03.html.

Contrary to the message that Mr. Geoffrey would have us to believe regarding Moses, the Creator's name was indeed very important to him. If knowing the name of the Almighty *wasn't* important to Moses, then why did he bring it up? As we can see within the above text of this translation, the JPS translators indicate three footnotes, which are as follows:

> [a] *Meaning of Heb. uncertain; variously translated: "I Am That I Am"; "I Am Who I Am"; "I Will Be What I Will Be"; etc.*
> [b] *Others "I Am" or "I Will Be."*
> [c] *The name* YHWH (*traditionally read* Adonai *"the LORD"*) *is here associated with the root* hayah *"to be."*[47]

Aside from giving their readers the various possible meanings of the Hebrew "`Ehyeh-Asher-Ehyeh`," the JPS translators concede the name YHWH (יהוה) appears in the original Hebrew text of Exodus 3:15. Although YHWH is indeed associated with the root "`Ehyeh-Asher-Ehyeh`," this is not His name. Many confuse the Almighty's immediate response in verse 14 as being His name. We should rather think of the response in verse 14 as the Almighty laying a foundation … preparing Moses for His actual name by first giving him the *meaning*. Then, in verse 15, He told Moses how to identify Him to the Israelites ("*Thus shall you speak to the Israelites*"). The name He gave to Moses is the name *YHWH*, and He made it clear that this is His name *forever*. This does not imply a name that should be allowed to pass through the generations as a forgotten memorial, but rather a name to be *exalted* and *remembered*!

If we analyze Mr. Geoffrey's presentation to this point, the folly of his reasoning is fully exposed. Here is a summary of what he does:

1. In the first paragraph cited in this chapter (p. 31), Mr. Geoffrey recognizes that it "**seems incomplete**" to say that calling upon the Name does not contain the element of pronunciation. In other words, calling upon the Name must include speaking that Name. This remark *undermines* his previous objective in maintaining that calling upon the Creator's name doesn't necessarily involve speaking or pronouncing that name.

2. Mr. Geoffrey backpedals, excusing himself from not attempting to pronounce the Creator's name by stating that there are a multitude of Torah commands that we don't know exactly how to do – so this would seem to imply that if we don't know exactly how to pronounce יהוה, then we shouldn't worry about it.

3. After explaining to his reading audience that they shouldn't have to worry about calling (or not calling) upon יהוה, he then does a "reversal" by stating, "Shouldn't we simply do the best we can to speak the name of יהוה?" This contradictory style does nothing to enhance his credibility.

4. Upon asking the above question, which has such an obvious answer, Mr. Geoffrey goes on to downplay the importance of speaking the Name by citing unspecified "key Biblical characters" for whom it was apparently (in his estimation) not an important issue. Again, as we are about to see, the two "key characters" he cites convey the *opposite* of what Mr. Geoffrey hopes to achieve in his treatise.

Mr. Geoffrey's reasoning, apart from lacking any substance, was written in such a way as to persuade the reader of the validity of his position. From our perspective, his reasoning serves to illustrate the

---

[47] From *Takakh: The Holy Scriptures*, The Jewish Publication Society, 1988.

contorted logic contrived by those who are bent on justifying a position that is otherwise without any merit whatsoever. We really need to be careful when reading *any* persuasive study, including this one. In the case of Mr. Geoffrey, we can only conclude that his article was conceived and composed with a slant that did not allow him to be open to another perspective. Our reaction to Mr. Geoffrey's methods may seem blunt, but we know of no other way to describe flip-flopping from, "Shouldn't we do our best to speak His name?" to "Speaking his name wasn't all that important to the ancients, so it shouldn't be an important matter to us, either."

Even though we find much of Mr. Geoffrey's reasoning to be misguided, his comments nevertheless do contain a certain amount of truth. He states that speaking the Creator's name did not overshadow the importance of the relationship between the Creator and the created. To the best of our knowledge, no Sacred Name advocate has ever stated otherwise. We have certainly never done so. Left out of Mr. Geoffrey's equation is the fact that, in any meaningful relationship, each party knows, respects, and uses the other party's name. This should never be construed as a perception that an individual's ***name*** is more important than having a meaningful relationship with him or her. Rather, respectfully using that person's name is an important ***part*** of that meaningful relationship. Based upon what Mr. Geoffrey wrote, he does not either understand or appreciate this truth.

10. Did Moses Not Consider it Important to Speak the Name יהוה?

As we mentioned earlier, the author of "HaShem" on the one hand states that we should do our best to speak the name יהוה, then downplays the importance of doing so by stating that it wasn't all that important in the lives of some "key Biblical characters." Surprisingly, one of the examples of "key Biblical characters" cited by Mr. Geoffrey is none other than ***Moses,*** a man who is recorded as having spoken the name *Yahweh* over **70 times** in the book of Exodus alone! Using Moses to validate the notion that it isn't important to speak the Creator's name would akin to using Rosa Parks to prove that Civil Rights was not an important issue to African-Americans of the 1960's. Here is the full text of Mr. Geoffrey's commentary:

> For instance, in one of the most dramatic passages of Scripture, ADONAI says to Moses,
>
> > *"I will make all My goodness pass before you, and I will proclaim before you the name יהוה…" [Then] יהוה came down in a cloud; He stood with [Moses] there, and proclaimed the name יהוה. יהוה passed before him and proclaimed: "יהוה! יהוה! a God compassionate and gracious, slow to anger, abounding in kindness and faithfulness, extending kindness to the thousandth generation, forgiving iniquity, transgression, and sin; yet He does not remit all punishment, but visits the iniquity of parents upon children and children's children, upon the third and fourth generations." Moses hastened to bow low to the ground in homage…* —Exodus 33:19, 34:5-8 JPS
>
> ADONAI audibly spoke His Name—יהוה—no less than three times while Moses stood in His presence. Moses responded quickly to the proclamation of the name of יהוה with worship in reverent fear. When Moses would next speak to ADONAI in one of the most profound, intimate moments of His life, He would surely be within the spirit of the moment to address the Creator according to His Name, now so clearly spoken in Moses' ears. In the very next verse, Moses speaks to the Creator and says,
>
> אִם־נָא מָצָאתִי חֵן בְּעֵינֶיךָ אֲדֹנָי
> יֵלֶךְ־נָא אֲדֹנָי בְּקִרְבֵּנוּ כִּי עַם־קְשֵׁה־עֹרֶף
> הוּא וְסָלַחְתָּ לַעֲוֹנֵנוּ וּלְחַטָּאתֵנוּ וּנְחַלְתָּנוּ
>
> > *"If now I have found favor in your sight,*
> > *אדני (Adonai), I pray, let אדני (Adonai) go*
> > *along in our midst…"*
> > *Exodus 34:9*
>
> In the presence of the Creator, having audibly heard the Creator Himself pronounce His Name mere seconds before, Moses responds by calling him אֲדֹנָי, Adonai.[48]

In response to the above commentary, we would like to address Mr. Geoffrey's assessment of Yahweh's proclamation of His name to Moses as being "one of the most profound, intimate moments of

[48] Geoffrey, Kevin, "HaShem," from the magazine *Bikurei Tziyon*, issue 75, B'reisheet / Genesis | Year 5763 (2002), p. 24 and p. 26.

his life." Without a doubt, as Mr. Geoffrey reasons, that was certainly a profound moment in Moses' life. Certainly, any recorded incident in which Moses interacted with the Almighty has to be considered a "profound moment." In the recorded incident selected by Mr. Geoffrey, we can understand why Moses might have been in such awe that he didn't himself speak the Name, and we aren't about to suggest that he at that moment should have done so. Nevertheless, the evidence actually bears out that Moses ***did indeed*** address Yahweh by name in Exodus 34:9. Our explanation is as follows:

To begin our explanation of how Moses actually addressed Yahweh by name in Exodus 34:9, we need to first point out that it is true that according to the Masoretic Text of Exodus 34:9, Moses addressed the Almighty with the title *Adonai*. We do not deny this fact, which is easily verified by accessing an interlinear Bible, such as *The Interlinear Bible*, 2nd Edition by Jay P. Green, Sr., or the online Scripture Analyzer, which offers the following view of the Hebrew text of Exodus 34:9, accompanied by the English translation:

At first glance, it might appear that Kevin Geoffrey's point is sound and that Moses, in spite of having audibly heard the Creator pronounce His own Name mere seconds before, responded by calling him אֲדֹנָי, Adonai. On the surface, this might lend credence to the Jewish principle of avoiding any mention of the Creator's personal name; that is, if it weren't for the fact that Moses is recorded mentioning the name Yahweh on many occasions. Moreover, as pointed out by E. W. Bullinger in *The Companion Bible*, the scribes, known as the *Sopherim*, substituted אֲדֹנָי (*Adonai*) in place of יהוה (Yahweh) in 134 places, ***including Exodus 34:9***. The *Sopherim* were considered "authorized revisers of the Sacred text,"[49] and they were apparently persuaded that it is not appropriate for any man to address the Creator by name. Therefore they altered any petitions directed at Yahweh by name to instead read *Adonai*, which means "Lord." They followed the same basic principle that exists when addressing leaders of nations, including royalty. Instead of addressing a king by name, the formal protocol is to address him as "Your majesty." In the same way, the President of the United States is addressed, not by name, but as "Mr. President." While their intentions may have actually been noble, they were nevertheless unjustified and in violation of Deuteronomy 4:2, where we are charged to neither add to nor take away from

[49] For more information about the *Sopherim*, c.f., *The Companion Bible*, Kregel Publications, Notes and appendixes by E. W. Bullinger, Appendix 32, Grand Rapids, MI, 1999 (originally published in 1922), p. 31.

Yahweh's Word. The process of removing the Tetragrammaton "takes away" and inserting *Adonai* "adds."

The following page displaying the 134 places where the *Sopherim* replaced the Creator's name with *Adonai* is copied from Appendix 32 of Bullinger's work[50]:

32 THE 134 PASSAGES WHERE THE *SŌPHERĪM* ALTERED "JEHOVAH" TO "ADONAI".

Out of extreme (but mistaken) reverence for the Ineffable Name "Jehovah", the ancient custodians of the Sacred Text substituted in many places "Adonai" (see Ap. 4. viii. 2). These, in the A.V. and R.V., are all printed "Lord". In all these places we have printed it "LORD*", marking the word with an asterisk in addition to the note in the margin, to inform the reader of the fact.

The official list given in the *Massōrah* (§§ 107–15, Ginsburg's edition) contains the 134.

Gen. 18. 3, 27, 30, 32; 19. 18; 20. 4.

Ex. 4. 10, 13; 5. 22; 15. 17; 34. 9, 9.

Num. 14. 17.

Josh. 7. 8.

Judg. 6. 15; 13. 8.

1 Kings 3. 10, 15; 22. 6.

2 Kings 7. 6; 19. 23.

Isa. 3. 17, 18; 4. 4; 6. 1, 8, 11; 7. 14, 20; 8. 7; 9. 8, 17; 10. 12; 11. 11; 21. 6, 8, 16; 28. 2; 29. 13; 30. 20; 37. 24; 38. 14, 16; 49. 14.

Ezek. 18. 25, 29; 21. 13; 33. 17, 29.

Amos 5. 16; 7. 7, 8; 9. 1.

Zech. 9. 4.

Mic. 1. 2.

Mal. 1. 12, 14.

Ps. 2. 4; 16. 2; 22. 19, 30; 30. 8; 35. 3, 17, 22; 37. 12;

We thus see that, indeed, Moses ***did*** address Yahweh by name in such verses as Exodus 34:9, which, as pointed out by Kevin Geoffrey, was a profound moment in the life of Moses. But how about considering some ***other*** **"**profound moments" in Moses' life?

How about the song he sang after the Egyptian army was drowned in the Red Sea? In that song, found in Exodus 15, Moses sang the name *Yahweh*, audibly pronouncing that name twelve times. Why didn't Mr. Geoffrey use *that* passage to validate his case for believing that speaking the Name was unimportant to "key Biblical characters"?

And how about the giving of the manna? It was then that Yahweh introduced the children of Israel to His weekly Sabbath day. Certainly this has to qualify as a "profound moment" in Moses' life. This event, found in Exodus 16, records Moses referring to the Almighty by His Name, **YAHWEH**, at least fourteen times. As significant as this event was, it eluded Mr. Geoffrey's radar. Clearly, Mr. Geoffrey's decision to use the account of Exodus 34 to validate his position could not have been based upon sound reasoning, nor a desire to present all the facts to his readers. There is no rule requiring anyone, including Moses, to speak the Name in each and every reference to the Almighty — or when addressing Him. Moreover, Mr. Geoffrey should have understood that all it *really* takes is ***one*** recorded instance to validate speaking the Name. In the case of Moses, however, he *routinely* referred to the Almighty by His name, *Yahweh*, but that doesn't mean he mentioned that name in every situation, nor would I ever expect anyone to believe such a thing. Mr. Geoffrey simply chose to select an instance in which, at first glance, it appears that Moses did not address the Creator by His name, as though that particular instance is the one each of us should use as the "determining factor." By digging deeper, we find that Moses actually did address Yahweh by name in the very verse cited by Kevin Geoffrey, but even if Moses hadn't done so, this would most certainly not cancel out the numerous *other* occasions in which he definitely *did* address Yahweh by name.

[50] *The Companion Bible*, Kregel Publications, Notes and appendixes by E. W. Bullinger, Appendix 32, Grand Rapids, MI, 1999 (originally published in 1922), p. 31.

11. Did Yeshua Not Consider it Important to Speak the Name יהוה?

According to Kevin Geoffrey, the next "key Biblical character" to whom speaking the name *Yahweh* was "not so vitally important" was the very Son of Yahweh, Yeshua the Messiah. As we review this particular claim, we need to bear in mind that no surviving Greek New Testament manuscripts contain the name *Yahweh*, whether it be in the form יהוה or the Greek equivalent Ιαουέ. This has led many to conclude that none of the NT writers ever wrote or spoke the name *Yahweh*. We believe this is a very premature conclusion, especially when you consider the abrupt distinction this makes between the *Tanakh* (Old Testament) and the New Testament. Consider, if you will, the fact that the Tetragrammaton (יהוה) appears 6,823 times in the *Tanakh*. Suddenly, however, when we come to the New Testament, it appears zero times! How did such an important name, mentioned so many times in the *Tanakh*, suddenly become *unmentionable* in the New Testament? As the expression goes, "Somethin' ain't right!"

As it turns out, there is an abundance of supporting evidence that the NT writers ***did*** in fact use the Tetragrammaton. We cover this aspect more extensively in our study *Sticks and Stones May Break My Bones, But Names Will Never Hurt Me: A Look at the Name We Call Our Heavenly Father*, especially in the chapter entitled "The Enemy Within." In our study, we mention that although it is true that the majority of ancient New Testament manuscripts only survives in Greek form, some Hebrew manuscripts have also surfaced, including the Hebrew Matthew, as well as a Hebrew text of the book of Hebrews. In these texts, there is evidence supporting the belief that the Tetragrammaton was in the original documents.[51] Thus, there is strong evidence that the insertion of a substitute for the Father's name occurred when the originals were copied. Notice the following commentary from the book *The Cairo Geniza*:

> We now know that the Greek Bible text as far as it was written by Jews for Jews did not translate the Divine name by *kyrios*, but the Tetragrammaton written with Hebrew or Greek letters was retained in much MSS. It was the Christians who replaced the Tetragrammaton by *kyrios*, when the divine name written in Hebrew letters was not understood any more.[52]

We see, then, that it is very likely that the authors of the New Testament books ***retained*** the name of both the Father and His Son in their writings. If they did not, this begs the question, "*Why not*?" Why ***not*** retain the name of the Almighty in the NT … when it appears in the *Tanakh* 6,823 times?

---

[51] *C.f., Hebrew Gospel of Matthew*, translated by George Howard, Professor of Religion, University of Georgia, Mercer University Press, 1995, Part Two (Analysis and Commentary), p. 229, where we read, "Shem-Tob's Hebrew Matthew employs the Divine Name, symbolized by "ה (apparently an abbreviation for השם, 'the Name')." On the following page, Professor Howard adds, "The appearance of the Divine Name in a Christian document quoted by a Jewish polemist is interesting, to say the least. If this text were a translation of the First Gospel by Shem-Tob himself, we would expect to find *adonai* in the text where the Greek or Latin reads 'the Lord.' We would never expect to see the ineffable Divine Name used as a translation equivalent of κύριος or *Dominus*. I have no hesitancy in saying that the occurrence of the Divine Name in places where the canonical text lacks any reference to the Lord at all, eliminates Shem-Tob as the author of this text. *No pious Jew of the Middle Ages would have dignified a Christian text by inserting the Divine Name*." [Note: In the *DuTillet Hebrew Matthew*, the Divine Name is abbreviated with two "yods" (יי), and it appears in its full form (יהוה) in the *Münster Hebrew Matthew*].

[52] From *The Cairo Geniza* by Paul E. Kahle, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 2nd edition, 1959, page 222. Those with internet access might consider accessing the following link for additional information: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tetragrammaton_in_the_New_Testament#_ref-9

Knowing that it is so likely that first century believers spoke the name *Yahweh*, we need to address whether or not Yeshua the Messiah spoke the name of His Father. According to Kevin Geoffrey, He did not. Let's read his commentary:

> Even Yeshua participated in the Jewish tradition of not speaking the Name and instead using "substitutions (called circumlocutions)." For example, 29 times in Matthew's Gospel, Yeshua is reported as using the circumlocution "Heaven" as we see in Matthew 4:17, "From that time Yeshua began to preach and say, 'Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.'"
>
> Perhaps more importantly, when Yeshua would directly address ADONAI in prayer, he would speak the name, "Father," and even the most intimate term of all, "Abba." Yeshua teaches His disciples to pray by addressing the Creator, "...Father in heaven, hallowed be your name," and in His hour of desperate need, the Son calls out to His "Abba! Father! All things are possible for you; remove this cup from Me; yet not what I will, but what You will."
>
> Given the examples of Moses and Yeshua alone, we can state with confidence that neither salvation, nor relationship, nor the ability to fulfill ADONAI's commands are in any way jeopardized by not pronouncing יהוה. On the contrary, Yeshua may very well have taught us the fullness of revelation in approaching ADONAI by calling Him "Father."[53]

In response to the above commentary, we would like to first of all, express bewilderment that Mr. Geoffrey believes "the kingdom of heaven" is a substitution for the name יהוה. The kingdom of heaven is simply a reference to the new wordly state of affairs that will be ushered in at Yeshua's return. It is not a substitution of the Creator's name, as Mr. Geoffrey supposes, nor did Yeshua use it as such.

Regarding the point that Yeshua addressed Yahweh as "Father" (Aramaic *Abba*) when praying to Him, this does nothing to validate Mr. Geoffrey's conviction that He never spoke His Father's name. June and I pray in the same manner. In fact, we ***rarely*** address Yahweh by name when we pray to Him! We primarily use the name *Yahweh* for ***identification*** purposes during our conversations with others – to identify ***Who*** it is we worship. This may not seem like such a big deal here in the 21st century. Back in the first century, however, things were vastly different. In ancient times the true believers lived in a society where a plethora of idols was worshiped. Among the more common ones were Zeus, Molech, Chemosh, Nisroch, Artemis, Apollo and Bel. Certainly, to distinguish the true Creator from the imposters, one needed to refer to the Almighty by ***name***, and that name was *Yahweh*. If someone had simply stated, "I worship the Creator," all those who worshipped the idols listed above would likely have nodded their heads in agreement, for certainly the Ammonites regarded *Molech* as the Creator, and they would have had reason to believe the speaker was referring to Molech! The Moabites regarded *Chemosh* as the Creator, so they would have had reason to believe the speaker was referring to Chemosh … and on it goes. However, if the speaker had stated, "I worship *Yahweh*," not only would this have turned more than a few heads, but it would likely have caused a disagreement, if not a skirmish! To bring this commentary closer to home, we will also remind you that in antiquity many heathens worshipped an idol whose name is pronounced *God*.[54] In conversation, then, a heathen might have explained to a Hebrew believer that he prayed to *God*. The Hebrew believer would have replied, "We only serve the One Creator Whose name is *Yahweh*! It is to Him alone that I offer my prayers!" Thus, the name *Yahweh* is indeed necessary in distinguishing the true Creator from the false ones. The name *Yahweh* identifies *Who* we worship! *God*, on the other hand, identifies a heathen idol.

---

[53] Ibid, p. 26.

[54] Again, we invite anyone interested in more details regarding the name/title *God* to read our study entitled "Do We Honor Yahweh by Referring to Him as 'Our God'?"

Perhaps you noticed that Mr. Geoffrey refers to the word "Father" as a ***name*** for the Almighty. This is a mistake. Words such as *father*, *mother*, *sister*, *brother*, *cousin*, *aunt* and *uncle* are common nouns used in identifying family relationships, but they are most certainly *not* names! We have met lots of "fathers," but we have never met anyone whose name was "Father." Nor is "Father" a name for the Creator. Rather, it is a noun describing His relationship to us. He is our Father; we are His children.

Mr. Geoffrey's final point in the above commentary involves stating with confidence that "neither salvation, nor relationship, nor the ability to fulfill ADONAI's commands are in any way jeopardized by not pronouncing יהוה." To this we reply, "Amein!" Neither June nor I have ever condemned anyone for choosing to not pronounce יהוה. Certainly, since we rarely use the name *Yahweh* when we pray to Him, we do not believe our relationship with Him is in any way jeopardized by not pronouncing יהוה. However, if you choose to *identify* Him to someone by a name other than the one He gave to Himself, we maintain that this not only misrepresents (misidentifies) who He is, but it also dishonors Him. *That* is the issue at hand here! We are not out to insist that we all speak the Creator's name (though we certainly recommend *reverently* doing so), we are not out to insist that a certain pronunciation is better than another, nor are we out to question anyone's salvation! We'll let Yahweh, through His Son Yeshua, be the judge of that!

With this backdrop, let us now return to Mr. Geoffrey's claim that Yeshua never spoke the name יהוה. To begin with, Yeshua Himself repudiates this claim in John 17:25-26:

> 25 O righteous Father, the world hath not known Thee: but I have known Thee, and these have known that Thou hast sent Me.
> 26 And I have declared unto them Thy name; and will declare *it*: that the love wherewith Thou hast loved Me may be in them, and I in them.

Yeshua Himself states that He ***declared*** the Father's name. What does it mean to "declare" someone's name? Is it possible to declare someone's name without speaking it? How would you declare the name of the President of the United States to someone without mentioning (speaking) his name?

We have already addressed the fact that no surviving Greek NT manuscripts contain the name *Yahweh*, which has led many to prematurely conclude that no first-century believers ever spoke the Name, even though Yeshua plainly stated that He did. Something else to consider is the fact that, according to the author of Hebrews, Yeshua ***did*** speak the Name!

In Hebrews 2:13, it is clear that the author of Hebrews believed that Yeshua spoke the name יהוה. He quotes a remark that Yeshua was ***prophesied*** to have uttered long before He was born in Bethlehem. Certainly, if Yeshua was prophesied to have spoken the name יהוה, we can be assured that He said it and that He said it *verbatim*. That's what "fulfilling prophecy" is all about! The text from which the Hebrews author draws this prophecy is the book of Isaiah, a book that was written nearly 700 years before Yeshua's birth. In this passage, found in Isaiah 8:11-18, the author of the book of Hebrews attributes the words spoken there to *Yeshua the Messiah*. Let's read the text of Hebrews 9-13 as it appears in the King James Version to clearly see that the One being referenced is Yeshua:

> But we see Jesus, Who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour; that He by the grace of God should taste death for every man.
> [10] For it became Him, for who *are* all things, and by Whom *are* all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings.
> [11] For both He that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one: for which cause He is not ashamed to call them brethren,
> [12] Saying, I will declare Thy name unto My brethren, in the midst of the church will I sing praise unto Thee.
> [13] And again, I will put my trust in Him. And again, Behold I and the children which God hath given Me.

The "He" and "Him" in the above passage is none other than Yeshua the Messiah. He is the Captain of our salvation, and He is not ashamed to call those who are sanctified His brethren. The underlined sentence above is taken from Isaiah 8:18, and according to the author of Hebrews, this is a quote from Yeshua: "Behold I and the children which God hath given Me." At first glance, the reader might abruptly conclude that Yeshua, in making that remark, did not speak the name יהוה. However, let's turn to the book of Isaiah, where the above quotation was taken. What follows is Isaiah 8:18 as it appears in the King James Version:

> [18] Behold, I and the children whom the LORD hath given Me *are* for signs and for wonders in Israel from the LORD of hosts, which dwelleth in mount Zion.

As we have already pointed out, the author of the book of Hebrews attributes the above quote to Yeshua the Messiah. Does Yeshua refer to His Father as יהוה in this verse? We need to remember that whenever the words "the LORD" appear in the Tanakh, this is where the translators replaced the Tetragrammaton. Thus, in the original text, the name יהוה appears. Here is how Isaiah 8:18 reads in the Hebrew text:

Once again, according to the author of Hebrews 2:13, the One speaking in the above verse is Yeshua the Messiah. As plainly revealed in the text, ***Yeshua spoke the Father's name***, just as He said He did in John 17:26.

We see virtually the same thing in Hebrews 10:5-10. It is in this text that the author of Hebrews describes Yeshua's sacrifice as being "once for all," and once again, he identifies Yeshua as being the speaker in a passage, only this time the text comes from the book of Psalms. Here is Hebrews 10:5-10 as it appears in the King James Version:

> 5 Wherefore when He cometh into the world He saith, Sacrifice and offering Thou wouldest not, but a body hast Thou prepared Me.
> 6 In burnt offerings and *sacrifices* for sin Thou hast had no pleasure.
> 7 Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of Me,) to do Thy will, O God.
> 8 Above when He said, Sacrifice and offering and burnt offerings and *offering* for sin Thou wouldest not, neither hadst pleasure *therein;* which are offered by the law;
> 9 Then said He, Lo I come to do Thy will, O God. He taketh away the first, that He may establish the second.
> 10 By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once *for all*.

As in the previous example we offered from Hebrews chapter two, the author is once again citing Yeshua as the speaker in a text found in the *Tanakh*. This time he cites a passage from Psalms 40:6-8. If we review the Hebrew text from which the author of Hebrews quoted, however, we do not find the

Tetragrammaton. Why, then, do we maintain that the above passage from Hebrews is further evidence that the author believed Yeshua spoke the Tetragrammaton?

It is because, in citing Psalms 40:6-8, the author of Hebrews only quoted a ***portion*** of what Yeshua said in that passage. Let's not only read Psalms 40:6-8, but *also* the surrounding text, as it appears in the King James Version:

> [5] Many, O LORD [יהוה] my God, are Thy wonderful works which Thou hast done, and Thy thoughts *which are* to us-ward: they cannot be reckoned up in order unto Thee: *if* I would declare and speak *of them* they are more than can be numbered.
> [6] Sacrifice and offering Thou didst not desire; mine ears hast Thou opened: burnt offering and sin offering hast thou not required.
> [7] Then said I, Lo, I come in the volume of the book *it is* written of Me.
> [8] I delight to do thy will, O my God: yea, Thy law *is* within My heart.
> [9] I have preached righteousness in the great congregation: lo, I have not refrained My lips, O LORD [יהוה], thou knowest.

As can be discerned from the above passage, if Yeshua is the speaker in verses 6-8 (and the author of Hebrews ***says*** He is), then He is *also* the speaker in the preceding and following verses. In both verses five and nine of the original Hebrew text, He speaks the Tetragrammaton. Thus, contrary to Mr. Geoffrey's claim, Yeshua did ***not*** participate in the Jewish tradition of not speaking the Name.

12. Response to Part IV of Kevin Geoffrey's article: Is יהוה His Only Name?

In the next portion of his treatise, Kevin Geoffrey attempts to persuade his reading audience that the Almighty has more than one name. In view of the fact that he has already presented the word "Father" as one of the Creator's names, it follows that he will come up with others. Mr. Geoffrey refers us to a verse that, on the surface, *might* appear to offer support for his position. However, as with each of the arguments he has thus far presented, once we carefully examine the evidence, we see that the verse he offers proves nothing of the sort. In the following commentary, Mr. Geoffrey attempts to prove that one of the Creator's names is "*Jealous*":

> The debate on this topic is the importance of יהוה over any other "name" of God found in the Scriptures. But is יהוה really His personal name—in other words, His only name? What do we do with passages like Exodus 34:14, which says, 'you shall not worship any other god, for יהוה, whose name is Jealous, is a jealous God…"?[55]

When examined from perspective of rudimentary, basic logic, the above verse does not make any sense. We know that יהוה is pronounced *Yahweh*, or something very similar. With this understanding, would it make any sense to say, "For Yahweh, whose name is Jealous, is a jealous Mighty One"? Please understand that in stating *Yahweh* in that verse, the Almighty is *already* giving us His name. Does He then promptly say His name is <u>another</u> name? This would be like saying, "George, whose name is Greg, is a vigilant person." (The name "Greg," by the way, comes from a Greek word meaning "vigilant"). Is George *also* named Greg? Is Yahweh *also* named Jealous?

The Hebrew word translated *jealous* is the word *Qanna* (קַנָּא), which is word #7067 in *Strong's* Hebrew and Chaldee Dictionary. Thus, based upon the reasoning offered by Kevin Geoffrey, we should be able to legitimately refer to our Heavenly Father by the "name" *Qanna*. Thus, the above question is better worded, "Is Yahweh <u>also</u> named Qanna?"

There is at least one glaring problem with this sort of reasoning. To begin with, Exodus 34:14 is the one and only place in all of Scripture where such a "name" as *Qanna* is ever given for the Creator, whereas the name *Yahweh* is used 6,823 times. Why is this "name" offered only *once* and never mentioned again? We have actually had at least one person tell us that he *prefers* the name "Jealous" for our Creator. Such being the case, we can only wonder why no one else, at least in Biblical times, felt the same way.

Secondly, we believe we need to seriously consider the Septuagint translation of Exodus 34:14. The Septuagint (the LXX version) is the Greek translation of the Hebrew that was done in the 3rd century B.C.E. It is the Septuagint version that the first-century believers used and quoted from most frequently, as evidenced by the Scripture quotations found in the *Brit Chadashah* (the New Testament). Many scholars are open to the likelihood that the Septuagint, although it was obviously translated from a Hebrew text, was not necessarily translated from the same text as the Masoretic Text.[56] Many possibilities exist, all of which are theories, as the parent text from which the LXX was translated is certainly lost. June and I often do Torah readings while comparing the Masoretic Text with the

---

[55] Ibid.

[56] See *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, Vol. 5, published by Doubleday, New York, 1992, article "Septuagint," section F, p. 1102.

Septuagint, and in many cases, when there is a translation discrepancy, the Septuagint reading makes the most sense. We would like to cite one example to illustrate our point. In Leviticus chapter 13, we read about the skin discolorations the priest was supposed to look for in determining whether or not his patient was leprous. In verses 29-30, the priest was instructed to examine the individual to see if the sore is deeper than the skin, plus if it had *yellowish* hair. If so, then the person was to be declared "unclean." Both the Septuagint and the Masoretic Text readings agree on this point. However, the discrepancy occurs in verse 31.

In verse 31 of the Masoretic Text (MT), we are told that if the priest examined the patient and the sore was not beneath the skin, plus the hair in it had not turned ***black***, he was to shut him up for seven days as a precaution. We then learn that if, after those seven days, the sore had not spread, plus the hair was not *yellow*, he was to be shaven, then shut up for an additional seven days. If, after that period of time, it still had not spread, he was to be pronounced "clean."

In view of the above instructions, one might legitimately ask, "Why the abrupt concern about the *black* hair in verse 31, then readdressing the concern about *yellow* hair in verse 32?" We have already learned from verse 30 that it is the *yellowish* hair that was a deciding factor in determining whether or not a man is unclean. But according to Leviticus 13:31-34 of the MT, the man is considered clean so long as the hair in his sore has not turned *yellowish* or *black*.

According to the Septuagint translation of Leviticus 13:31, the concern is not over *black* hair at all. We read that so long as the sore is not beneath the skin, plus there is no *yellowish* hair in it, the patient is shut up for seven days, then reexamined. If nothing has changed, i.e., the sore has not spread, he is shaved and shut up for an additional seven days. If there is still no change, he is then pronounced "clean." As we can see, the Septuagint only addresses the concern over whether or not the hair in the sore has turned *yellow*.

For comparison purposes, we are displaying a side-by-side English translation from both the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint reading of Leviticus 13:31:

Masoretic Text (*King James Version*)	Septuagint (*translated by Sir Lancelot C.L. Brenton*)
[31] And if the priest look on the plague of the scall, and, behold, it *be* not in sight deeper than the skin, and *that there is* no black hair in it; then the priest shall shut up *him that hath* the plague of the scall seven days.	[31] And if the priest should see the plague of the scurf, and behold, the appearance of it be not beneath the skin, and there is no yellowish hair in it, then the priest shall set apart *him that has* the plague of the scurf seven days.

Sealing the matter that *black* hair was not the original concern of the author of Lev. 13:31 lies in the fact that, according to verse 37, black hair is the sign that the sore has healed. We suggest reading Leviticus 13:1-37 in its full context, paying special attention to the "color discrepancy" that exists between the MT and the Septuagint in verse 31. When the word translated "black" in the MT is changed to "yellow," the reading makes more sense. C. F. Keil, in *Commentary on the Old Testament*, recognized the problem posed by the reading of the Masoretic Text:

> In שָׂחֹר אֵין בּוֹ (v. 31) there is certainly an error of the text: either שׂחר [the Hebrew word for "black"] must be retained and אין [the Hebrew expression translated "there

> is no"] dropped, or שָׁחֹר must be altered into צָהֹב [the Hebrew word for "yellow"], according to verse 37. The latter is probably the better of the two.[57]

In other words, C. F. Keil states that he believes a better translation of Lev. 13:31 would have the word "yellow" instead of the word "black." I'm not sure if he was even aware of the fact that this is precisely how the Septuagint translation renders this verse, as he made no mention of the Septuagint's translation.

Of course, our purpose for including this commentary on the Septuagint is to point out the discrepancy between the Septuagint's translation of Exodus 34:14 and the reading as found in the Masoretic Text. Before we display the two texts, we would like to point out a fact that is not very well known among the scholarly community; namely, the fact that in the earliest copies of the Septuagint the Tetragrammaton (יהוה) was preserved, whereas in the copies available to us today, the Name is translated as "*kyrios*."[58] We believe the evidence points to the Name being removed from the Septuagint during the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, the tyrannical Greek ruler who, as mentioned previously in this study, ordered the deaths of some 80,000 Jews for refusing to abandon Yahweh's Torah. The story of Antiochus Epiphanes can be read in the Apocryphal books of *Maccabees*. We also mentioned that, according to the Talmud, one of Antiochus Epiphanes' decrees was one forbidding the mentioning of the Name of the Creator. Please remember that this same Talmudic account records Judah Maccabees *repealing* the decree when he and his men defeated Antiochus Epiphanes' vast army. Equipped with the understanding that the Septuagint originally contained the Tetragrammaton, combined with the fact that it was the primary source cited by New Testament writers, as well as the likelihood that it comes from a different Hebrew original than the Masoretic Text, here is a side-by-side comparison of Exodus 34:14 in the English translation of the *Masoretic Text* and the same verse as found in the translation of the *Septuagint*:

Masoretic Text (*King James Version*)	Septuagint (*translated by Sir Lancelot C.L. Brenton*)
[14] For thou shalt worship no other Mighty One: for Yahweh, Whose name *is* Jealous, *is* a jealous Mighty One.[59]	[14] For ye shall not worship strange mighty ones, for Yahweh Almighty, a jealous name, is a jealous Mighty One.[60]

[57] From *Commentary on the Old Testament*, by C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, Vol. 1, Hendrickson Publishers, Peabody, MA, 2001, p. 574. Originally published by T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1866-91.

[58] *C.f., The Journal of Theological Studies*, Vol. XLV, Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1944, p. 159, article entitled "Notes and Studies: The Tetragrammaton in the LXX" by W.G. Waddell, where we read his response to the general claim that the Name did not appear in any copies of the Septuagint: "This statement is now flatly disproved by a new papyrus of the LXX, the remains of a roll containing the second half of the Book of Deuteronomy, which in the extant fragments shows no example of κύριος, but everywhere the Tetragrammaton written in Aramaic characters. This papyrus belongs to the Société Royale de Papyrologie du Caire; it is part of the collection of Fouad Papyri, of which Nos. 1—89 were published in one volume (*P. Fouad I*, 1939), and it bears the Inventory No. 266. Written in beautiful, rounded uncials by a Jew who was also master of the Greek language, it may be dated to the 2nd or the 1st century B.C.: the nearest analogue to the script appears to be the *Dialectical Treatise* (now in Paris), written before 160 B.C. (E. Maunde Thompson, *Intro. to Greek and Latin Palaeography*, 1912, pp. 112 f.), and there is on one fragment a marginal annotation in a cursive script which supports this early date."

[59] We have restored the name "Yahweh" in place of the KJV substitution "the LORD." We also prefer the term "Mighty One" instead of "God," especially in reference to the Almighty.

[60] Same as above. In view of the fact that the earliest copies of the Septuagint contained the Tetragrammaton, we believe we are justified in restoring the Name to its original place.

As shown above, the Septuagint makes it very clear that the word "jealous" was never intended to be understood as a "name" for the Almighty. While we can understand Kevin Geoffrey's reasoning for presenting the word *Jealous* as a name for the Creator, in the end it can be shown to be the result of insufficient research on his part. Even as presented in the Masoretic Text, the word "jealous" can be understood as simply serving as an adjective used to modify the word "name." We could do the same thing with anyone's name. I might say, "Ron, whose name is mud, wrecked my car." I trust no one reading this would be so naïve as to regard "mud" as being another name for Ron. In the same way, Yahweh's name is presented as being a "jealous name," and in the Hebrew text this is represented by the phrase "Whose name is jealous" – a description of His name, not the revelation of another name for the Almighty!

To underscore the fact that the Almighty only has ***one*** name, we challenge anyone to produce a text of Scripture where the plural of the Hebrew word for name (*shem*) is ever used in reference to Yahweh. Indeed, the word "name" is always used in the *singular form* when referring to the Almighty. Another common error is mistaking ***titles*** for names. For example, many folks refer to *Elohim* and *Adonai* as being names for the Almighty. *Elohim* and *Adonai* are titles, however, not names. Assigning *Elohim* or *Adonai* as names for the Almighty would be the same as designating *President* and *Chief Executive* as names for George W. Bush.

13. His Name is "I AM" (ehyeh ahsher ehyeh)?

One of the common tactics that I find most annoying to contend with is that of presenting an ambiguous text as evidence when the whole of Scripture provides the clear answer. As I have repeatedly noted in this study, the name *Yahweh* appears 6,823 times in the Tanakh. No other name is given for the Almighty, nor do we ever read that He has "names" (Hebrew *shemot*, plural). This fact is ignored by Kevin Geoffrey, as evidenced from the following commentary. It is rather lengthy, but in order to allow the reader to grasp the full context of the point he attempts to make, I am leaving out nothing:

> Yeshua Himself alludes to perhaps the most famous passage regarding the Name when he teaches about His own divine, eternal nature and His oneness with ADONAI.
>
> Yeshua said to them, "Truly, truly I say to you, before Abraham was born, ἐγω εἰμι, (I AM)."
>
> This is the exact Greek phrase that the Septuagint uses to translate אֶהְיֶה, *ehyeh* in Exodus 3.
>
> > *Then Moses said to* אֱלֹהִים *(elohim, God), "Behold, I am going to the sons of Israel, and I will say to them, 'The* אֱלֹהִים *(elohim, God) of your fathers has sent me to you.' Now they may say to me, 'What is His name?' What shall I say to them?* אֱלֹהִים *(elohim, God) said unto Moses,* אֶהְיֶה אֲשֶׁר אֶהְיֶה *(ehyeh ahsher ehyeh, I AM WHO I AM)"; and He said, "Thus you shall say to the sons of Israel,* אֶהְיֶה *(ehyeh, I AM) has sent me to you.'"* אֱלֹהִים *(elohim, God), furthermore, said to Moses, "Thus you shall say to the sons of Israel,* יהוה*, the* אֱלֹהִים *(elohim, God) of your fathers, the* אֱלֹהִים *(elohim, God) of Abraham, the* אֱלֹהִים *(elohim, God) of Isaac, and the* אֱלֹהִים *(elohim, God) of Jacob, has sent me to you.' This is My name forever, and this is My* זֵכֶר *(zaycher, memorial-name) to all generations. (Exodus 3:13-15, NAS)*
>
> In response to Moses' question, "What is His name?" ADONAI replies, "אֶהְיֶה אֲשֶׁר אֶהְיֶה *(ehyeh ahsher ehyeh,* I AM WHO I AM)." The narrative breaks, and then ADONAI goes on to add "יהוה, the God of your fathers, etc." Verse fifteen, however, is curious. ADONAI says "This is My name forever, and this is my זֵכֶר (*zaycher*, memorial-name) to all generations," yet in the previous verses, He only refers to אֶהְיֶה אֲשֶׁר אֶהְיֶה, *(ehyeh ahsher ehyeh)* as His name. In this passage, He does not say that יהוה is His Name.
>
> I would like to submit that there is a parallelism here. His "name forever" may very well be referring to אֶהְיֶה אֲשֶׁר אֶהְיֶה, *(ehyeh ahsher ehyeh)*, which speaks of his self-existence or self-sufficiency, while His זֵכֶר (*zaycher)*—the way we are to remember Him and know His character—is wrapped up in covenant relationship, that is, as יהוה, the covenant-making God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.[61]

We interrupt Mr. Geoffrey's commentary here, as he presents some misinformation and half-truths that are at best misleading and deceptive at worst. To begin with, as we explained in chapter nine, we believe that in Exodus 3:14, the Almighty lays a foundation, preparing Moses for His actual name by first giving him its *meaning*. Then, in verse 15, He instructs Moses how to identify Him to the Israelites ("*Thus shall you speak to the Israelites*"). Secondly, we believe we must reiterate that Mr. Geoffrey

[61] Geoffrey, Kevin, "HaShem," from the magazine *Bikurei Tziyon*, issue 75, B'reisheet / Genesis | Year 5763 (2002), p. 26.

ignores the fact that the Tetragrammaton is freely used over 6,000 times in the Tanakh, and here he seems to throw his support to a one-time usage of "אֶהְיֶה אֲשֶׁר אֶהְיֶה *(ehyeh ahsher ehyeh,* I AM WHO I AM)." The 6,000-plus times that יהוה appears seems to be of no consequence to Mr. Geoffrey.

Thirdly, we would like to know Mr. Geoffrey's purpose in bringing up Yeshua's use of the expression ἐγω εἰμι, (I AM). Yeshua *never* said, "The name of My Father is ἐγω εἰμι, (I AM)." All He said was, "Before Abraham was, ἐγω εἰμι, (I AM)." It appears that Mr. Geoffrey is reading more into this verse (John 8:58) than is really there.

Furthermore, Mr. Geoffrey attempts to draw a parallel betweem the expression that Yeshua used in John 8:58 and the expression found in Exodus 3:14 of the Septuagint version. This is where he presents a "half-truth," for if we read the entire Greek text of Exodus 3:14, it does nothing to suggest that ἐγω εἰμι (I AM) is the name of the Creator. Here is the complete text of Exodus 3:14, as found in Sir Lancelot C.L. Brenton's translation of the Septuagint:

Και εἶπεν ὁ Θεος προς Μωυσῆν, λέγων, ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ Ὤν· και εἶπεν, οὕτως ἐρεῖς τοῖς
And spoke the Almighty to Moses, saying, I am the Being; and said, Thus shall you to the say

υἱοῖς Ἰσραηλ, ὁ Ων ἀπέσταλκέ με προς ὑμᾶς.
children (of) Israel; The Being has sent me to you.

The Greek expression ἐγω εἰμι simply means "I am," just as anyone might say, "I am a student of the Word." The Apostle Paul, in Acts 21:39, used the same Greek expression when he said, "I am indeed a man." However, according to the Septuagint version of Exodus 3:14, the Almighty didn't merely say, "I AM," he said, "I am the Being." This being the case, perhaps Mr. Geoffrey might try to make a case that the Almighty's name is also "The Being." Again, this is the only time the Almighty is ever identified in this way. He is identified as *Yahweh* 6,823 times.

Moreover, according to Kevin Geoffrey, the Almighty does not say His name is *Yahweh* (יהוה) in Exodus 3:13-15. Maybe He doesn't say this directly, but the name יהוה does appear in that passage, and we believe it can be demonstrated that it is placed there as His name. He directs Moses, "Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, YAHWEH, the Almighty of your fathers, the Almighty of Abraham, the Almighty of Isaac, and the Almighty of Jacob, hath sent me unto you: this *is* My name for ever, and this *is* My memorial unto all generations."

In the above text, the Almighty first identifies Himself by His name *Yahweh*. He then further identifies Himself as being the Almighty of the Israelites' ancestors, including Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. One might compare this to an introduction given for a speaker at a seminar: "I would like to introduce you to John Doe, top researcher for ACME Logistics, professor of astrophysics at Technoscience University, the world's foremost expert on stellar cartography, and the lead developer of the nardonoscope." No one listening to this introduction would consider the man being introduced as having any name other than John Doe. However, by employing the reasoning suggested by Kevin Geoffrey, the speaker's name must consist of virtually the entire introduction. We will see Mr. Geoffrey's reasoning in more detail shortly.

Kevin Geoffrey concludes his article with the following commentary:

This is not a purely original way of understanding this passage [i.e., that His "name forever" may very well be referring to אֶהְיֶה אֲשֶׁר אֶהְיֶה, *(ehyeh ahsher ehyeh)*]. The Jewish Encyclopedia states,

> *The oldest exegetes, such as Onkelos and the Targummim of Jerusalem and pseudo-Jonathan regard "Ehyeh" and "Ehyeh asher Ehyeh" as the name of the Divinity…*[62]

Even if "this is My name" is not referring to אֶהְיֶה, *ehyeh*, ADONAI's name according to this passage would be:

יהוה אֱלֹהֵי אֲבֹתֵיכֶם אֱלֹהֵי אַבְרָהָם אֱלֹהֵי יִצְחָק וֵאלֹהֵי יַעֲקֹב

The point is,

> *while יהוה is the most common divine designation for the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, it cannot be sustained that this and this alone is His name… there are no grounds for conclusively stating that it and it alone is God's name.*[63]

He is יָהּ, (Yah), יהוה, אֲדֹנָי (*Adonai*) our אֱלֹהִים (*Elohim*, God); He is אֶהְיֶה אֲשֶׁר אֶהְיֶה, (ehyeh ahsher ehyeh), He is אֵל שַׁדַּי (*el shaddai,* God Almighty), He is אָב (*av*, Father). He is beyond labeling, beyond containing, yet through His Son, Yeshua, we know Him and call Him אַבָּא (*abba*, Daddy). What else is left to say but בָּרוּךְ הַשֵּׁם, *baruch hashem*—bless the Name!

We have, in essence, already responded to Mr. Geoffrey's closing remarks. However, since he presents his reasoning in a slightly different way, we will address them again. To begin with, we find it interesting that he cites authors from the *Jewish Encyclopedia* to validate his apparent conclusion that Exodus 3:13-15 proves that *"Ehyeh asher Ehyeh"* is the Creator's name. If that verse doesn't satisfactorily prove to Mr. Geoffrey that His name is יהוה (YHWH), then why not just take Yahweh's word for it in verses such as Isaiah 42:8? Please examine the name the Creator emphatically says is His name in this verse:

> 8 I am יהוה, that is My name; I will not yield My glory to another, nor My renown to idols. (JPS Translation, except for changing "the LORD" to יהוה, which appears in the original Hebrew text).

With all due respect to Kevin Geoffrey's scholarship, we would like to suggest that he search out what ***the Almighty*** has to say about His name instead of turning to such men as Onkelos and pseudo-Jonathan. Mr. Geoffrey seems intent that we should opt for something akin to *"Ehyeh asher Ehyeh,"* even though it's outnumbered 6,823 to 1 in favor of יהוה (YHWH).

With regard to the following colossal name suggestion proposed by Mr. Geoffrey:

---

[62] Crafword Howell Toy, Ludwig Blau, "Tetragrammaton," *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, p. 119.
[63] Tim Hegg, "The Sacred Name, Part 3," *TorahResource.com* (Tacoma, WA, 2001).

יהוה אֱלֹהֵי אֲבֹתֵיכֶם אֱלֹהֵי אַבְרָהָם אֱלֹהֵי יִצְחָק וֵאלֹהֵי יַעֲקֹב, this translates as "YHWH (the) Almighty of your fathers, (the) Almighty of Abraham, (the) Almighty of Isaac, and the Almighty of Jacob." If this is how he wishes to refer to the Almighty, then so be it. However, one cannot help but wonder if he is attempting to prove something so utterly difficult and inconvenient in order to cause anyone who takes him seriously to throw up their hands in exasperation and say, "Just ***forget*** it!"

We might add that the above monstrosity, as alluded to earlier, is not how the Almighty phrased things in Isaiah 42:8, where the simple, one-worded proper noun ***Yahweh*** appears. Moreover, the "name" אֱלֹהֵי אֲבֹתֵיכֶם אֱלֹהֵי אַבְרָהָם אֱלֹהֵי יִצְחָק וֵאלֹהֵי יַעֲקֹב (minus יהוה) only appears ***three times*** in the entire Tanakh … and only within chapters three and four of Exodus. Once again, plurality of occurrences seems to have no bearing on Mr. Geoffrey's reasoning ability.

In his conclusion, Mr. Geoffrey borrows a quotation from a study authored by Tim Hegg to validate his point. We have already addressed Mr. Hegg's approach on this subject, and the above quote from his study (that there are no grounds for believing that יהוה is the Creator's only name) does nothing to add credence to his scholarship. As we mentioned earlier, we challenge anyone to produce a text of Scripture where the plural of the Hebrew word for name (*shem*) is ever used in reference to Yahweh. Indeed, the word "name" is always used in the *singular* when referring to the Almighty. He does ***not*** have "many names," as some would have us to believe. In fact, if we carefully review and examine the "names" that Mr. Geoffrey offers above, such as "Adonai," "Elohim," "El Shaddai," "Av" and "Abba," we find that ***none*** of them can be classified as "names." They are, at best, ***titles***.

Part II: The Online Forum Discussion

15. So Who is HaShem?

Curiously, when it comes to the designation "HaShem," we find that not only is this a term meaning "the name," but this Hebrew word ***also*** represents the name given to a ***man***. That's right, according to Scripture, there was a man whose name was *Hashem* (הָשֵׁם). We read about this man in I Chronicles 11:34:

> [34] the sons of Hashem the Gizonite, Jonathan
> son of Shageh the Hararite,

The name *Hashem* has exactly the same Hebrew spelling as the designation commonly applied to the Creator by Judaism: (הָשֵׁם). Shown below is I Chronicles 11:34 as it appears in *The Interlinear Bible*:

2043	7681	1121	3126	1493	2044	1121
בְּנֵי	הָשֵׁם	הַגִּזֹנִי	יוֹנָתָן	בֶּן־שָׁגֵי	הַהֲרָרִי׃	
of sons the	Hashem	,Gizonite the	Jonathan	of son the	Shage	.Hararite the

m

We have had but limited exposure to the Jewish believer's reaction when it is pointed out that *HaShem* was originally a man's name before being applied to the Creator. We have offered the above explanation to only two Jews, and in neither case were they willing to accept the fact that they were applying a man's name to the Creator. One of the responses we received was something to the effect of, "But word #2044 in *Strong's* isn't the same thing! It doesn't *mean* 'the name'!" This argument can be easily demonstrated as irrelevant by simply countering, "If an alternate meaning for the Hebrew *satan* was 'supreme,' would you support referring to YHWH as 'satan'?" Regardless of the meaning we wish to attach, the point is, they are spelled and pronounced *identically*.

In early 2005, I was involved in a forum discussion pertaining to the term *HaShem*, and the two Jews I mentioned above participated, one of whom goes by the name "Shimson," and the other who goes by "Rivkah." As could be expected, the Jews defended their use of *HaShem*, and even denied that they were using it as a substitute for the Tetragrammaton.

With regard to the Israelite named *Hashem* (I Chron. 11:34), Shimson justified his practice of using *HaShem* in reference to the Creator by attempting to demonstrate that the name of the Israelite from I Chronicales 11:34 is completely different from the designation *HaShem* used in reference to the Creator. In one of the biggest demonstrations of double-talk and nonsensical reasoning that I have ever read, he offered his claim that the two words (though spelled identically in Hebrew) are not the same, nor are they pronounced the same. Shown below are his exact words, as taken directly from the forum posting:

Author	Topic: Who is "Hashem"?
Shimson bar-Tzadoq Posts: 826 Registered: Dec 2002	posted 02-21-2005 05:14 PM quote: On the issue of the person mentioned in 1 Divrei Yamim 11:34 when one looks at the Hebrew texts one finds that this person's name was spelled Hey (Qamatz)-Shin (Tzere)-Mem pronounced Hoshem and is from an UNKNOWN root, but believed by most scholars to be from the shoresh[64] (Shin-Mem-Mem) or (Shin-Waw-Mem) and Hoshem means "fat." (Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon, page CCXXVI) and (Etymological Dictionary of Biblical Hebrew by Matityahu Clark, page 264). I will further add that Hey (Qametz) - Shin (Tzere) - Mem is one word, where Hey (Pathah) - Shin (Tzere) - Mem is a Shin (Tzere) - Mem with the definate article Hey (Pathahh). Any school child knows that a definate article Hey with a Qametz happens when the initial consonant of the word is a Guttaral. This is not the same as HaShem from the shoresh (Shin-Mem) which is spelled Hey (Pathakh)-Shin (Tzere)-Mem and means "The Named One," "The Renowned One," or "The Famed One." How do we know this because in Hebrew a Substantive Adjective is a noun, which is what HaShem is. A substantive by itself like Hhakham for example means "wise one" where when it is an adjective it means "wise." By extension hehhakham is translated as, "the wise one." (Basics of Biblical Hebrew, page 65) This are OFTEN used for example HaQadosh means "The Se-Apart One." Qedoshim means "Set-Apart Ones." Just as HaBorei doesn't simple mean "The Create" it can also mean "The One Who Creates." Just as HaMashi'ahh means "The Anointed one" (Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon) and so it is not un-scriptural to call Eluwwim by a title.[65]

It would be easy to get lost in the above jargon, or perhaps "just accept" the above commentary because of the authoritative perspective from which the author wrote it. Please remember, however, that both Hebrew terms (*HaShem*, the term used instead of the Tetragrammaton and *Hashem*, the Israelite

---

[64] Shimson later defined the term *shoresh* for his readers who are unfamiliar with Hebrew terms. The following is from a posting he submitted on 04-14-2005 at 12:49 AM in the "Who is 'HaShem' 2" thread: "**Shoresh** - Three letter roots that biblical Hebrew words come from. Hebrew roots are typically composed of three consonants (triconsonantal), occasionally two (biconsonantal). A shoresh/root represents the origin or simplest form from which any number of Hebrew words are derived. For example the word e`eseh (I will do) in Hebrew is spelled Aleph - Ayin - Sin - Hey. It comes from the three letter root Ayin-Sin-Hey. By taking three letter roots (shoreshim, plural of shoresh) words and verbs in Hebrew are formed. So taking the shoresh (three letter root) into a verb form is how past, present, and future tense verbs are congigated. For exmaple some scholars say that Hey-Waw-Hey is the shoresh (three letter root) for Yod-Hey-Waw-Hey, other scholars say it is Hey-Yod-Hey. Even others say Hey-Waw-Yod, this one is because in ancient Hebrew verbs that end in Hey (for example Qoof-Nun-Hey) were originally ended in Yod (for example Qoof-Nun-Hey).
"The following link shows how the verb is formed from the Shoresh being conjugated. The letters in black are the shoresh, the collored letters are the congigation. The only way to display this is in Hebrew, any other method does not show you what I mean. http://www.basicsofbiblicalhebrew.com/Files/BBH.diagnostics2.pdf."

[65] This is an *excerpt* from a posting by Shimson on 02-21-2005 at 5:14 PM in the forum thread entitled entitled "**Who is HaShem?**" His entire posting, as well as the complete discussion, which the forum moderator later pronounced the lengthiest discussion that had ever been conducted on his forum board, may be accessed by visiting www.eliyah.com. The URL for the actual discussion is http://www.eliyah.com/forum2/Forum10/HTML/002207.html.

whose name is recorded in I Chronicles 11:34) are spelled the same: הַשֵּׁם. In spite of the identical spelling of the one *HaShem* vs. the other *Hashem* (including the Hebrew vowel points), Shimson insisted that the one is not only different in meaning from the other, but that it is *pronounced* differently as well (i.e., "Hoshem" instead of "Hawshem"). What follows is my word-for-word response to Shimson's commentary above. I have taken the liberty of copying and pasting my response directly from the forum thread where it was posted:

Author	Topic: Who is "Hashem"?
Acheson Posts: 1112 Registered: Nov 1999	posted 03-02-2005 12:52 AM Shalom, Shimson: Greetings in the name of YHWH through His Son Yeshua the Messiah. Back on 02-21-2005 at 05:14 PM you wrote the following with regard to the Israelite name *Hashem* (I Chron. 11:34): quote: On the issue of the person mentioned in 1 Divrei Yamim 11:34 when one looks at the Hebrew texts one finds that this person's name was spelled Hey (Qamatz)-Shin (Tzere)-Mem pronounced Hoshem and is from an UNKNOWN root, but believed by most scholars to be from the shoresh (Shin-Mem-Mem) or (Shin-Waw-Mem) and Hoshem means "fat." (Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon, page CCXXVI) and (Etymological Dictionary of Biblical Hebrew by Matityahu Clark, page 264). I will further add that Hey (Qametz) - Shin (Tzere) - Mem is one word, where Hey (Pathah) - Shin (Tzere) - Mem is a Shin (Tzere) - Mem with the definate article Hey (Pathahh). Any school child knows that a definate article Hey with a Qametz happens when the initial consonant of the word is a Guttaral. I reply: I know I have already replied to the above commentary once, but I believe you misunderstood my response. I have since sent an inquiry to a Jewish rabbi in an effort to see if he might validate the information you offered. He did not do so, I'm afraid. First, though, regarding your use of *The Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon*, page CCXXVI, I see nothing on that page validating either your claim that the word spelled "he-shiyn-mem" means "fat" or that it should be pronounced "*hoshem*." In fact, the word "fat" does not appear anywhere on that page. Furthermore, the vowel-pointing offered on that page is the same as that offered in *Strong's*. I know that I was able to locate the proper Hebrew word because the listing identified this word as a masculine proper noun used in I Chron. 11:34. It definitely has a "qâmêts" under the "*he*," just as *Strong's* does. Of course, I realize that the "qâmêts" and the "short qâmêts," which apparently conveys that "o" sound, are very similar in appearance, so I can see how easy it would be to confuse the one for the other. It appears, though, that both *Strong's* and *The Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon* agree, at least with regard to how the first syllable of that name is vowel-pointed.

I can certainly understand how and why a Jewish person would be biased towards wanting to vowel-point the name *Hashem* so as to pronounce it differently than the common expression used as a substitute for the Tetragrammaton (HaShem), for it really does not seem fitting to me that we should desire to refer to the Almighty with a word pronounced identically to the name already reserved for a man. To me it is dishonorable, but I realize that what is dishonorable to one is not to another. I believe this is where we need to be careful about "just accepting" traditions handed down to us. If I had "just accepted" the traditions handed down by my parents, I would still be worshipping on Sunday and observing Christmas. I would also be referring to the Almighty as "LORD God." It wasn't by any means easy giving up those traditions, but I am glad I did. I believe all of us need to be willing and prepared to sacrifice traditions for the sake of truth.

Since I obviously don't know Hebrew all that well, I fully understand that anything I say will be taken with "a grain of salt," and that is fine, for I am not about to tell you or anyone what you must do to please the Father. I am only striving to do what I believe is pleasing in view of the information available to me. However, sometimes when these matters arise, I am compelled to inquire of the Hebrew experts to see what they have to say. Certainly a Jewish rabbi would be more apt than most people to find any justification for pronouncing the Israelite man's name as "*H**o**shem*," since it is so obvious that the alternative is to settle for a pronunciation that matches the common appellative employed by mainstream Judaism. In spite of whatever biases that Rabbi Shraga Simmons may have, he nevertheless affirms that the "most accurate pronunciation" of this Hebrew name is "**Haw-shem**."

I visited a Jewish website where people are invited to ask the rabbis questions. This particular website can be accessed at the following URL: http://jewish.com/page.php?do=page&cat_id=1109

This website gives anyone with questions several different options from different categories as they select which rabbi will answer his or her question. The option I selected was for an orthodox rabbi to answer a question from the following category:

> **Rabbinic era (14)**
> Beginning with the end of the Persian rule of the land of Israel, and the start of Hellenistic rule of the Middle East under Alexander the Great (approx. 333 B.C.E.) ending with the conquest of the land of Israel to Islam in 648 C.E. This period includes the writing of the Mishnah, Gemara, and major works of Midrash.

As I indicated earlier, it was Rabbi Shraga Simmons who responded to my inquiry. Here is the question I submitted to the website:

> Hello,
> Could you please share what you believe to be the most accurate pronunciation

of the Israelite whose name is only mentioned in I Chronicles 11:34 and traditionally rendered "Hashem"? I was recently informed that, with the more ancient vowel pointings, that name was not actually pronounced "Hashem," but I do not have access to his resources to check out his claim. He told me that it was more accurately pronounced "Hoshem." I would appreciate any assistance you can offer.

Sincerely,
Larry

Here is the response I received:

Thank you for writing and sharing your thoughts.

The most accurate pronunciation would be Haw-shem.

I hope this has been helpful. With blessings for success,

Rabbi Shraga Simmons
aish.com [Note: This is from an e-mail sent on 3/1/2005]

My reaction: I don't believe this Jewish rabbi has any reason to want to justify the pronunciation *Haw-shem*, yet he plainly recognizes it as the "most accurate pronunciation." I see no reason to believe that the vowel-pointings for that Hebrew name would have been changed so as to match the common appellative reserved for the Almighty by Judaism. Such a "change" would not have been helpful to their cause. Instead, it would have been more helpful for them to have done the ***opposite***, changing the vowel-pointing in that name so as to be pronounced as an "o." The fact that they did not do this persuades me that, indeed, Rabbi Shraga Simmons is correct in his assessment.

I realize you and I approach our worship of the Almighty from vastly different perspectives. As a completely independent student of the Word who has no ax to grind, no following to impress, no unscriptural traditions to hold on to, I simply do not follow the reasoning behind preferring *Hashem*. Even if I were to be completely mistaken in how I pronounce the Almighty's name, He alone knows my heart and my desire to use His name in a manner that brings Him honor. And if the pronunciation is wrong, I am thankful to serve a loving and merciful Heavenly Father.

Rather than concern myself with the traditions of modern-day folk, my family and I opt for the traditions of the ancients, who freely spoke the Name. According to *Everyman's Talmud* by A. Cohen, p.24:

> To the Oriental, a name is not merely a label as with us.

> It was thought of as indicating the nature of the person or object by whom it was borne. For that reason special reverence attached to 'the distinctive Name' (*Shem Hamephorash*) of the Deity which He had revealed to the people of Israel, viz. the tetragrammaton, JHVH.
>
> In the Biblical period there seems to have been no scruple against its use in daily speech. The addition of *Jah* or *Jahu* to personal names, which persisted among the Jews even after the Babylonian exile, is an indication that there was no prohibition against the employment of the four-lettered Name.

On page 25, Cohen offers additional insight that seems to conflict with today's modern Jewish perspective:

> On the other hand, there was a time when the free and open use of the Name even by the layman was advocated. The Mishnah teaches: 'It was ordained that a man should greet his friends by mentioning the Name' (Ber. IX.5). It has been suggested that the recommendation was based on the desire to distinguish the Israelite from the Samaritan, who referred to God as 'the Name' and not as JHVH, or the Rabbinite Jew from the Jewish-Christian.

It seems that the "Jewish perspective" regarding mentioning the Tetragrammaton depends upon which Jew you ask. I believe the 6,823 + appearances of the Tetragrammaton in Scripture speaks loudly in support of calling upon that name and mentioning it to others, so I am inclined to accept Cohen's remark about laymen freely speaking the Name. I know Abraham did (Gen. 12:8) and I believe Yeshua did, too. At least He said He did (John 17:6, 26), and I believe Him. Everyone else out there can choose to refer to the Almighty however they choose, so far as I'm concerned, but as for me and my house we will continue to call upon YHWH.

Yours in Messiah,
Larry[66]

I stand by the above posting as strongly now as I did when I submitted it over eleven years ago. However, Shimson questioned the wisdom of the Rabbi who answered my question with regard to the ancient pronunciation of *HaShem*. I therefore decided to e-mail a Hebrew professor at Dallas Theological Seminary, who sent me a response, which I incorporated into a posting I subsequently submitted to the forum:

[66] I submitted this posting on 03-02-2005 at 12:52 AM in the forum thread entitled "Who is HaShem?" This thread may be read in its entirety by accessing www.eliyah.com.

Author	Topic: Who is "Hashem" 2
Acheson Posts: 1112 Registered: Nov 1999	posted 04-18-2005 11:15 PM

As I mentioned earlier, I e-mailed another Hebrew professor to see what input he might be able to add in assisting me at reaching a conclusion on how that [Israelite] man's name is or was pronounced. I decided to e-mail a professor at Dallas Theological Seminary. I mentioned the discussion I am involved in and asked him if he could validate the findings I have come up with. Certainly, if I am as "off the mark" as Shimson wants everyone to believe I am, he could very well have told me. Here is the response I received today:

> Dear Larry:
>
> Because of severe time constraints, I can answer or deal with only the matter of the pronunciation of the name in 1 Chron 11:34. It is "haw-shame," exactly as observant Jews pronounce the substitute for Yahweh. And, of course, it means "the name." I can hardly conceive of anyone confusing this man's name with that of the Lord in OT times since the habit of pronouncing Yahweh as Ha-Shem did not arise until well after OT times. To give credence to this answer you might tell your Jewish friend that I hold an MA in Judaica from NYU in New York and a PhD in Ancient Near Eastern Studies from Columbia University. I hope this helps.
>
> Cordially,

Note: I intentionally left out the Hebrew professor's name. Anyone who would like to know his name can e-mail me privately at seekutruth@aol.com.

Notice that the professor mentions the reason it is so unlikely that anyone would have confused the Israelite Hashem's name with "**HaShem**" is because the custom of referring to YHWH in this manner did not arise until "after OT times." Obviously, then, if referring to YHWH in such a manner had arisen during the days of the Israelite named Hashem, the professor agrees that there could very well have been confusion (without any context to aid the listener, of course).

Bottom line: The Israelite man named "**Hashem**" was given a name that is pronounced identically to the "term" much of Judaism uses **instead of** the Creator's true name.

Thus, as I mentioned way back in my original posting, those who refer to YHWH as "**HaShem**" call Him by a "term" that is pronounced the same as the name originally given to a man. All for the sake of "treating His name with utmost reverence." This is a part of why I believe they achieve the opposite

> effect.
>
> Let's not settle for referring to the Almighty with a term that matches the pronunciation of a mere man's name. Let's go with the one He gave to Himself (no substitutes), and if you really believe He is so touchy that He will not tolerate any mispronunciations in spite of your best efforts, I can only suggest that you get to know Him a little better.[67]

I really tried to go to great lengths to see if the Jews who contributed to that forum could validate their choice of referring to the Almighty as *HaShem*. However, at each turn I was seemingly met with adversity and confusing answers. Shimson, determined to justify his term of choice, attempted to present the Israelite named *Hashem* as somehow having a name that is in no way connected to the *HaShem* that he uses in reference to the Creator. He could not escape the fact that they are spelled identically, so he frantically attempted to prove that they are *pronounced* differently. When even a Jewish rabbi and a Hebrew professor refuted his attempt, Shimson remained firm in his stand.

Moreover, as I also presented in that same forum, the Hebrew scholars who translated the Septuagint into Greek during the 3rd century B.C.E. did not understand the Israelite *Hashem's* name to be pronounced *Hoshem*, which is the pronunciation touted by Shimson. In I Chronicles 11:34 of the Septuagint, the name *Hashem* is transliterated *Asam* (Ασαμ), not *Osam* (Οσαμ). Those ancient Hebrew scholars understood the "aw" sound, not an "oh" sound. Shimson's response amounted to a weak attempt at discrediting the Septuagint, including a comment he presented that he doesn't believe it was even translated by Hebrew scholars from Judea. Regardless of "who" translated it, we need to remember that it was somehow sufficient enough that the authors of what is known as the New Testament used it nearly exclusively when quoting from the *Tanakh*. I urge caution when attempting to discredit the Septuagint translation.

[67] Excerpt from a posting I submitted on 04/18/2005 in the **"Who is Hashem?" 2** thread (the first thread had grown so large that it would not accept further postings, so a new one was started).

16. Replacing the Tetragrammaton: A Case of Denial

As I mentioned earlier, the two Jews with whom I discussed the "HaShem" issue in the internet forum discussion denied that they were using *HaShem* as a substitute for the Tetragrammaton. Notice what Shimson wrote:

> On your issue with the term HaShem. No one is telling you or anyone else to use HaShem to begin with so I am not sure what your gripe is. Besides as I mentioned before I don't replace HaShem Yod-Hey-Waw-Hey with HaShem anywhere, and I also don't read English translations to begin with. I haven't quoted any scripture using HaShem as a replacement. In order to replace something you have to be taking something that already exists in a place and replacing it with something. I have not taken The Elohim from somewhere it already existed and put something else in its place. Besides there is no command that one MUST use Yod-Hey-Waw-Hey every time one is talking about Elohim.[68]

As we have mentioned elsewhere, June and I fully understand that there is no command that one must use the Creator's name each time we speak about Him, nor have we ever given so much as a hint that this is something we should do in each and every situation; so Shimson's last point above was not based upon a response to any suggestion on my part that we should all "use Yod-Hey-Waw-Hey every time one is talking about Elohim." My primary concern with his commentary above, however, wasn't so much that he misunderstands my position, but that he is stuck in a *denial loop*. Even though he says *HaShem* instead of *Yahweh* (or some other pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton that he might think is more correct), he denies that he is replacing anything. Shimson claims he doesn't replace the name Yod-Hey-Waw-Hey (YHWH) with HaShem anywhere, which would include his own writings. Having read enough of his writings prior to the above comment, I knew something was out of kilter. I returned to a posting he had submitted only a week earlier and found an example of how, whether he chooses to admit it or not, he replaces the Tetragrammaton with *HaShem*. Here is what he had written:

> So the Har Sinai experience for a Jew is the crown of the exodus from Egypt. It was the time in history where HaShem changed history and the physical reality by causing all of Israel to receive a gift from on high.[69]

I shared the above excerpt with Shimson as an illustration that, contrary to his claim, he does indeed practice replacing the Tetragrammaton with *HaShem*. Here is an excerpt of what I wrote, which I have taken the liberty of copying and pasting directly from the forum where our views were discussed:

---

[68] From a posting submitted by Shimson on 02-20-2005 at 06:20 PM in the forum thread entitled "Who is HaShem?" This forum is located at www.eliyah.com.

[69] From a posting submitted by Shimson on 02-13-2005 at 09:05 AM in the thread "Specifically, how?", located at www.eliyah.com.

Author	Topic: Who is "Hashem"?
Acheson Posts: 1112 Registered: Nov 1999	posted 02-21-2005 09:04 AM Hi, Shimson: I'll just address one more comment for now: You wrote: quote: As I mentioned before no Jew who knows His Hebrew does not believes that HaShem is a replacement for Yod-Hey-Waw-Hey. If you read what I wrote I was real careful to qualify this. I reply: I agree that you were "real careful to qualify this," but I simply disagree with you ... completely. To demonstrate as much, I will copy and paste an excerpt from a commentary that you submitted in the thread entitled "**Specifically, how?**" back on February 13th: quote: Originally posted by Shimson bar-Tzadoq on 02-13-2005 09:05 AM in the thread "**Specifically, how?**" So the Har Sinai experience for a Jew is the crown of the exodus from Egypt. It was the time in history where HaShem changed history and the physical reality by causing all of Israel to receive a gift from on high. My reaction: There is no doubt in my mind that, in the above excerpt, you replaced the name of the Creator with **HaShem**. Even an elementary student understands that when a word is used as a name, it becomes a proper noun. To find out whether or not the word is used as a proper noun, try replacing it with your own name to see if it works. That is simply how "proper nouns" work. The use of "**HaShem**" seems to represent an attempt to culturally redefine what constitutes a "name" or "name usage." Let's try replacing "**HaShem**" in the above sentence: "It was the time in history where **Shimson** changed history and the physical reality by causing all of Israel to receive a gift from on high." Or, could it read: "It was the time in history where **YHWH** changed history and the physical reality by causing all of Israel to receive a gift from on high." English grammar normally calls for the use of a definite (or indefinite) article if we need to identify someone by his or her **title**. Example: "It was the time in history where **the Almighty** changed history and the physical reality by causing all of Israel to receive a gift from on high."

	It is my understanding that in your original sentence. which I borrowed from your quote, **HaShem** was used as a name, and I believe 99% of non-Jews polled would agree. However, since you have redefined the rules so as to fit the predetermined parameters of Judaism, to you it is not used as (or in place of) a name. I simply disagree. That is the impression that I have. Yours in Messiah, Larry[70]

Curiously, even with the above illustration, Shimson denied replacing the Tetragrammaton in the quotation I supplied. What follows is an excerpt from his subsequent posting in which he replied to my comment:

Author	Topic: Who is "Hashem"?
Shimson bar-Tzadoq Posts: 826 Registered: Dec 2002	posted 02-21-2005 05:14 PM Once again your impression is incorrect. Please provide me with the original wording of my post and the date on which I originally wrote Yod-Hey-Waw-Hey and then later changed it to HaShem. If you don't have that please provide with the Scripture I was quoting in that instance where I took replaced Yod-Hey-Waw-Hey and later went back and put HaShem. As Lee asked you earlier please provide this information because you are bearing false witness. You are the one REPLACING my words with other words, not me.[71]

As I believe is obvious by now, June and I are on completely different wavelengths than Shimson. Shimson believes that he can refer to the Almighty as "HaShem" without replacing or substituting anything because YHWH wasn't in his original thought processes in the first place, so no replacing was done! In other words, if we don't *originally* write, speak or think the Tetragrammaton, then referring to the Almighty as *HaShem* does not involve replacing or substituting anything for the Creator's name. For someone like me to dare suggesting that he does otherwise is "bearing false witness"! This same individual, elsewhere in his writings, expresses his view that the name of the Creator should never be transliterated (i.e., have its pronunciation carried over from Hebrew to any other language).[72] Curiously, Shimson chose to transliterate his *own* name from Hebrew.

---

[70] From a posting I submitted on 02-21-2005 at 09:04 AM in the "Who is HaShem?" thread, which is located on a forum board at www.eliyah.com.

[71] From a posting submitted by Shimson on 02-21-2005 at 5:14 PM in the "Who is HaShem?" thread, which is located on a forum board at www.eliyah.com.

[72] To that end, Shimson wrote, "I am firm believer that The Name of Eluwwim i.e. the Shem Hameyuhhad should never be transliterated, but kept ONLY in Hebrew as it was done in the Greek and various Aramaic translations of the Tanakh. I also

In the same forum, another Jewish participant who went by the screen name "Rivkah" had this to say to a fellow participant named Lee about her own belief that she doesn't substitute the Tetragrammaton with *Hashem*.

Author	Topic: Who is "Hashem"?
Rivkah Posts: 197 Registered: Oct 2004	posted 03-31-2005 09:36 AM BS"D Lee, you're reading something in the quote that is not there: "Invariably, Yacov responds to my inquiries about Marsi with expressions of thanks to Hashem (The Name) for the progress that has been made and hope for future progress ... If I say "thanks be to Hashem" I am saying "thanks be to The Name" referring to The Name without actually writing It to keep It Holy, just as others do when they write "Hashem." Rivkah[73]

Since I do not grasp the concept of giving thanks to a generic "the name" instead of to a person whom I identify by name, I find Rivkah's explanation to be unacceptable.

While it would not be practical to share the entire contents of the forum discussion (it was destined to become the largest forum discussion to ever take place on that forum board), I will share just a few highlights from my exchange with Rivkah. One of those highlights was her refusal to even accept the fact that the translators of the Jewish commentary known as *The Chumash* substituted *HaShem* for the Tetragrammaton.

June and I own a copy of *The Chumash*, which is a Jewish Publication Society compilation of the first five books of Scripture (the *Torah*). *The Chumash* not only contains the English translation of the Torah, but it also displays the Hebrew text. Although the Hebrew text clearly displays the Tetragrammaton (יהוה), it is consistently rendered *HASHEM* in the English translation. Without question, the translators of the Hebrew text chose to substitute (replace) YHWH with HASHEM. I brought this matter to Rivkah's attention as follows:

---

don't believe in just casually writing His Name in places where it can be easily printed out, destroyed, torn, etc." This is an excerpt from a posting he submitted 02-20-2005 12:01 PM in the "Who is HaShem" thread, in the Scripture Discussion forum found at www.eliyah.com.

[73] This is an excerpt from a posting submitted by Rivkah on 03-31-2005 at 09:36 AM in the "Who is HaShem?" thread, which is located on a forum board at www.eliyah.com.

Author	Topic: Who is "Hashem"?
Acheson Posts: 1112 Registered: Nov 1999	posted 04-02-2005 10:19 PM Hi, Rivkah: Regarding the command in Leviticus 22:32 to not profane His name, I do not see a prohibition in that verse from speaking His name. Furthermore, in my *Chumash* Jewish Torah and commentary, five paragraphs are devoted to commentary on Lev. 22:32. Not once does it mention that either speaking or mispronouncing His name constitutes "profanation." Since I certainly do not see any verbiage in Lev. 22:32 stating that reverently speaking His name is tantamount to profaning it, and since even the Jewish commentators seem to agree, I am thus left to regard your view as a misinterpretation of that verse. This has nothing to do with my knowing or not knowing Hebrew, as I presume the Jewish commentators did know Hebrew. Speaking of the *Chumash* I just noticed that it freely substitutes *HASHEM* in place of the Tetragrammaton. Maybe the one I own is different from what others may have? All I know is, the one I have is The Stone Edition, edited by Rabbi Nosson Scherman and Rabbi Meir Zlotowitz, published by Mesorah Publications, Ltd., 8th ed., 1997, and it appears that in each instance of where the Tetragrammaton appears in the Hebrew text, they render it "**Hashem**" in English. I know you mention not using the term *Hashem* when quoting Scripture. I am very curious as to how you and Shimson feel about your fellow Jews who freely used it to replace the Tetragrammaton when **translating** Scripture. May YHWH bless you, Larry[74]

In Rivkah's response, she defends the practice of the translators, insisting that there is no "replacement" at all:

Author	Topic: Who is "Hashem"?
Rivkah Posts: 197 Registered: Oct 2004	posted 04-03-2005 12:10 AM There is no replacement, the Hebrew letters are right there in the Hebrew Text where they are suppose to be. The Name is not translatable therefore the ENGLISH translation has "HaShem" IN REFERENCE to The Name, not a replacement at all. Rivkah[75]

[74] Excerpt from a posting I submitted on 04-02-2005 at 10:19 PM in the "Who is HaShem?" thread, which is located on a forum board at www.eliyah.com.

[75] Excerpt from a posting submitted by Rivkah on 04-03-2005 at 12:10 AM in the "Who is HaShem?" thread, which is located on a forum board at www.eliyah.com.

As brought out by Rivkah, so long as the original ***Hebrew characters*** of the Tetragrammaton are preserved intact when ***copying*** that original text, there is no violation. Moreover, as she reasons above, providing any other language's characters when ***translating*** the text is perfectly okay, thus making allowance for words such as *HaShem* on the grounds that there can be no substitutions within a ***translation***. Here Rivkah digs an even deeper hole for those who share her approach to whether or not Judaism replaces YHWH with *HaShem*. As she puts it, the term *HaShem* is merely used "***in reference to the Name***." If *HaShem* is only used "in reference" to the Name … and there is nothing wrong with this concept … then why can't we just conclude that "the LORD" isn't really a substitute at all … that it's just used "in reference" to YHWH, and is therefore "perfectly acceptable"? Here, then, is the response that I submitted to the above comment:

Author	Topic: Who is "Hashem"?
Acheson Posts: 1112 Registered: Nov 1999	posted 04-03-2005 01:20 AM Hi, Rivkah: I may respond to your entire posting later, but for now I will only respond to your last comment. You wrote: quote: There is no replacement, the Hebrew letters are right there in the Hebrew Text where they are suppose to be. The Name is not translatable therefore the ENGLISH translation has "HaShem" IN REFERENCE to The Name, not a replacement at all. I reply: Okay, let me get this straight. When the folks who translated the *Chumash* translated it from Hebrew to English, and they came to the Creator's name (YHWH), they rendered it **HASHEM**, and you are stating that "there is no replacement." Thus, would you not also agree that the King James Version translators were completely justified in rendering the Tetragrammaton "the LORD" in English, ... and "there was no replacement"? Also, you state that the Name is "not translatable." Would you likewise state that it is "untransliteratable"? May YHWH bless, Larry[76] Report this post to a moderator | IP: Logged

[76] This is the complete posting that I submitted on 04-03-2005 at 1:20 AM in the "Who is HaShem?" thread, which is located on a forum board at www.eliyah.com.

Although Rivkah was unwilling to concede that *HaShem* is used as a substitute for the Tetragrammaton, I was able to produce numerous quotes from Jewish-run web sites in which the authors readily admit to replacing the Tetragrammaton. Here are a few:

The Jewish website "**Ask the Rabbi**" concedes that "Hashem" is a substitute for the Almighty's name:

> We use the word Hashem to refer to G-d. Literally, Hashem means "The Name." The word Hashem actually appears in the Torah, as in "...fear the great and awesome Hashem (Name) - the L-rd your G-d." (Deutoronomy 28:58).
>
> Essentially, the reason for using a substitute is out of respect. The actual name of Hashem has inherent sanctity and must be treated with respect; for example, it may not be erased.[77]

Establishing the fact that *HaShem* is an actual substitute for the Tetragrammaton is *The Encyclopædia Judaica.* The author of the article "God, Names of" in this Jewish encyclopedia wrote the following:

> In order to avoid pronouncing even the sacred name 'Adonai for YHWH, the custom was later introduced of saying simply in Hebrew *ha-Shem* (or Aramaic *Shema'*, "the Name") even in such an expression as "Blessed be he that cometh in the name of YHWH" (Ps. 118:26).[78]

The obvious paradox posed by using *HaShem* within the expression of "Blessed be he that cometh in the name of YHWH" is the fact that the ensuing result is the phrase "… in the name of HaShem," which literally means, "… ***in the name of the Name***"! The above Jewish author understood how nonsensical this particular substitution is, which constitutes his own understanding that *HaShem* is indeed used *instead of* YHWH, which constitutes a replacement.

Another representative of Judaism, Rav Menachem Leibtag of Irene Stern College, in his article "Parshat Ki Tavoh," wrote the following:

> **SHEM HASHEM**
>
> 1. It is a very common practice to say (or write) HASHEM instead of saying His Name. In this week's Parsha, Chumash itself uses this word when it refers to God. Can you find that pasuk? [Hint, it's in the tochacha (towards the end).]
> Attempt to explain the importance of this pasuk, and how it relates to a primary theme in Chumash.[79]

---

[77] The above quote may be read at the following URL: http://ohr.edu/ask/ask212.htm#Q4

[78] From the *Encyclopædia Judaica*, Vol. 7, Encyclopædia Judaica Jerusalem, The Macmillan Company, Copyright 1971 by Keter Publishing House, Lt., Jerusalem, Israel, p. 680.

[79] Here's a link to the site from which I quoted the excerpt from Mr. Leibtag's article: http://www.lind.org.il/ml_parsha/5760/kitavo60_ml.htm

Even the title of Mr. Leibtag's section, "Shem Hashem," suggests that he treats "Hashem" as a name, as "Shem Hashem" literally means "Name the Name." However, it's a dead giveaway that such is his practice when he writes that it's a common practice to say *Hashem* instead of saying His Name. If someone calls me "Joe" *instead of* saying "Larry," they have just either substituted or replaced my name with something that is not my name. However, Shimson and Rivkah would answer that they did no such thing, because they would say they never took my name out of any writing and replaced it with "Joe," nor did they say something like, "Larry … er, I mean, Joe, told me …," which would have been an obvious replacement. With this level of nonsense combined with unyielding denial, I hope I don't need to explain any further that the forum discussion "Who is HaShem?" was not a very productive or edifying discussion.

17. Will the Messiah Restore the Name When He Returns?

In spite of the obvious fact that using *Hashem* instead of YHWH is the same as replacing the name YHWH, Rivkah denied doing any such thing. The following is an excerpt from a posting in which she responded to my displaying the previously-cited quote from Menachem Leibtag:

Author	**Topic: Who is "Hashem"?**
Rivkah Posts: 197 Registered: Oct 2004	posted 04-02-2005 01:43 PM SHEM HASHEM 1. It is a very common practice to say (or write) HASHEM instead of saying His Name. This is true, it is common practice to refer to the "The Name" (HaShem) without pronouncing It or writing it for two reasons, 1) We do not know Its pronounciation until Mashiach comes and restores this knowledge to us, 2) Even if we knew It we would not take it out of Its holy context by saying It or writing it in a casual setting or setting where it could be desecrated.[80]

Here Rivkah lists her two reasons for not writing or pronouncing the Creator's name, neither of which we find to have any substance. First of all, as we have already covered, the Almighty is more honored when we at least ***try*** to get His name right than when we outright replace it, which is what happens with the use of *Hashem*. Secondly, if using the Name in a casual setting is wrong, then she may as well accuse Boaz of desecrating the Name when he used it as he greeted the workers in the field (Ruth 2:4). June and I are all for using the Creator's name respectfully, and saying, "May Yahweh bless you!" is doing just that. If that pronunciation isn't 100% correct, we do not fear being corrected by Him, for He is a merciful Heavenly Father who knows we are doing the best we can, and He knows that no one alive today is responsible for any loss in retaining the precise pronunciation (presuming the precise pronunciation is of ultimate importance to Him).

Finally, with regard to her belief that Judaism will once more begin speaking the Creator's name when the Messiah (Mashiach) returns, this does not seem to be what Yeshua the Messiah had to say about this matter. What follows is my response to the Jewish claim that they will not speak the Creator's name until the Messiah comes to "restore that knowledge" to them:

[80] Excerpt from a posting submitted by Rivkah on 04-02-2005 at 1:43 PM in the "Who is HaShem?" thread, page 10, which is located on a forum board at www.eliyah.com.

Author	Topic: Who is "Hashem"?
Acheson Posts: 1112 Registered: Nov 1999	posted 04-17-2005 10:02 AM ***Waiting for Moshiach ... or a Case of Foolish Virgins (Matt. 25)?*** Rivkah and Shimson have made it clear that they have no intention of even **trying** to learn and call upon the Creator by His name until the Moshiach [Messiah] comes and tells them what it is. As I have mentioned previously, this reminds me of my former Sundaykeeping friends who told me that, yes, in the next "dispensation," the world will once again observe the weekly Sabbath, but that won't happen until the Messiah returns. Then, and only then, do we need to bother with Sabbath observance. Then, and only then, do we need to bother with being concerned about learning the Creator's name. Is there a pattern here? I believe there is. Of course, I do not put the blame on Judaism any more than I put blame on those Christians who teach that Sabbath observance will not be enforced again until the Messiah's return. I believe we are simply dealing with an adversary who is doing his best to keep the world from observing Torah. This same adversary is doing his best to keep the world from knowing and using the Creator's name. In fact, they have been duped into believing that any attempt to speak His name constitutes such heinous sins as blasphemy and bearing false witness. I don't believe Yahweh left His people without sure clues that lead to knowing His name ... and I sure don't believe He is a Creator who burns with anger when those who try don't quite enunciate it with 100% perfection. I'm not quite sure who it is Shimson and Rivkah worship, but the One I worship is a Mighty One of love, mercy, forgiveness and understanding towards those who seek to honor Him. He will forgive you if you mispronounce His name, providing you do so in a reverent attempt to honor it. One can do this in a casual setting as well as one that is more formal. ONE thing we should all know about the Messiah is the fact that He openly spoke the name of His Father. I realize that there are bound to be some who don't believe that His words "I have declared Thy name" (John 17:6, 26) really means that He declared the name YHWH, but many of us here in this forum know better. He freely spoke the name YHWH. Those Jews who teach that they aren't going to so much as bother with trying to learn His name might wish to give a little attention to what Yeshua said in Matthew 23. In that chapter, upon pronouncing all of His "woes" upon the hypocritical scribes and Pharisees, who are the forerunners of modern-day Judaism, He also pronounced one upon the city of Jerusalem. In verse 37, He said: [37]O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, *thou* that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent to thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her

> chickens under *her* wings, and ye would **not**! [38]Behold, your house is left unto you desolate.

Here Yeshua, as I have previously mentioned in the other "Hashem" thread, speaks of the close relationship that He desires to have with His people, but they simply aren't willing, as "love," "mercy," "compassion," "forgiveness," etc., do not seem to form a part of the Judaism equation. Maybe someday that will change. Someday it will have to. Are they ready yet? From the exposure I have seen in this thread, the answer is no. Again, you will hear of how unforgiving YHWH is, but how many times will you hear of His great compassion, His tender mercies, His love for His children who seek to honor Him? All I know is, it hasn't happened in 16+ mega-pages of a forum thread. If this was simply an oversight on their part, now would be a good time to offer an explanation.[81]

Getting back to Yeshua's words directed at Judaism as a whole, He wanted that close relationship with them, but they simply aren't interested. At least they weren't back then, and I don't see the signs here of anything that's changed in 2,000 years.

Yeshua closes Matthew chapter 23 by issuing the following notice:

> [39]For I say unto you, you shall not see Me henceforth, **TILL** ye shall say, Blessed *is* he that cometh in the name of **YHWH**!

I trust you know the reason for why I emphasized the word "**till**" in the above quote. The Jews contributing to this thread have made it clear that they have no intention of speaking the Creator's name until after the Messiah comes and reveals it to them. However, the Messiah has already told them that they aren't even going to see Him again until they first say (as in speak, utter), "BLESSED IS HE THAT COMETH IN THE NAME OF **YHWH**."

The reason I am so comfortable with placing the Tetragrammaton in the above verse is because I know that it is a direct quote from Psalms 118:26, and King David, in writing that verse, placed the Tetragrammaton there. But not only is that Name written in that verse, but it is a name that, according to Yeshua's own words, must be **SPOKEN**, not suppressed, substituted for, something else used instead of it, etc., etc. ... whatever verbiage is used to justify Judaism's stand against speaking it.

I realize we are fighting against a powerful enemy, one who has deceived the whole world. He will use whomever he can to achieve his purposes, and believe me, one of his purposes is to keep the world from knowing and using the Creator's name. What I have seen in this forum is just how hard at work he is at keeping folks from learning and using that name.

If Judaism wants the Moshiach to come as much as they seem to indicate they do, I think they should simply work at doing what Yeshua says must be done **FIRST**. Right now, they have things backwards. Yeshua says, "If you

---

[81] In spite of this and other open suggestions to come forth and express a mutual agreement with regard to YHWH's compassion and love for His children, neither Shimson nor Rivkah took advantage of my invitation.

want to see me, then **first** say, "Blessed is He that cometh in the name of YHWH!" (HaShem won't "cut it," I'm afraid).

But Judaism says, "No, Yeshua, we won't speak that name until You **FIRST** come and tell us how to pronounce it!"

I wonder which side will get their way.

On one occasion, Shimson plainly asserted that he knows precisely who he worships, even though he doesn't call upon Him by name. He had written:

quote:

I take it that Sacred Namers and former Christians have this problem of people not knowing who they serve. Doesn't happen to me.

Of course, it is easy for anyone and everyone to confidently rest in their own self-assurance that they fully "know" who they worship. One thing we do know: Sometimes people are a bit over-confident about how certain they are of "who" they worship. Yeshua addressed this head-on in John 4:22. Sometimes people really believe in their hearts they know "who" they worship, only to find out later on that they were deceived. I think I would be careful about proclaiming to know "who" I serve while simultaneously saying, "I don't know Him by name," or at best, "I'm afraid if I were to try pronouncing it, but got it wrong, that I would never be forgiven."

As I close this posting, I thought I would offer yet another testimony from a very respected Jewish web site in which they admit that they substitute "**HaShem**" for the Creator's name:

> The Mishnah confirms that there was no prohibition against pronouncing The Name in ancient times. In fact, the Mishnah recommends using God's Name as a routine greeting to a fellow Jew. Berakhot 9:5. However, by the time of the Talmud, it was the custom to use substitute Names for God. Some rabbis asserted that a person who pronounces YHVH according to its letters (instead of using a substitute) has no place in the World to Come, and should be put to death. Instead of pronouncing the four-letter Name, we usually substitute the Name "Adonai," or simply say "Ha-Shem" (lit. The Name).

The above quotation can be accessed at the following URL:
http://www.jewfaq.org/name.htm

The teaching that we shouldn't speak the Creator's name unless we are 100% certain of its precise pronunciation is simply a man-made teaching ... one that actually makes void YHWH's commandments. Do I believe Yeshua would have addressed this tradition? Yes, I do.

	BLESSED IS HE THAT COMETH IN THE NAME OF YAHWEH![82]

My posting the Matthew 23 prophecy from Yeshua that Jews need to call upon the name YHWH ***before*** they will see Him again (as opposed to their claim that they need Him to ***first*** come and teach it to them) drew an immediate, though weak, response from Rivkah. Here is her complete posting, as taken directly from the forum:

Author	**Topic: Who is "Hashem" 2**
Rivkah Posts: 197 Registered: Oct 2004	posted 04-17-2005 10:43 PM Originally posted by Acheson: Waiting for Moshiach ... or a Case of Foolish Virgins (Matt. 25)? Rivkah and Shimson have made it clear that they have no intention of even trying to learn and call upon the Creator by His name until the Moshiach [Messiah] comes and tells them what it is. BS"D Zecharya 14:9 "IN THAT DAY shall Y-H-V-H be One and His Name One." In this present world Shem HaMeyuchad (The Unique Name - Y-H-V-H) is not pronounced, but when Mashiach comes (the Messianic Age) HaShem will once again be pronounced as written. > It is our duty to pray to the Master of all, to ascribe greatness to the Molder of primeval creation, for He has not made us like the nations of the lands and has not emplaced us like the families of the earth; for He has not assigned our portion like theirs nor our lot like all their multitudes. (For they bow to vanity and emptiness and pray to a god which helps not. Yeshayahu 45:20) But we bend our knees, bow, and acknowledge our thanks before the King Who reigns over kings, the Holy One, Blessed is He. He stretches out heaven and establishes earth's foundation (Yeshayahu 51:13), the seat of His homage is in the heavens above and His powerful Presence is in the loftiest heights. He is our El-him and there is none other. True is our King, there is nothing beside Him, as it is written in His Torah, "You are to know this day and take to your heart that Y-H-V-H is the only El-him - in heaven above and on the earth below - there is none other.(Devarim 4:39)' > Therefore we put our hope in You, Y-H-V-H our El-him, that we may soon see Your mighty splendor, to remove detestable idolatry form the earth, and false gods will be utterly cut off, to perfect the universe through the Almighty's sovereignty. Then all humanity will call upon Your Name, to turn all the earth's

[82] Excerpt from a posting I submitted on 04/17/2005 in the **"Who is Hashem?" 2** thread (the first thread had grown so large that it would not accept further postings, so a new one was started).

> wicked toward You. All the world's inhabitants will recognize and know that to You every knee should bend, every tongue should swear (Yeshayahu 45:23). Before You, Y-H-V-H, our El-him, they will bend every knee and cast themselves down and to the glory of Your Name they will render homage, and they will all accept upon themselves the yoke of Your kingship that You may reign over them soon and eternally. For the kingdom is Yours and You will reign for all eternity in glory as it is written in Your Torah, "Y-H-V-H shall reign for all eternity. (Shemot 15:18)"
>
> And it is said, "Y-H-V-H will be King over all the world - on that day Y-H-V-H will be One and His Name shall be One." (Aleinu)

Rivkah
Do not fear sudden terror, or the holocaust of the wicked when it comes (Mishlei 3:25).

Plan a conspiracy and it will be annulled; speak your piece and it shall not stand, for El-him is with us (Yeshayahu 8:10).

Even till your seniority, I remain unchanged; and even till your ripe old age, I shall endure. I created you and I shall bear you; I shall endure and rescue (Yeshayahu 46:4).

B"H[83]

When I read the above response, I scratched my head and thought, "You call this a *response*?" It offered nothing in the way of a rebuttal to what I had submitted less than an hour earlier. I wasn't the only one who realized that Rivkah was sidestepping my commentary and the points I raised. A fellow participant who went by the screen name of Shlomoh submitted the following reply:

Author	Topic: Who is "Hashem" 2
Shlomoh Posts: 1167 Registered: Feb 2000	posted 04-18-2005 09:24 AM quote: Originally posted by Rivkah: **Originally posted by Acheson:** **Waiting for Moshiach ... or a Case of Foolish Virgins (Matt. 25)?** **Rivkah and Shimson have made it clear that they have no intention of even trying to learn and call upon the Creator by His name until the Moshiach [Messiah] comes and tells them what it is.** **BS"D**

[83] This is the complete posting submitted by Rivkah on 04/17/2005 in the **"Who is Hashem?" 2** thread.

Zecharya 14:9 "IN THAT DAY shall Y-H-V-H be One and His Name One."

In this present world Shem HaMeyuchad (The Unique Name - Y-H-V-H) is not pronounced, but when Mashiach comes (the Messianic Age) HaShem will once again be pronounced as written.

Shalom Rivkah,

That was a nice quote of Artscroll's rendition of the Aleinu prayer, but it only side-stepped Larry's question. I don't know what Rabbi made the statement above about not pronouncing the name as written in this age, but I do know that Yeshua HaMashiach told the Rabbanites of His day that their house was left to them desolate (70 CE) and that they would see Him no more UNTIL they said, "Baruch haba b'shem YHWH!" This will PRECEDE, not follow, Mashiach's appearance. Yeshua also told the Rabbinites that the kingdom was to be taken from them and given to a nation (ethos, goyim) bringing forth the fruits thereof. It should come to no supprise then that the Encyclopedia Judaica should attribute the preservation of the pronounciation of the name to the early Christian writers. After all, until Constantine welded church and state together in the fourth century, the Christians lived at least on a Noachide level of observance as the Jerusalem Council (Acts 15) required of them.

Shlomoh[84]

Report this post to a moderator | IP: Logged

We appreciate Shlomoh's response. Indeed, the day will come when Jews will say, "Baruch haba b'shem YHWH!" This day will PRECEDE, not follow, the Messiah's return. Why wait around for the prophecy to be fulfilled (which it certainly will someday), when we can be *part* of that fulfillment in the here and *now*? Eventually Yahweh's people will all call upon His name and teach others about Him and His righteous ways. Let's not be foolish virgins and wait around with partially-filled lamps! Remember what the *lamp* is? Psalms 119:105 tells us:

> 105 Thy WORD is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path!

There is so much more that we could add to this topic, but I believe we have sufficiently addressed the major concerns brought about by a Jewish tradition that will eventually come to a halt … whether in the near future or in the distant future. If we can trust Yeshua's own words, then we know they *will* eventually come to pass. When He comes, we will all have said, "Blessed is he that comes in the name of YHWH!"

---

[84] This is the complete posting submitted by Shlomoh on 04/18/2005 in the **"Who is Hashem?" 2** thread, found at www.eliyah.com.

18. Is Mispronouncing the Name a Salvation Issue?

Until that glorious day of the Messiah's return arrives, many within Judaism, even among those who recognize Yeshua as the Messiah, have a great deal of baggage to let go of. One that we haven't really addressed in this study is a tightly-held belief that, unless one enunciates the Creator's name with perfect resonance, that person will have no part in the world to come. This way of thinking was introduced to me by Shimson in one of his postings to the forum discussion. In the excerpt that follows, he mentions that mispronouncing the Creator's name is a violation of Exodus (Shemoth) 20:6 (I believe he meant to say verse 7):

Author	Topic: Who is "Hashem"?
Shimson bar-Tzadoq Posts: 826 Registered: Dec 2002	posted 04-08-2005 06:35 AM In terms of what I mentioned about Shemoth 20:6, once again if you go back to what I mentioned several times before. The entire context of this debate started from asking a question of WHAT Jews do or don't do on this issue and WHY. The answer was given of why most Jews do or don't do a certain thing. It is based on Yeshayahu 8:20 Torah and Te'udah. As I mentioned before for a JEW to raise up a false pronunciation/neder of The Name of Elohim would be a breech of Shemoth 20:6 (especially knowing what we know on the issue). The Te'udah of Am Yisrael is clear on this, and we know that in the Olam Haba (World to Come) the Mashi'ahh ben-Dawith will come and make all unknown things known. Elohim says what He says on that, and only He knows what Him not forgiving results in. I haven't passed any judgement on anyone, including those Jews who commit pesha (direct breach with full knowledge) on this.[85]

Shimson clearly believes that mispronouncing the Creator's name constitutes a violation of Exodus 20:7, where we are told,

> 7 Thou shalt not take the name of YHWH thy Elohim in vain; for YHWH will not hold him guiltless that taketh His name in vain.

The above translation is from the King James Version. The JPS Translation offers the following translation of Exodus 20:7. Note: We are restoring the Tetragrammaton to its original place and substituting the translation "God" with "Mighty One":

> 7 You shall not swear falsely by the name of YHWH your Mighty One; for YHWH will not

[85] This is an excerpt from a posting submitted by Shimson on 04-08-2005 at 06:35 AM in the forum thread entitled "Who is HaShem?" This discussion forum is located online at www.eliyah.com.

```
clear one who swears falsely
by His name.
```

What we would like for you to notice is that in neither of the above translations is there a hint of there being a sin for attempting to pronounce the Creator's name, but not getting it "just right."

Again, Shimson seems to approach the matter of speaking the Creator's name as being akin to a morbidly suspenseful game of Russian Roulette. Since, in his estimation, no one alive today knows *for sure* the precise pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton, it could be a huge mistake if we should exhaust ourselves with researching the pronunciation of that name only to come up with something that is not a precise match. How "huge" of a mistake would it be, according to Shimson, if we come close, but not close enough? Well, he expounded on the above post five days later, and although he makes it clear he is not out to "pass judgment" on anyone, he expresses the view that, unless we get it "just right," there is *no forgiveness*. That is the penalty for not properly enunciating the Creator's name, in spite of what may be one's best attempts to do so. Shown below is an excerpt from the posting Shimson submitted:

Author	**Topic: Who is "Hashem"?**
Shimson bar-Tzadoq Posts: 826 Registered: Dec 2002	posted 04-13-2005 01:06 PM You also say that it is okay for person to call Elohim by whatever method they have concluded Yod-Hey-Waw-Hey to be pronounced as and Elohim is merciful. Yet, you seem to imply that He is not merciful on the Jew who would not lift up incorrect spellings and prounications about His Name.[86] That is a bit of a weird double standard. Yet, as I mentioned before: For a Jew,as I mentioned before, the Hebrew Torah commands us not to lift up false information about Elohim. In the Teimani Torah Tajj, Shemoth 20:6 it states, **"Lo tiso' ath shem YHWH Alohakho lashow' ki lo yinaqqah YHWH ath ashar yiwo shmo lashow.'"**. Translated this means, **You will not lift up/raise up/bear/ Name/Renown of YHWH your Elohim to falsehood/false (or incorrect nedarim). Because YHWH does not forgive whom will lift up/raise up/bear His Name to falsehood/false (or incorrect nedarim)."** You can take that and interpret that anyway you want it, but as a Jew I am prohibited from spreading false information about any aspect of Him because HE said that HE doesn't forgive such. Because the Yemenite Torah Tajjim are clear on Shemoth 20:6 the issue is a straight and easy one, and the Aramaic Tarjum of Onkelos also indicates this (La teme bishma daYHWH lemagana are la yezake YHWH yath deyeme bishmeh leshiqra). I mentioned before the Tanakh is a neder so it is completely understandable why it records times when Israel knew EXACTLY how to pronounce Yod-Hey-Waw-Hey. According to the Te'udah of Am Yisrael we await the Mashi'ahh to restore the full knowledge of Elohim. Until then most Jewish sources discuss ALL the theories instead of misleading people into thinking that one is better than another, based on human understanding. i.e. only giving people part of the story instead of giving them all the information to make their own

[86] Although this comment was directed at me, it is completely untrue, as I believe I have successfully demonstrated through the various excerpts I have supplied from the forum discussion postings I submitted. We are not out to judge anyone, although we do speak out with regard to what we believe dishonors YHWH.

	decisions. The above is according to the Te'udah of Am Yisrael, and non Jews and non-Geirim are not bound to it.[87]

In posting the above, Shimson told his readers that we can take what he wrote any way we want. Well, since he has already made it clear that mispronouncing the Creator's name is a Torah violation, and since he here establishes that there is no forgiveness for violating this particular Torah command (at least this is how he understands the commandment in Ex. 20:7), it is clear that, to him, the issue of pronouncing the Creator's name is indeed a *salvation issue*.

June and I want to make it clear that we believe we do not honor Yahweh when we replace His name with substitutes. Thus, we likewise believe that each of us should do his or her best to research and prove to themselves which pronunciation comes closest to matching the one that the Almighty gave to Moses. However, if our best research produces a pronunciation that is not precise, or even one that isn't even *close*, we believe YHWH is honored by those who at least strive to please Him. June and I have come across what we believe are some pretty strange renditions of the original pronunciation, but so long as those who come up with those forms have done so in "good faith," then we believe YHWH is honored. We do not regard Him as a stern Gestapo-style commander ready to cut us down, when in spite of our best research, we nevertheless come up short. It is in this vein that I submitted the following response:

Author	**Topic: Who is "Hashem" 2**
Acheson Posts: 1112 Registered: Nov 1999	posted 04-17-2005 10:02 AM Over and over again throughout this discussion, I have stressed how confident I am of our Heavenly Father's mercy, forgiveness and understanding of those who seek to honor Him by calling upon Him by name, as well as letting others know the identity of Who we worship. I have often mentioned His lovingkindness and of how I know He understands and forgives those who, even if they fail in their honest efforts, did their best to honor Him. There is a reason for why I have devoted so much space towards mentioning this aspect of our Heavenly Father. For those who would care to reread Shimson's and Rivkah's postings, you will notice that they have not discussed this aspect of the Almighty. The impression they leave me with, if I didn't know YHWH's Word, would be that He is <u>not</u> a merciful and loving Heavenly Father. They certainly have not expressed agreement of how loving and merciful He is ... at least not yet! Go ahead, read their commentaries. You will read of how YHWH is **not** forgiving, but not of how He is forgiving. You will not read of how merciful He is. You will not read of his lovingkindness; no, not even <u>once</u>. Sixteen pages worth of commentary, yet they couldn't even take a moment to share this aspect of our Heavenly Father. Yet, time <u>was</u> taken to share how **<u>un</u>**forgiving our Almighty is. There is a reason for this.[88]

[87] This is an excerpt from a posting submitted by Shimson on 04-13-2005 at 01:06 PM in the forum thread entitled "Who is HaShem?" This discussion forum is located online at www.eliyah.com.

[88] This is an excerpt from a posting I submitted on 04-17-2005 10:02 AM in the forum thread entitled **"Who is HaShem?" 2**. This discussion forum is located online at www.eliyah.com.

To my amazement, even though that forum discussion continued for ten more days, neither Rivkah nor Shimson took the hint to speak out regarding their understanding of the Almighty's lovingkindness and mercy towards His children. I was left to wonder just what impression they really do have of Him. June and I have had limited exposure to Jews over the years, so if Rivkah and Shimson were to serve as the only representatives of Judaism that we should ever be exposed to, it would be very difficult to want to adopt the lifestyle they live. Thankfully, we know that they, like folks in any walk of life, do not represent all of Judaism. Nevertheless, the whole of Judaism has chosen to substitute the Creator's name with forms such as *HaShem*, and if they have valid reasons for doing so, they need to come up with better ones than those covered in this study.

BLESSED IS HE THAT COMETH IN THE NAME OF YAHWEH!