

A Messianic inquiry into “What happened to the Tetragrammaton?”

There is a **remarkable and enormous discrepancy** between the ancient documents of the Tanakh (TNK, = the so-called “Old Testament”) and those of the Apostolic Commentary (AC, = the so-called “New Testament”). It is this: in the TNK sources (written in Hebrew and Aramaic/Chaldee), the Name of the Almighty is given quite clearly, lavishly (nearly **7000** times), and unmistakably by the “Tetragrammaton”, a word of 4 Hebrew or Aramaic characters which are well-represented in English as “YHWH”; *but in numerous Greek sources of the AC, there is no sign of the Tetragrammaton, whether in Hebrew or Aramaic characters or in an obvious Greek transliteration of them.* Instead, one finds overwhelmingly the Greek word *kyrios* which corresponds to the Hebrew generic role-title *adonai*, both meaning in English *lord or master, Sir, possibly Supreme Master*; while the role-title *Mighty One*, which in Hebrew is the word *elohim* or a related word, is apparently replaced by *theos* which in English is generally translated “God”, which is the name of an Indo-Germanic deity and has no near connection to either Hebrew or Greek. Odd.

I have read a close analysis of the principles followed by the Jehovah's Witnesses translators, who placed the name *Jehovah* 237 times into the AC of their New World Bible The author (unnamed, unfortunately) says:

The New World Bible Translation Committee believed that the Tetragrammaton was used by the original Greek Scripture writers, but then removed by scribes and copyists by the fourth (sic) century. *This possibility requires careful scrutiny inasmuch as verification of the Tetragrammaton's removal is the sole condition justifying restoration of Jehovah's name to the Christian Scriptures.* (My underlining; and of course *Jehovah* is a poor representation in English of the Tetragrammaton.)

After careful scrutiny of something over 5000 Greek source fragments and documents for the AC, some of them going back to the second century CE and a tiny scrap into the first, as well as non-canonical writings of “early” Christian believers, he concludes that there is no evidence of such removal. (He has already decided that the original writings must have been in Greek, not Hebrew or Aramaic.) If his underlined condition is sound, then there is no justification for restoring the Tetragrammaton to the “Christian Scriptures” or AC, in fact this would be regarded as defying the notion of inerrant inspiration of the AC, because he has been at pains to argue that the AC originals were written in Greek. Some agreement with this viewpoint appears to come from the Bible Societies who dominate the field of publishing Scripture translations worldwide. But is it sound? *Is* the underlined assertion correct? Would one be justified in restoring the Tetragrammaton to the Christian Scriptures (AC) as some translators have done, for example associates of the Institute for Scriptural Research in producing the version called *The Scriptures*, even if we could not demonstrate its removal in specific instances?

Whatever degree of interest one may have in the Jehovah's Witnesses *per se*, if you are interested in the question of the true Names, this quote and its underlying research deserve careful consideration.

To me the quote sounds like straining at a gnat while swallowing a camel - classic misdirection. Admittedly, it is a large gnat, large enough to look like a camel to many and therefore deserving to be strained at. But the true camel, which is regularly swallowed without a thought let alone a second thought, is this far larger problem implied in our first paragraph: *How could the Mighty One Who persistently lavishly and insistently made His Name known for His people to use throughout the TNK that He inspired, suddenly without warning capitulate and refrain from using it at all throughout the AC that He inspired, replacing it with pagan substitutes in flagrant contradiction of His own earlier commands in this respect?*

It is worth listing a few possible answers to this riddle; each will be examined in its own section, with an overall conclusion being drawn in yet another:

1. The Mighty One of the TNK is not the same as the Mighty One of the AC, therefore a name change was in order, indeed required (*Marcionism*)
2. The Mighty One of the TNK is the same as the Mighty One of the AC, but changed His mind about using His own Name and settled for something the Gentiles might feel happier with (*some Christianity*)
3. The Mighty One of the TNK is the same as the Mighty One of the AC, but using a particular name is no big deal, as long as you mean the right Being (*more Christianity, Judaism*)
4. The Mighty One of the TNK changed His mind about letting people use His proper Name and left them to

their own devices (*Judaism*)

5. The Mighty One of the TNK is the same as that of the AC, and caused the inspired writers of the latter to use His true Name, but this was replaced with malicious intent by various people (*Conspiracy*)

6. The Mighty One of the TNK is the same as that of the AC, and caused the inspired writers of the latter to use His true Name, but translators and copyists rapidly replaced it with “dynamic equivalents” (*Entropy*)

7. The AC is just commentary, wonderful not inspired, its terminology not above suspicion (*Canonicity*)

So let us consider our options:

Option 1: The Mighty One of the TNK is not the same as the Mighty One of the AC (*Marcionism*), therefore a name change was in order, indeed required

This is a very blatant statement of the core thought of Marcionism, so in-your-face that many Christians may think “I’ll have nothing to do with *this!*”, never realising how extensively Marcionism in camouflage has penetrated and shaped much of Christian thinking. Even options 2 and 3 cannot stand logically unless they are covering-up for the Marcion theory, they violate the nature and character and word of the One who was, and is, and shall be: YHWH.

Let’s consider Marcion and his heresy briefly. He was born 10 years or more before the apostle John finished writing his Epistles (maybe even 70CE). He seems to have been an amazing person, think Richard Branson, Billy Graham and even a bit of the apostle Paul all rolled into one. A *bishop* and son of a *bishop*, he became well-off as a shipowner and launched into a career of teaching, evangelizing, church-planting, theological philosophizing and scriptural criticism which had an enormous impact on the spread of Christianity in the Roman Empire, so much so as possibly to be responsible for the very name *Christian* eventually being applied to some believers. Churches full of his disciples were all over the place - to quote GRS Mead, *Fragments of a Faith Forgotten* (London and Benares, 1900; 3rd Edition 1931, pp.241+) :

This much we know, that the views of Marcion spread rapidly over the “whole world,” to use the usual Patristic phrase for the Graeco- Roman dominions; and as late as the fifth century we hear of Theodoret converting more than a thousand Marcionites. In Italy, Egypt, Palestine, Arabia, Syria, Asia Minor and Persia, Marcionite churches sprang up, splendidly organized, with their own bishops and the rest of the ecclesiastical discipline, with a cult and service of the same nature as those of what subsequently became the Catholic Church. Orthodoxy had not declared for any party as yet, and the Marcionite view had then as good a chance as any other of becoming the universal one. What then was the secret of Marcion’s success? As already pointed out, it was the same as that of the success of modern criticism as applied to the problem of the Old Testament.

- even by about 135CE, just after the final destruction of Jerusalem, when it was essential not to be seen to be “Jewish”. Marcion may have originated or boosted the following long-lasting features of Christianity, some of them arising partly in reaction to his success and the dangers it was perceived to carry:

- The disparaging name “*Old Testament*” for the TNK
- The “*New Testament*” itself, as a body of inspired writings to be added to the TNK
- The concept of “*New Testament Christianity*” as distinct from Nazarene Judaism
- The doctrine or at least the label of the *Trinity* to contrast with the TNK’s Monotheism
- The general absence of the *Tetragrammaton* in Christian writings
- The large group of theologies called “*dispensationalism*”, and the even larger class called “*replacementist*”

- The “faith only” movement (*solafideism*), in contrast to the TNK concept of *emunah*
- *Sola Scriptura*, the warcry of the Reformers
- The formalization of such Catholic ideas as *Church Tradition*, the *Rule of Faith*, and the *Apostolic Succession*. In fact, Harnack paradoxically called Marcion the creator of the Catholic Church - which vigorously repudiated Marcion - because the need to refute him precipitated the structured formation of that body
- The (falsely so-called) *Apostles' Creed*
- *Gnosticism*, the monotheistic counter to Marcion's *Dualism*
- Multiplied forged semi-scriptures (*pseudepigrapha*) aimed at opposing his doctrines

Not too bad for one just heretic! In addition, as I researched Marcion I was struck with the similarity between his followers and people I met during the 1970s and 80s in the charismatic revival in South Africa and overseas. This was no accident, he was so antinomian he had to be charismatic - but see later.

So what was his heresy? Simply this: in trying to ensure that the Father of the Saviour couldn't possibly be accused of being the author of sin - an effort which many people might regard as praiseworthy - he resorted to *Dualism*, saying that the Creator (i.e. the Mighty One of the, watch carefully now, “Old Testament”) whom the Gnostics as overt monotheists thought must at some great remove be responsible for sin, was not the same as the loving Kurios of the (again watch carefully) “New Testament” - Marcion couldn't handle what the TNK taught about YHWH, he wanted a different kind of being to worship. Of course, there *was* no “New Testament” yet, so Marcion went out and made one to support his philosophy. This he did by taking 10 of Paul's letters that were in general circulation, and the Gospel of Luke, and editing them severely to remove traces of Hebrew influence. Furthermore, he wrote his own “gospel” and offered it to the congregation at Rome, along with a fat donation. They turned his cash and his gospel down, and excommunicated him, but not before he had set a bad example for dealing with the source documents of the “New Testament”: *edit them to suit the theology you want them to undergird.*

(Please be aware that editorial revisionism like this was rampant around that time in many fields, it was a quick way to gain kudos as an author. I am not suggesting that Marcion *invented* the practice, but in applying it to the contents of what he presented as an inspired authoritative overrider of the TNK that had been most carefully and scrupulously copied for many hundreds of years, he showed a lamentable lack of respect for precisely those texts he was vaunting so highly.)

Quoting Mead again - and Mead was a Gnostic writer anxious to claim Marcion as one of his own:

Marcion's view was in some respects even more moderate than the judgment of some of our modern thinkers; he was willing to admit that the Yahweh of the Old Testament was just. With great acumen he arranged the sayings and doings ascribed to Yahweh by the writers, and compilers, and editors of the heterogeneous books of the Old Testament collection, in parallel columns, so to say, with the sayings and teachings of the Christ - in a series of antitheses which brought out in startling fashion the fact, that though the best of the former might be ascribed to the idea of a Just God, they were foreign to the ideal of the Good God preached by the Christ. We know how in these latter days the best minds in the Church have rejected the horrible sayings and doings ascribed to God in some of the Old Testament documents, and we thus see how Marcion formulated a protest which must have already declared itself in the hearts of thousands of the more enlightened of the Christian name.

As for the New Testament, in Marcion's time, the idea of a canon was not yet or was only just being thought of. Marcion, too, had an idea of a canon, but it was the antipodes of the views which afterwards became the basis of the orthodox canon.

Here at the very origins of the “New Testament” stands its sponsor, maybe even its inventor, the man with the bright idea that believers *need* a “New Testament” to read; and he is determined to erase any signs of Hebrew influence on it, and specifically concerned to put maximum distance between on the one hand the Mighty One of the TNK who had unmistakably revealed Himself to be YHWH, and on the other hand the loving good Father Who gave His beloved Son to be our Saviour from that horrid law that the other Mighty One, the One Who had created sin, had tied everybody up in. Marcion had scripted a cosmic “Bad Cop, Good Cop” scenario and specified two very different leading actors for it. Since Marcion's Bad Cop was already called YHWH and Marcion couldn't do anything about that, he needed another name for the second actor. In seeking this he received welcome if unsolicited and probably unsuspecting reinforcement from a surprising quarter: the Jews with their Septuagint, often denoted LXX, which was the Greek translation of the Hebrew TNK.

Although the task of translating the TNK into Greek had begun in Egypt more than 3 centuries before, it was not yet finalized before Marcion's time, despite a cute story that 70 Hebrew scholars laboured in Alexandria for 70 days back in about 200BCE and produced the LXX clean and clear in one shot. Even so revisions were already being undertaken, including some to *remove allusions to [haMashiach]*, because many interested Greek-literate Gentiles were coming to faith in Messias by reading the LXX; and it is noteworthy how the Name of the Creator was treated in revisions shortly after the Apostolic era. From being written in Hebrew (even ancient Hebrew) letters in the midst of the Greek of the LXX in the early half of the Apostolic Century, a sea-change took place as the main readership of the LXX shifted from Greek-literate Jews to Jewish-interested Gentiles. Presumably the Hellenised Jew reading the LXX would be indoctrinated well enough not to *pronounce* the Name when he saw it there, a Hebrew-lettered Tetragrammaton in the midst of Greek writing, but the unenlightened goy might not be so respectful. He might ask how to pronounce these odd characters, and that would be very embarrassing. So more and more copies of the LXX came out with Greek workarounds like *kurios* and *theos* (Heb: *Adonai* and *Elohim*) instead of the Tetragrammaton. This meant that the discomfort level of informed people reading a (copy or translation of a) Pauline epistle or a gospel which *didn't* feature the true names would be minimized, it was only to be expected in terms of the generally accepted LXX practice. Neither Jews nor Marcion wanted his largely-Gentile disciples to know the set-apart name "YHWH". Generics would be just fine, thank you.

(You may be interested to read what the translators of the Authorised - "King James" - Version said about these Greek translations of the Tanak in their original Preface to the 1611 edition of the AV/KJV:

While God would be known only in Jacob, and have his name great in Israel, and in none other place; while the dew lay on Gideon's fleece only, and all the earth besides was dry; then for one and the same people, which spake all of them the language of Canaan, that is, Hebrew, one and the same original in Hebrew was sufficient. But when the fulness of time drew near, that the Sun of righteousness, the Son of God, should come into the world, whom God ordained to be a reconciliation through faith in his blood, not of the Jew only, but also of the Greek, yea, of all them that were scattered abroad; then, lo, it pleased the Lord to stir up the spirit of a Greek prince, (Greek for descent and language) even of Ptolemy Philadelph king of Egypt, to procure the translating of the book of God out of Hebrew into Greek. This is the translation of the Seventy interpreters, commonly so called, which prepared the way for our Saviour among the Gentiles by written preaching, as St. John Baptist did among the Jews by vocal. For the Grecians, being desirous of learning, were not wont to suffer books of worth to lie moulding in kings' libraries, but had many of their servants, ready scribes, to copy them out, and so they were dispersed and made common. Again, the Greek tongue was well known and made familiar to most inhabitants in Asia by reason of the conquests that there the Grecians had made, as also by the colonies which thither they had sent. For the same causes also it was well understood in many places of Europe, yea, and of Africk too. Therefore the word of God, being set forth in Greek, becometh hereby like a candle set upon a candlestick, which giveth light to all that are in the house; or like a proclamation sounded forth in the market-place, which most men presently take knowledge of; and therefore that language was fittest to contain the Scriptures, both for the first preachers of the gospel to appeal unto for witness, and for the learners also of those times to make search and trial by. It is certain, that that translation was not so sound and so perfect, but that it needed in many places correction; and who had been so sufficient for this work as the Apostles or apostolick men? Yet it seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to them to take that which they found, (the same being for the greatest part true and sufficient) rather than by making a new, in that new world and green age of the Church, to expose themselves to many exceptions and cavillations, as though they made a translation to serve their own turn; and therefore bearing witness to themselves, their witness not to be regarded. This may be supposed to be some cause, why the translation of the Seventy was allowed to pass for current. Notwithstanding, though it was commended generally, yet it did not fully content the learned, no not of the Jews. For not long after Christ, Aquila fell in hand with a new translation, and after him Theodotion, and after him Symmachus: yea, there was a fifth, and a sixth edition, the authors whereof were not known. These with the Seventy made up the Hexapla, and were worthily and to great purpose compiled together by Origen. Howbeit the edition of the Seventy went away with the credit, and therefore not only was placed in the midst by Origen, (for the worth and excellency thereof above the rest, as Epiphanius gathereth) but also was used by the Greek Fathers for the ground and foundation of their commentaries. Yea, Epiphanius above-named doth attribute so much unto it, that he holdeth the authors thereof not only for interpreters, but also for prophets in some respect; and Justinian the Emperor, injoining the Jews his subjects to use especially the translation of the Seventy, rendereth this reason thereof, Because they were, as it were, enlightened with propheticall grace. Yet for all that, as the Egyptians are said of the Prophet to be men and not God, and their horses flesh and not spirit: so it is evident (and St. Hierome affirmeth as much) that the Seventy were interpreters, they were not prophets. They did many things well, as learned men; but yet as men they stumbled and fell, one while through oversight, another while through ignorance; yea, sometimes they may be noted to add to the original, and sometimes to take from it; which made the Apostles to leave them many times, when they left the Hebrew, and to deliver the sense thereof according to the truth of the word, as the Spirit gave them utterance. This may suffice touching the Greek translations of the Old Testament.

The *St. Hierome* mentioned here is the Jerome who made the translation into Latin called the *Vulgate*.

I have quoted the KJV translators (though I take issue with them even in their very first line) both for general interest and because there is an interesting admission here: that the Apostles would not have followed the Seventy

interpreters or translators of the Hebrew TNK into Greek *when they left the Hebrew* - i.e. when the Seventy mistranslated the Hebrew - but would have delivered *the sense thereof according to the truth of the word*. Obviously it is more important to have infallibly inspired Apostles than an infallibly-inspired Greek translation of the TNK. One wonders then why the KJV translators did not expect the Apostles while writing the 'Greek New Testament' to have delivered the true and only Name of the Father in four Hebrew letters, considering that even the Seventy could not bring themselves to replace it with Greek "equivalents" in that LXX which allegedly those Apostles would have been quoting from and correcting whenever necessary *when they (the translators) left the Hebrew ... as the Spirit gave them (the Apostles) utterance*. If the KJV translators believed that the Apostles wrote their gospels and epistles in Greek - and it appears that they so believed - and furthermore believed that the Apostles corrected the Seventy by replacing the Tetragrammaton with a Greek no-name term everywhere the Seventy had been careful to retain it from the Hebrew TNK - and this is the only conclusion one can draw in the circumstances - then they must have believed that the entirety of the TNK was wrong in proclaiming the name of the Almighty to be what He said it was: *YHWH*. Wrong nearly 7000 times?!! Wrong - *in exactly the same way* - nearly 7000 times? Now **there's** an interesting conspiracy theory - a crowd of TNK writers scattered across the Middle East, over a period of well over a thousand years, diligently recording the oracles and commandments of their Mighty One, their personal interactions with Him, including the injunction not to bear false witness (and Moshe, according to the tradition that the apostles would have been familiar with, having received the Pentateuch given letter by letter to him from YHWH) - and agreeing, without any recorded documentation note you of this conspiracy, to misrepresent His identity in one single very consistent and set-apart way. (So who set it apart, under this hypothesis?) Furthermore, if the fundamental revelation of your religion is so numerous and consistently in error, how can you whether Jew or Christian possibly regard the TNK as inspired and a reliable base for belief and conduct? Far better to adopt the Marcionic hypothesis to the extreme, scrap the TNK, and - Marcionic optimism notwithstanding - watch the 'New Testament' sink without a trace too, as it utterly depends on the TNK.

We have then a situation where *motive, means and opportunity* for keeping the Tetragrammaton and its Owner out of the congregations meet in a single very competent and charismatic man with enormous influence across much of the Roman Empire. His strategy to achieve this censorship? *Invent the "New Testament"!* Will his congregations use politically-incorrect copies of Paul's letters with those four Hebrew letters pointing unmistakably back to the Creator? *Never!* Will he provide a sanitized, de-Hebrewed Apostolic Update for the believers to focus on so that the "Church" needn't continue to rely on even Hellenized versions of the LXX? *Most certainly!*

Am I saying the AC is not the inspired Word of YHWH? My thoughts on that are listed towards the end of this paper, the issue right here is the fact that a large percentage of Gentile Christian believers across a goodly swathe of the Roman Empire would, at least as early as 138CE, after perhaps twenty years or more of hard work by Marcion, have been most surprised and even affronted if the Tetragrammaton had happened to turn up in their "New Testament" whether or not the original authors of the epistles or the gospels had put it there, whether they wrote originally in Greek, Hebrew or Aramaic. No need really to look around for a conspiracy, Marcion was a very effective one-man conspiracy, if you can imagine such a thing, against the Tetragrammaton ever appearing in the AC. First-to-market with the "New Testament" concept, he ensured that its wide intended readership would have been most perturbed if ever "YHWH" was allowed on its pages. Marcion, says a possibly naïve commentator, "was a man who determined all by the canon (*sola scriptura*). He did not rely on secret visitations or mysterious documents in order to validate his teaching. He relied solely on the plain message of the Gospel and the Epistles of Paul." However, he drew up his canon, and he edited its contents, to suit his teaching: *YHWH bad, Kyrios good!*

Let's make this clear: before Marcion, **no one** significant was saying "We need something more for our Scriptures than the TNK" (for example this thought clearly wasn't in Paul's mind when he was writing to Timothy and telling him that in the Scriptures, which by definition were at that time only the TNK, he had **everything** he needed to make him wise for deliverance). **Marcion** was saying "We *can't* have the TNK for our Scriptures, they reveal the wrong G-d. So we need something new, and I know just what to provide." Initially even the believers in Rome rejected the notion, but somehow it clung and developed momentum. After a while of being faced with the concept, in reaction, **lots of people** were saying "We **do** need something **more** for our Scriptures than the TNK, although we can't really throw the TNK out, let's get together and study the situation and decide what to add to the TNK as, what did he call it, oh yes, the *New Testament*. Then the TNK can be the *Old Testament* and the extra stuff can be the *New Testament*." In short, in order to be free to escape from the Mighty One of the TNK and His requirements for obedience to His Laws, it was necessary to invent the "New Testament".

(In saying this, I am aware that the individual apostolic writings - an Epistle here, a Gospel there - as they became available were greatly valued by and carried great authority in the believing assemblies. But that was not the same thing as immediately defining a complete new corpus of revelation equal or superior to the TNK. Part of the problem was that there were so many epistles and gospels with so many authors viewed with various levels of esteem, that it took many decades for the dust to settle and consensus to develop to the point where it was reasonable to conceive of a new canon, let alone agree on its contents. Marcion saw a gap and tried to give it a shape and to fill it in such a way as to push the TNK right off the field.)

As early as 115CE Polycarp, a personal disciple of the Apostle John and bishop of Smyrna (one of the only two congregations to escape rebuke in the *Letters to the Seven Congregations*, Polycarp and his fellow-congregants must have been doing things right!) replied to Marcion, who met him on one occasion and said, "*Dost thou know me?*" *"I do*

know thee, *the firstborn of Satan*." And about 138CE, Justin Martyr wrote about Marcion's long and effective teaching career:

And there is Marcion, a man of Pontus, who is even this day alive, and teaching his disciples to believe in some other god greater than the Creator. And he, by the aid of devils, has caused men of every nation to speak blasphemies, and to deny that [Elohim] is the maker of this universe, and to assert that some other being, greater than He, has done greater works. All who take these opinions from these men are, as we before said, called Christian.

Time perhaps for a quote from Wikipedia under "Biblical_canon" (of course, should you happen to look it up, it has probably changed...):

[Marcion of Sinope](#): c. 150, was the first of record to propose a definitive, exclusive, unique canon of Christian scriptures. He rejected the teachings of the [Old Testament](#), which he claimed were incompatible with the teachings of [Jesus](#). The [Gospel of Luke](#), which Marcion called simply the "Gospel", he edited to remove any passages that connected Jesus with the Old Testament. This was because he believed that the god of the [Jews](#), [YHWH](#), who gave them the [Law of Moses](#), was an entirely different god than the Supreme God who sent Jesus and inspired the [New Testament](#). By editing he thought he was removing [judaizing](#) corruptions and recovering the original inspired words of Jesus. He also used ten [Letters of Paul](#) (excluding [Hebrews](#) and the [Pastoral Epistles](#)) assuming his Epistle to the Laodiceans refe[r]red to [canonical Ephesians](#) and not [apocryphal Epistle to the Laodiceans](#) or another text no longer extant. To these, which he called the Gospel and the Apostolicon, he added his Antithesis which contrasted the [New Testament](#) with the [Old Testament](#). Marcion's canon and theology were soundly rejected as [heretical](#); however, he forced other Christians to consider which texts were canonical and why. He spread his beliefs widely; they became known as [Marcionism](#). [Henry Wace](#) in his introduction of 1911 stated: "A modern divine ... could not refuse to discuss the question raised by Marcion, whether there is such opposition between different parts of what he regards as the word of God, that all cannot come from the same author." The [Catholic Encyclopedia](#) of 1913 stated: "they were perhaps the most dangerous foe Christianity has ever known."

Makes you think, particularly after reading this note from Tony Robinson on some Big Names in the development of New Testament Christianity:

"Later [Augustine](#), a Roman Catholic monk, championed Marcion's ideas about grace opposing God's Law and made it a major part of church theology. At the time of the Reformation, men such as John [Wyclif](#) with his first manuscript English Bible, and Miles [Coverdale](#) the English translator of the first printed English Bible, were heavily influenced by Augustine. In 1514 Coverdale was ordained a priest and later entered the Augustine Monastery at Cambridge. The notion of grace over Law was accelerated when the French Reformer John [Calvin](#) endorsed this position in his "Institutes of Christian Religion," which became the guide for the Reformed Churches of Protestantism.

In the New Testament what appears to be the substitution of grace for Law is nothing more than a difference in the way God's eternal principles of Law are manifested. In the Old Testament the principle of sacrifice was portrayed through animals, but in the New Testament Christ is ever fulfilling that dimension of the Law as the "Lamb of God." Each time a life is redeemed, the spirit of the Law with the principles of sacrifice and priesthood of the Messiah is even more evident today than before."

Is Marcionism true? That philosophical question is not relevant to this particular inquiry. What is relevant is the historical fact: because of his philosophy, Marcion, a highly talented, charismatic, influential man persuaded a large number of people that they *needed* a Hebraism-free "New Testament". Starting from that base, what hope could there be that the Tetragrammaton would ever be admitted to its pages? With an editor like that, who would ever know a century down the line whether Paul did or didn't use the Tetragrammaton in his original manuscripts, except perhaps for a small group of Nazarene believers clinging to the Hebrew TNK - and, no less than eighteen sources of the time tell us, a *Hebrew* version of Matthew's gospel at least - despised as Jews by the Christians and outcast as Christians by the Jews?

Unnoticed as fundamental to *the notion of grace over Law* is Marcion's Dualism: the "Bad Cop, Good Cop" scenario which required the invention of the New Testament so that there could be the antithesis of Old Testament and New Testament. The challenge to this is not Gnosticism, but Continuism - the assertion that there is and ever has been but one Mighty One, He is YHWH, and He is steadily and consistently and faithfully working out all things according to His purposes and in accordance with His own nature. *I am YHWH, I change not.*

The relentless spectre of Marcion has stalked the corridors of Christian history down the centuries. One would imagine

it is important to isolate his contribution to current evangelical belief and to eliminate its evil effects. None of them can be more evil than the erasure of the Name of the Mighty One Who planned for our salvation from before the foundation of the earth as an integral part of His purpose in creating all things through His Son, by putting forward as truly inspired scriptures mere politically-correct editorial revisions leached of their essence. None of them can be more crippling to the extension of the true Kingdom of Heaven in the hearts and minds of men than the notion that the Law - the Torah, the Teaching, the Word - is somehow reduced in importance by being associated with something derisively and derivatively termed "the Old Testament".

(Marcion's Dualism was followed 150 years later by that of Manes, founder of Manichaeism, himself responsible for theological offshoots with longlasting influence. But the two thinkers should not be confused. The Manichean heresy, like Gnosticism, was a mixture of elements of Christianity with the principles of the religion of Zoroaster.)

Option 2: The Mighty One of the TNK is the same as that of the AC, but He changed His mind about using His own Name and settled for something the Gentiles would understand (*some Christianity*)

Few Christians understand that "God" is not the Name of the Being they are supposed to be worshipping. Historically the word "God" when it is used legitimately is the name of a pagan, Indo-German deity, but it has been stretched out to have a generic meaning by which you can call *any* "mighty one" a "god", much as you could colloquially call any pool cleaner a Kreepy or any vacuum cleaner a Hoover, regardless of its real name. To have this double use for the same word, as a role-title (meaning *mighty one*) and as a proper name, is obviously ambiguous and can cover up all sorts of muddled thinking. The Muslims exploit this semantic confusion by declaring *There is no god but God, and Allah is his name*. At least they appear to acknowledge that a proper name should be used for the Supreme Being, even if *Allah* actually takes us no further since it merely means *the mighty one*. Reduced to its basics, the Muslim declaration is *There is no mighty one but [an Indo-German deity], and The Mighty One is his name*, a rather circular definition. Alternatively you may hear *There is no god but one, and Allah is his name*. I leave it to you to figure out whether this helps one break out of the circle.

But what about Christianity? What would the corresponding definitive declaration be? Something like *There is no god but God, and God is his name*, I guess. Decoded, this then means *There is no mighty one but [an Indo-German deity], and God is his name*. I understand how distressing this thought would be to a Christian, I was there too, for most of my life. You may snort and say "Nonsense, that's not what I'm saying!" but I have to say, "Yes, that *is* what you are saying. It may not be what you *want* to say, but it *is* what you *are* saying." To which I imagine you might respond with *But is there no way of making clearer what I mean?* And I am happy to reassure you, yes indeed there is, there's a totally unambiguous way to do it, and it's available to you in your Bible but probably hidden behind the words your translators chose to use. You may need to go first to the preface or introduction, and hear them tell you what they've done. Then go through the "Old Testament", from Genesis 2v4 to Malachi 4vs5, with a black pen and scratch out wherever it says "the LORD" or "LORD" and write above it "YHWH" (don't worry, it's not desecration or blasphemy, it's more like pulling down the altars built to honour false mighty ones). That'll take more than an idle hour or two, as you do it just ponder that there are nearly 7000 instances in most translations. You'll be making several changes per page for virtually every page of the "Old Testament", it's a task that takes some dedication, at say 5 changes per minute, about 2 minutes per page, you'll need to spend at least 20 hours on the job. Oh, and don't blame me if you get sidetracked and start reading the Scriptures and it takes a few years longer than planned. Good.

You're finished? Congratulations, that was the easy bit. You have now restored the proper Name of the Almighty to His book of self-revelation, not quite perfectly but a lot better than before.

Has it crossed your mind that that phrase you kept crossing out, "the LORD", was not a proper name but a role-title? Yes, the translators did the reverse switcheroo. They took away His personal proper Name and gave you an impersonal role-title instead which could apply equally well to a lot of people or deities in various cultures down the centuries, try for example *Krishna*.

But worse awaits, now you need to get rid of the corruption of that Indo-German deity's name and replace *that* with the correct information. And that's a lot more difficult. In giving you "God" all over the "Old Testament", the translators used that one word as the translation of not just one particular word, but of a whole group of related words, each with its own flavour and emphasis. These words all orbit around the core concept *Mighty One*, which is a role-title; they describe with different nuances *how* YHWH is the *Mighty One* of His people. The most frequent

probably is *Elohim*, a plural form which serves amongst other implications to remind us that we need no other mighty ones, no idols, no Indo-German deities, no Mafia Godfathers or St Christopher medals or insurance companies, welfare states and so forth.

Next step: please go back to Genesis 1:1 with your black pencil, and everywhere you see “God” scratch it out and put *Elohim* or *Mighty One* instead. Again you'll be working through the night, or several nights, before your task is completed on probably the very last page of your “Old Testament”. I apologize that I can't conveniently tell you the different specific places where you should use different variants, but you *can* buy any of a very small handful of English translations that show them to you correctly, for example *The Scriptures* from Institute for Scripture Research.

Now you're in a position to make yourself clear: what you want to say is, *There is no Mighty One but YHWH. YHWH is His Name!* You now have at your tongue-tip the essential distinctive that distinguishes the faith of the Hebrew Scriptures (and hopefully the Apostolic Commentary) from the Muslims, the Hindus, the Buddhists and all the rest. This of course is not welcome news to those who would like us all to merge into a one-world syncretistic religion. Nor was it welcome news to similar people nearly two thousand years ago. A lot of people did not want it published then, and many more would rather not have it publicised now.

Quick review of progress so far: most of the translators of the “Old Testament” throughout history then took away from us the true Name and the knowledge of the Name, and translated it with an impersonal, Tom-Dick-and-Harry role-title? Then they took a whole spectrum of role-titles and translated them all with just one personal name, the name of a pagan deity? Right? Right. Comprehensive, wasn't it? Clever sleight-of-hand too. Makes you wonder why they did it. Well, give some thought to the following.

I've already alluded to the lead given by the Jewish scribes translating the LXX, and the tradition eventually made to stick in Judaism that the Tetragrammaton should not be sounded except in the most limited of circumstances. How welcoming were the Jewish establishment towards the new Messianic stream in Judaism? Let me quote an assessment by a Jewish scholar for you to digest. Here's the background: as you may know, the Anglican Church has for very many years made use of *The Book of Common Prayer* to lay down prewritten prayers for use in its services. But this was no new notion at the time of its founding, in fact the Jews had had exactly the same sort of thing for nearly one and a half millenia before the Anglican Church was a gleam in the eye of Henry VIII. The Jewish one was and is called the *Siddur* and here is why it came into being and why you don't read about it in the Scriptures:

...we should be aware of why the rabbis fixed and standardized the prayers and put them in a Siddur (prayer book). Rabbi Jeffery Cohen, author of Blessed Are You: A Comprehensive Guide to Jewish Prayer, tells when and how and why the Jewish prayers were standardized. Rabban Gamaliel II of Yavneh (A.D. 80-110) was the rabbi primarily responsible for the standardization of Jewish prayers. According to Jeffery Cohen, there were three main reasons Gamaliel wanted to standardize the prayers:

- *"First, he realized that, with the Temple in ruins, a new spiritual impetus was required, one which the synagogue and daily worship could best provide. Second, his period witnessed an upsurge of Christian (sic) missionary activity, coinciding with the composition of the Gospels and their dissemination among Jewish communities*
- *"Gamaliel was constantly pestered by minim, members of the new faith who delighted in engaging him in disputation; and he was especially alarmed at the infiltration of new Christians (sic), indistinguishable at that time from their fellow Judean Jews, pressing their prayers and literature onto an unsuspecting Jewry. The simple, uneducated folk could not be expected to distinguish whether a religious text left in a synagogue was Orthodox or sectarian.*
- *Neither, given the flexibility and spontaneity allowed in the framing of prayers, could they know whether one called upon to act as reader was a secret adherent of the new faith and was uttering acceptable or unacceptable religious sentiment. Hence Gamaliel's decision to establish, once and for all, a fixed and authorized order of daily prayer*
- *"Gamaliel's third reason may have been his wish to stem the disturbing fashion of charismatic or ecstatic prayer that was becoming fashionable among those early Christians (sic) and was appealing even to some of his own colleagues and disciples. In the absence of a fixed and regulated liturgy, they were emboldened to give expression to their own, often wild, outpouring of exaggerated body language and meaningless phraseology, claiming that it was the Spirit that was working on them*
- *"In the light of this potentially dangerous trend--especially given the corresponding spread of mystical and ecstatic prayer in Christian (sic) circles--Gamaliel may have felt further impelled to introduce the discipline and rational spirit of an officially sanctioned and statutory order of service?"⁷*

The above information was not written by someone antagonistic toward Jewish tradition; it was written by a non-Messianic Jewish rabbi. Nor is the above information taken from some fringe publication. It is taken from a book published by Jason Aronson, Inc., a Jewish publisher described in the Foreword as a "famed publisher" that "publishes many books by current and former Y.U. [Yeshiva University] professors,"⁸ This information shows that the three reasons for standardizing Jewish prayers were as follows:

- 1. To provide a cohesive, fixed form of worship to preserve the unity which had formerly been preserved by Temple worship.*
- 2. To prevent Messianic Jews from uttering any prayers except those prayers which were pre-approved by the unbelieving rabbis.*
- 3. To quench the moving of the Holy Spirit which was being manifested through the Spirit-led prayers of Messianic Jews.*

Would a Jewish establishment that took that kind of swift action regarding prayers, have been likely to tolerate let alone insist on the renegade soon-to-be Christians using the Tetragrammaton, the Jews' own most closely-protected secret, in their writings, translations, teachings and prayers? (Sorry about all those "sic"s I added, applying "Christian" without qualification to those early believers is bound to mislead most readers of the above.)

(And in a swift aside, let me point out that the esteemed Rabban seems not much concerned about dissident apostles turning their backs on the Jews and synagogues and launching out with a new "Christian" gospel to the vast masses of Gentiles which he might have been quite happy to see going off with yet another heresy, as long as the synagogues and the daily worship could remain pure and focus Jewish minds on the Rabbinic faith. No, here **at the end of the Apostolic Century** he was really concerned to prevent the Messianic Nazarene believers, "**indistinguishable at that time from their fellow Judean Jews**", from subverting and persuading *an unsuspecting Jewry*. Also, please note, the Jewish author himself makes the point that the Jews were experiencing a problem with *dissemination among Jewish communities* of the brand new Gospels, please note the plural. Do I need to make the point that the *simple, uneducated folk*, the Jews of Judea, were hardly prime candidates for speaking Greek and using the Septuagint for their synagogue worship? Their language of choice (or of necessity) would have been either Hebrew or Aramaic, closely related to it. Another sliver of evidence pointing to a non-Greek provenance for the original Gospels.)

On the other side of the fence, it's interesting to take a peek into the Catholic Encyclopedia, which exists in order to reflect and explain the party line of the world's largest single Christian organization. (If you do not appreciate the changeableness of Wikipedia, you may prefer the stable consensus of reputable scholars.) See for yourself how sensitive they are to this issue:

Etymology of the Word "God"

(Anglo-Saxon *God*; German *Gott*; akin to Persian *khoda*; Hindu *khoda*).

God can variously be defined as:

- the proper name of the one Supreme and Infinite Personal Being, the Creator and Ruler of the universe, to whom man owes obedience and worship;
- the common or generic name of the several supposed beings to whom, in polytheistic religions, Divine attributes are ascribed and Divine worship rendered;
- the name sometimes applied to an idol as the image or dwelling-place of a god.

The root-meaning of the name (from Gothic root *gheu*; Sanskrit *hub* or *emu*, "to invoke or to sacrifice to") is either "the one invoked" or "the one sacrificed to." From different Indo-Germanic roots (*div*, "to shine" or "give light"; *thes* in *thessasthai* "to implore") come the Indo-Iranian *deva*, Sanskrit *dyaus* (gen. *divas*), Latin *deus*, Greek *theos*, Irish and Gaelic *dia*, all of which are generic names; also Greek *Zeus* (gen. *Dios*, Latin *Jupiter (jovpater)*, Old Teutonic *Tiu* or *Tiw* (surviving in *Tuesday*), Latin *Janus*, *Diana*, and other proper names of pagan deities. The common name most widely used in Semitic occurs as 'el in

Hebrew, 'ilu in Babylonian, 'ilah in Arabic, etc.; and though scholars are not agreed on the point, the root-meaning most probably is "the strong or mighty one."

Totally insensitive, wouldn't you say? Could any earnest yet naïve searcher after truth, relying on the authority of the above article and the mighty Church that looms behind it, ever come to understand that "God" is not "the proper name of the one Supreme and Infinite Personal Being, the Creator and Ruler of the universe, to whom man owes obedience and worship", but merely the application of a pagan name as a technically poor translation of a simple role-title: "the strong or mighty one"? Could that searcher imagine, based on this article, that there *is also a proper name* in the Semitic, one that is used in the Hebrew Scriptures far *more* widely than the *common* "name" 'el that the article *does* mention? Is this article revealing or concealing the proper Name of the Almighty? Is there the faintest hint in this scholarly article that in the TNK the Mighty One of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Joshua, David... declares Himself roundly, frequently and almost invariably to be named YHWH? That the basic concept of Judaism, recited weekly if not twice-daily in any observant home, is *Hear, o Yisra'el, I YHWH am your Mighty One?* - albeit that they too hide the truth strangely behind an alias, probably *Adonai*, or a circumlocution, *haShem*. And that it is exactly this Being, with this self-stated proper Name, that appears all over the pages of the TNK on which our Apostolic Commentary is inevitably based? The proper Name, I am saying, that is remarkable by its absence from those Greek manuscripts which are generally held to give us a true reflection of the original source documents of the AC?

One wonders what the scholars who contributed such an article to the Encyclopedia did with the uncomfortable awareness that they in their enlightened position could not possibly be without, namely that the *proper* name "most widely used in Semitic", i.e. in the Hebrew TNK, is unarguably *YHWH* (a point, by the way, on which most scholars are agreed), and it is used there much more often than the *common* "name" or role-descriptor 'el? Why would they want to exclude this highly relevant information from their impressive and persuasive article which includes any number of names of irrelevant beings from pagan religions?

If one must guess at a motive (and I have to guess, I can't *understand* why one would want to hide the precious truth of the Name that is above every other name) it seems likely that there might be a desire to underplay the differences and emphasize the similarities between Christianity and other religions, which would make it easier to get along with and draw in people of other faiths into the Catholic community - even if it means inventing the odd similarity and denying the odd essential distinctive. *We all believe in the same God, you know.* Yes, possibly you do - but is he the right one? Not if his name is not YHWH.

One might agree with the Catholic encyclopaedist that "*God can ... be defined as: the proper name of the one Supreme and Infinite Personal Being, the Creator and Ruler of the universe, to whom man owes obedience and worship*" - but only at the cost of ignoring the unmistakable fact that that same Being gave us His proper Name, and it is YHWH. Not "God" or anything else. Define "God" as His proper name, and you contradict almost every page of the TNK.

We have no need and no right to define any name as His personal name, He has revealed it to us as "YHWH" and that should be that.

Of course, it is the basic position of the Roman Catholic Church that the authority of the Church is as great as or greater than that of the Scriptures, and I guess that extends to "defining" whom they worship too. However, they should be aware that at some stage exercising one's freedom of choice has to bump up against reality, and surely the most fundamental possible point of collision is right here. But I think you can see how the absence of the Tetragrammaton from the AC manuscripts would save you an awful lot of embarrassment if you were leading an organization that would prefer Christians to submit to its own set of rules rather than to YHWH and His Torah. And I think you may by now be asking yourself whether there is perhaps a trace of the influence of Marcion at work here.

Perhaps I should introduce another disquieting quotation here:

"In 1865, under the patronage of Queen Victoria, all of the elite institutions of Britain, including the Anglican Church, the Grand Lodge of England, Oxford and Cambridge Universities, etc., gathered to fund a new institution, the Palestine Exploration Fund, dedicated to the 'rediscovery' of the Holy Land. The PEF's first Secretary Treasurer [was] freemason Walter Besant..."

"The PEF was founded for three purposes:

- 1) 'With the avowed intention of gradually introducing the Jews, pure and simple, who is [sic] eventually to occupy and govern this country...'*
- 2) To survey every inch of the territory on both sides of the Jordan, for British military-strategic purposes...*

3) To give the gnostic British gamemasters an open-ended tool to reinterpret the Bible, and thus to manipulate the minds of hundreds of millions of Christians and Jews. As Besant, a raving gnostic and brother-in-law of Theosophy cult leader Annie Besant, put it, 'The principal reason alleged for conducting this inquiry was the illustration of the Bible which might be expected to follow such an investigation.'... Said Besant, 'The work before the Committee of the Fund, as regards Jerusalem, was, therefore, briefly this: We proposed nothing less than the absolute identification of every sacred site.' Special attention should be given to the Temple Mount and the issue of the Temple of Solomon... Thus was founded the vast discipline of 'Biblical Archaeology.'

"Through the PEF, the British re-established the tradition of cultural/religious manipulation in the 19th century. Besant was the PEF's secretary from 1868 until 1886, the year when PEF head Sir Charles Warren and he became, respectively, the first Grand Master, and the first Treasurer, of the Quatuor [sic] Coronati lodge--which they established, in their own words, as an 'archaeology lodge,' the first ever in the history of freemasonry...

"The PEF/Quatuor [sic] Coronati cynical manipulation of religion continues both in the plot to rebuild Solomon's Temple *per se*, and in the broader cultural war against true Christianity, Judaism and Islam, of which that plot is a part. Take, for instance, the widely publicized Holy Blood, Holy Grail series, written by Michael Baigent, Richard Leigh, and Henry Lincoln, and trumpeted by the BBC, among others. The book claims that the British Royal Family and its associated oligarchy is the continuation of a bloodline begun by the marriage of Jesus Christ (who, according to this heresy, was never crucified) to Mary Magdalene, a 'secret bloodline' which allegedly continued throughout the Merovingian Dynasty in Europe and the crusading orders such as the Templars (who derived their name from the headquarters in Solomon's Stables underneath the Temple Mount) and the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem, around which are grouped other initiates, such as the freemasons. The 'inspiration' for such trash is hardly divine: The lead author, Michael Baigent, is a Corresponding Member of the Quatuor [sic] Coronati lodge, and Brother Baigent thanks, for his assistance, the Rev. Neville B. Cryer, one of Quatuor [sic] Coronati's most prominent members, and the longtime head of the immensely influential British and Foreign Bible Society." [EIR 58-9] [My emphases]

One asks unwillingly *How much influence and in what directions might a high-ranking Freemason exert on the activities of the B&FBS as its longtime head?*

Back to the hypothesis outlined in my subheading: I've made it rather clear, I hope, how it suited the purposes of various people for various reasons to bury the Name **YHWH** under some sort of generic alias. (If you want more examples, I have archived a lot more, but you might find it more convincing to do your own research, on the Internet or more conventionally.) The question then becomes, was replacing the Tetragrammaton in the AC man's idea, or that of YHWH Himself?

Let's consider what we (well, maybe not you, but certainly I) would expect if YHWH had decided to drop His TNK Name for the AC revelation in favour of some alias, maybe in order to make Himself more readily acceptable to the Gentiles?

1. For some reason, He would have decided that there was a facet of His being that He needed to present to the Gentiles that was more important than the fact of His being the One Who *is*. In other words, in order to be able to present this other facet effectively, He would run the risk of being assigned a secondary, derivative role rather than the primary, originating position that is His, far above all of creation, incomparably greater than any other mighty one you could imagine
2. He would have chosen an alias that would somehow present that more important facet of His nature effectively across a wide spectrum of peoples and cultures
3. He would have advised His people the Hebrews that He was going to present Himself differently to the Gentiles than He had to them over the many centuries.
4. He would have instructed His messengers to use that alias and emphasize that aspect of His character to those receiving the message.
5. He would somehow have identified His Son our Saviour with that alias in order to present a coherent message to the Gentiles.

I suppose we could think of some more, but we have enough to start with, I hope you'll agree that they are valid and relevant considerations, not mere straw men put up for the sake of being easily knocked down. (If some more do cross your mind, please share them with me and let's consider them together.) Let's see how well these few stand up under scrutiny. Let's start by looking at a familiar scene whose fuller implications have perhaps not been identified clearly enough: some Athenians are being addressed in the Areopagus by one of YHWH's messengers, not a rough

Galilean fisherman crude and direct of speech, but a cultured Roman citizen, a smooth and skilled debater who could hold his own in any philosophical wrestling match, a man sensitive to the undercurrents of Greek thought: the Pharisee named Sha'ul. (The Epicureans and Stoics derisively called him a *seed-picker* or *crow* initially, somebody pecking obsessively at a trivial topic that wouldn't interest real folks who had massive intellectual fields to harvest: what a surprise they had coming!)

If YHWH instructed His messengers to use an alias, surely Sha'ul was a very unfaithful and unreliable messenger? For look, here he is on the Areopagus, surrounded by sharp practitioners of what its advocates proclaim to be the most precise of all languages, the language with a word for everything and everybody (!), surely the right place for him to use the exact audience-familiar term as a relevant alias - and see what he does:

Act 17:22 And having stood in the midst of the Areopagus Sha'ul said, "Men of Athens, I see that you are very religious in every matter.

Act 17:23 "For passing through and observing the objects of your worship, I even found an altar with this inscription: TO THE UNKNOWN MIGHTY ONE. Not knowing then whom you worship, I make Him known to you:

Act 17:24 "יְהוָה, who made the world and all that is in it, this One being Master of heaven and earth, does not dwell in dwellings made with hands.

Act 17:25 "Nor is He served with men's hands - as if needing any - Himself giving to all life, and breath, and all else.

Act 17:26 "And He has made from one blood every nation of men to dwell on all the face of the earth, having ordained beforehand the times and the boundaries of their dwelling,

Act 17:27 to seek the Master, if at least they would reach out for Him and find Him, though He is not far from each one of us.

Act 17:28 "For in Him we live and move and are, as also some of your own poets have said, 'For we are also His offspring.'

Act 17:29 "Now then, since we are the offspring of Elohim, we should not think that the Elohim is like gold or silver or stone, an image made by the skill and thought of man.

Act 17:30 "Truly, then, having overlooked these times of ignorance, Elohim now commands all men everywhere to repent,

Act 17:31 because He has set a day on which He is going to judge the world in righteousness by a Man whom He has appointed, having given proof of this to all by raising Him from the dead."

What an opportunity for him to set their minds at rest, to say to them "It's OK guys, that *Unknown Mighty One* - you call him Theos - you're worried about overlooking, I know all about him and I can tell you he is actually your familiar Theos, and you know what, you can alternatively call him *Kurios* - those two are really one and the same." But he didn't, did he? Instead, he slapped them rather elegantly in the face with the logical gauntlet that they, with all their pantheistic bureaucracy of mighty ones for every conceivable requirement and situation, had somehow missed out on identifying the essential, primary, ultimate Being, Ground of all being, namely the single non-pareil Mighty One of the rustic and despised cultural backwater Israel whose Mighty One had so long ago declared *Hear o Yisra'el! I YHWH am your Mighty One and you shall have no other mighty ones before My face.*

(It has been well said by the Jewish philosopher Abraham Joshua Heschel, that *the Greeks learned to comprehend the universe while Jews learned to fear [G-d].* And which of the two is the beginning of wisdom?)

Lest you feel you are missing something here, lest you think that like Sha'ul I am a crow pecking busily away at a nothing seed on a busy freeway, about to be squashed by thundering theological juggernauts, let's change analogy here. You've just stubbed your mental toe against a little piece of linguistic rock sticking up a centimeter or so above your consciousness level, and you're about to rub it better and rush off on your next thought journey. Not so fast, please, we need to just dig down around that little rocky projection before you forget all about it, maybe dig that little rock up and examine it before tossing it aside. *Why* didn't, why couldn't Sha'ul possibly have used the word *theos* that the Greek manuscripts say he used? Because it isn't merely a little roughness projecting out of a smooth oration, no sir, do that bit of digging I recommended and you will find that *theos* is the tiny visible outcropping of a monster buried meteorite of sun-worship religion, and that that specific word *theos* is an exact alias, virtually just a different spelling for, *Zeus*, the top deity in the Greek pantheon..... (Comes across too in the Latin *Deus*. Just see above in the

quote from the Catholic Encyclopaedia.) For Sha'ul to say *Theos made the world and all that is in it*, would have been to identify YHWH with Zeus - for Sha'ul an utter impossibility, utter blasphemy. And the internal evidence of the Acts passage agrees that he *didn't* say this, for his listeners in Acts 17:32 knew very well that Zeus was not capable in reality of raising people from the dead, many of them dismissed this thought of resurrection as preposterous, nor did they think that Zeus had *made the world and all that is in it*, in their mythology the Titans had done that, the reason the Epicureans and Stoics hauled Sha'ul onto Mars' Hill was because they thought he was babbling about *daemonic beings*, so set were they in their conviction that there was no resurrection of real human beings from the dead; therefore the idea that Zeus would raise people from the dead for the purpose of judgement was not in keeping with their theology, therefore clearly Sha'ul was *not* talking to them about *Zeus-theos*.

And this distinction is strengthened by Sha'ul's next point, that the One he was introducing them to was *[the] One being Master of heaven and earth*. This was a direct challenge to the "Zeus"-possibility, because they recognized Zeus, but not this "Unknown G-d". They were clear in their own minds that the "Unknown G-d" was *not* Zeus. Sha'ul did nothing to suggest that He might be. So why would he use a tag that was more than halfway to the name of Zeus?

Now tell me: since the favoured Greek texts we have underlying our AC use the specific word *theos* at the start of verse 24, who is wrong? The people who produced those Greek texts, which have Sha'ul saying ego-soothing but paradigm-disrupting lies to the Athenians, or the translators of *The Scriptures* who must apparently have said something like *The only possible name for Sha'ul to have used here in this gauntlets-down confrontation is the Tetragrammaton, which would have pointed any Greek hearers familiar with the LXX right back into the TNK, declaring clearly that they must look into the Jewish history and faith for this Mighty One whom they did not know, and which conveyed exactly that quality of pre-existence, supremacy and creative, legislative and judicial authority which he emphasizes in the following verses?* I go right along with them, *Theos* doesn't cut it, *YHWH* does. Did Sha'ul miss the point? Did Luke record his speech inaccurately? Or did somebody a little further down the publishing line perhaps soften the blow?

(And at the same time, could you tell me why we have colleges and university faculties of **theology**? Why do so many people want to learn about Zeus, of all things?)

You can see, I imagine, that Marcion wouldn't have been too happy with Sha'ul cutting to the bone, did you notice that while he included Luke's Gospel - severely slashed - in his "New Testament" he didn't extend the same privilege to the same author's *Acts of the Apostles* even though much more of the latter is eye-witness stuff from Luke's own experience? Couldn't be that Marcion objected to the Greek author... If pressed for a reason, I might be inclined to suggest that *Acts* is just far too Hebrew for Marcion's purposes. Strip it of its Jewishness and there's precious little *Acts* left over to include in your canon. (Marcion might also have been put off if it was true what Dr Brad Young has surmised, that at least the first 15 chapters of *Acts* were written in Hebrew initially.) And it really doesn't seem as though the Mighty One being presented there is showing any different kind of face from that presented in the TNK. Paul here is not uplifting a softly-loving, forgiving father-figure called God or *Theos* or anything else but is very clearly presenting YHWH of the TNK, the creator and the sovereign and the judge of all. So why don't the AC translators in general agree with those of e.g. *The Scriptures* and make this plain? Perhaps they think it does not matter... How much longer can they continue in this attitude, considering Sha'ul's rebuke and warning to the Athenians: "***Truly, then, having overlooked these times of ignorance, Elohim now commands all men everywhere to repent, because He has set a day on which He is going to judge the world in righteousness by a Man whom He has appointed, having given proof of this to all by raising Him from the dead***"?

Well, let's return to our five expectations and examine them in more structured fashion, one-by-one:

1. For some reason, He would have decided that there was a facet of His being that He needed to present to the Gentiles, that was more important than the fact of His being the One Who *is*. In other words, in order to be able to present this other facet effectively, He would run the risk of being assigned a secondary, derivative role rather than the primary, originating position that is His, far above all of creation, incomparably greater than any other mighty one you could care to think about

Is there such a facet, found extensively across the pages of the AC? Nearly, but not quite. Undoubtedly there is a strong and consistent emphasis on the Fatherhood of YHWH, often parallel to the emphasis on the Sonship of haMashiach, but also, e.g. Eph 1, saying to the Gentiles "The Mighty One is prepared to be your Father too". But nowhere is this concept exposed at the risk of reducing His primary position, in fact this revelation is used to emphasize His primacy and to attribute all the more honour to Him, far from reducing Him to some sort of near-equivalence to the pagan pantheon. It is a facet of His nature which is well-established in the TNK, there is no disjunction or variance here. Even the Pharisees were strong on the concept of the Fatherhood of YHWH.

2. He would have chosen an alias that would somehow present that more important facet of His nature effectively across a wide spectrum of peoples and cultures

Again, we do find a characteristic AC phrase, "Elohim our Father" which is however anything but an alias. It does present that particular facet of His nature, but only in the same manner as TNK phrases such as "YHWH Tsidkenu" and

“YHWH Tsavaot” refer right back to the essential core of which this is a facet: *YHWH*. Alias it is not, emphatic of the same essence it is (by the Sh'ma there is a monotheistic equivalence between *YHWH* - the Name - and *Elohim* - the essential role-title).

3. He would have advised His people the Hebrews that He was going to present Himself differently to the Gentiles than He had to them (the Hebrews) over the many centuries.

Far from this, He took a facet of His nature that they had treasured, for example in many Psalms, as being for them (His Fatherhood) and warned them that He was going to extend exactly that same face to the Gentiles because the Jews had been disobedient, faithless and ungrateful children. It was no new way of presenting Himself, and thus needed no new alias, indeed the point would have been lost if His Name became submerged in the process.

May I allow a contemporary rabbi to emphasize the importance of this relationship in Jewish thinking, how far back in the TNK they trace it back to, and how it is indivisible from their understanding of His rule over them?

Our relationship with YHWH is characterized under two headings:

1. *On the one hand [YHWH] is described as our Father. Thus Moses declares in [YHWH]'s name, My firstborn son is Israel (Exodus 4:22), and declaims Is He not your Father... (Deut. 32:6).*
2. *On the other hand we refer to [YHWH] as the King in every blessing that we recite. According to our rabbis the very first commandment of the Ten Commandments; I am [YHWH] your [Mighty One] (Exodus 20:,2) obligates us to accept [YHWH] as our absolute monarch.*

At best, a superficial understanding of this two-faceted connection would allocate these two aspects of the Divine-human bond into separate areas. The aspect of King would be descriptive of [YHWH]'s interaction with the Jewish people as a whole, whereas the aspect of Father would be descriptive of the role of Divine Providence which gives every individual separate guidance and scrutiny.

I say at best, because it is possible to totally misinterpret the description of [YHWH] as the Father of Israel and to understand it in the spirit of the maxim that describes George Washington as the father of his country.

The fact that George Washington is the father of his country implies nothing whatever about his relationship with Americans, either viewed individually or as a collective, of whatever generation, including his own. It merely serves to identify him as America's founder, with the added implication that he was a founder who really took the establishment of a free and independent America to heart. He was not simply a victorious general, a popular war hero who served as his nation's first president, he was an idealist who really believed in the importance of establishing a nation founded on the principles enshrined in the U.S. Constitution. In the pantheon of Judaism this "George Washington" niche belongs to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, not to [YHWH].

[YHWH] is described as the Father of Israel in a genuine paternal sense. In His treatment of Israel [YHWH] fully carried out all the functions of a conscientious parent to the letter. He worried about Israel's upbringing during the Egyptian exile, He instructed and educated the Jewish nation personally through the meeting at Sinai, and He provided for its future by bringing it into the Promised Land. (Rabbi Noson Weisz: Do I Really Need This? Torah Portion: Bamidbar, www.aish.com, 2007)

In fairness to the rabbi, I must point out that he would likely be horrified by my replacing his chosen terms with the correct ones.

4. He would have instructed His messengers to use that alias and emphasize that aspect of His character to those receiving the message.

Again I ask, if this were the case why did Sha'ul pass up such a perfect opportunity on the Areopagus? He is dealing with exactly the fact of the Fatherhood of YHWH, it is critical to his argument, but he doesn't even bother to use the appellation so frequently found in the AC, "Elohim the Father". Rather, he uses the fact of that Fatherhood as background support for his primary point: His authority to judge the world in righteousness.

5. He would somehow have identified His Son our Saviour with that alias in order to present a coherent message to the Gentiles.

This is not exactly what happens. Certainly there are many places where the Fatherhood of the Mighty One and the Sonship of the Anointed are coupled in a coherent presentation, but the point is that they are not linked through both using some word in common that is an alias for the Tetragrammaton. In contrast, the very common formulation,

found in both Sha'ul and Kepha, is *Elohim our Father and the Master* יהוה *Messiah*. In John, James and Jude we are more likely to find just יהושע *Messiah*, but this is still far from incorporating any such alias. Instead, by incorporating the true Name of the Almighty One, it reinforces it as continuing to be essential.

It is concluded that there is overwhelming evidence in the AC against the proposition of our subtitle. In other words,

“Third, the teaching that the Law of [YHWH] was superseded by or in opposition to the grace of G-d did not originate with Paul, but developed as a result of the heretic Marcion’s interpretation of Paul’s writings.”

Option 3: The Mighty One of the TNK is the same as that of the AC, but using a particular name is no big deal, as long as you *mean* the right Being (*more Christianity, Judaism*)

Essentially this is *the Shakespearean solution*, the “rose by any other name would smell as sweet” approach to the problem, a comforting human-centric thought that’s very, very popular. The “any name will do” position is naturally a “there is no particular name” position, and well-honoured by time and illustrious proponents - please note the following two quotes from Justin Martyr, one of the more respectable Ante-Nicene “Fathers”:

For God cannot be called by any proper name, for names are given to mark out and distinguish their subject matters, because these are many and diverse; but neither did any one exist before God who could give Him a name, nor did He Himself think it right to name Himself, seeing that He is one and unique, as He Himself also by His own prophets testifies, when He says, “I God am the first,” and after this, “And beside me there is no other God.” On this account, then, as I before said, God did not, when He sent Moses to the Hebrews, mention any name, but by a participle He mystically teaches them that He is the one and only God. “For,” says He, “I am the Being;” manifestly contrasting Himself, “the Being,” with those who are not,...

- Justin's Hortatory Address To The Greeks, Chap. XX

But to the Father of all, who is unbegotten, there is no name given.

- The Second Apology of Justin for the Christians Addressed to the Roman Senate, Chap. VI

Sounds good but simply isn't true, and shows a lamentable lack of knowledge of the TNK which it clearly contradicts (e.g. the underlined clause, all those emphases are mine). But perhaps he had been misled by studying the more modern versions of the LXX in which the true Name had been hidden from unsuspecting uncircumcised eyes behind *Kurios* or *Theos* used generically. It also shows the recurring confusion visited inevitably upon those who insist on using a role-descriptor as a name, and a name as a role-descriptor. Justin contradicts himself, asserting exactly what he denies.

In many peoples' minds Will Shakespeare's words are on a par with those of the apostle Paul. But as we see above this theology far predates the quote from the worldly-wise Bard. Where did it originate? Probably with the one who would have us believe such things - the one who hates his Opponent to be recognised and attributed with all the esteem that is His due - the enemy of our beings. It was almost certainly transmitted through Greek sophistry, and it must come under the spotlight of Scripture.

Last first: *Is there indeed no name given to the Father of All? Nonsense, the Hebrew TNK is full of His Name YHWH, no other name appears in it anywhere near as often. What Justin should have said to the Roman Senate is, the reason people don't know the Father of all is because with great determination and skill and conspiracy His Name YHWH has been hidden from the ordinary man and the nations for many centuries by exactly those people who were commissioned to spread His fame abroad, namely in the first place the children of Israel. (However, before we point too many fingers at the "Jews", let's spare a few for the societies (including the Watch Tower Bible and Tract Societies) who in the 21st century CE commission and publish Name-obscuring translations of the Scriptures, and the theological professors who say *Well yes, we do know what the right Name is but you don't want to use it, it'll just confuse the people* and the preachers who preach two or three sermons every Sun's day in a false name, and the choirs and congregations who make the rafters resound most promisingly with *Oh, for a thousand tongues to sing the honours of Thy Name* and go on unwittingly to spoil it all by substituting pagan references for His Name a breath or two later.)*

Presumably Justin's point is that, in order to be given a name, you must have a father, since the father names the child. How then can the Father of all, Who is unbegotten, be given a name? Well, He gave Himself a Name, so that He might be known and identified by and distinguished from His creation, that's all there is to it.

First next: *Is it true that "God cannot be called by any proper name"?* This translation of Justin's words into English is highly misleading and ironical, but I won't complain too much about the translation because his original words almost certainly suffer unintentionally from exactly the same irony: "God" is in fact a proper name, as is "Theos" which probably is the exact word that Justin Martyr used in his original Greek. So, what he was saying is precisely this: *[Proper name] cannot be called by any proper name.* Either this is an inherently contradictory statement, that immediately falls apart from its own internal stress, or it is the improper application of a *proper name* to describe the *role* of a being, namely the Mighty One of the Hebrew Sh'ma. (The proper name used, in English "God" or in Greek "Theos", is in each case the proper name of a **pagan mighty one** whose name should therefore never in earnest cross the lips of a believer in YHWH obedient to His teaching. With great reluctance I use those names here, I do believe there are extenuating circumstances.) So we may move on to face the next assertion, a better phrasing of the present one, namely *the Mighty One cannot be called by any proper name.* Happily, Justin has already refuted himself, so I can't be accused of putting words into his mouth.

Second last: *nor did He Himself think it right to name Himself...* It is almost incredible that Justin can say this, resorting to the inaccurate excuse that He didn't mention any Name, just a participle by way of teaching, to Moses. How could Justin possibly have read Exodus 4 and maintained this conclusion? It is outright denial of the irrefutable fact that the Name appears from Genesis 2 onwards, and indeed Eve is specifically quoted in Genesis 4 as saying *I have gained a man from YHWH.* How could Justin have missed this?

Let me answer my own questions: Justin could have - if he had read not the original Hebrew, but rather some emasculated later versions of the Septuagint, in which he would have read in Exodus the equivalent of *so that they believe that the Lord God of their fathers...* and of *And Moses said to the Lord, "O the Lord..."*... and similar. Similar, in fact, to the King James' Version and almost all English translations since. (Why have I put in and struck out the word *the* in the quote from Moses? To point out an inconsistency: if you're going to translate YHWH by *the Lord* before the quotation marks, why not translate it *the Lord* just after the quotation marks? It is after all exactly the same word in the original, YHWH not *ha* YHWH, a combination which would be most improper. Simple, being consistent would make it obvious that a proper name - without a *the* - was required in **both** places, and that a role-title - with a *the* - was being used improperly in both places.)

No, Justin, He Himself did indeed think it right to name Himself, and to make it quite unmistakable that He **had** named Himself, and had revealed His Name to those who want to worship Him in truth, and wanted them to know and use His Name. Either you knew this if you studied the *Hebrew TNK*, or else you were misled by later versions of the Septuagint. Whichever, you unlike Sha'ul succeeded in relieving the conscience of the Greeks concerning their failure to know YHWH. It was a great opportunity that you missed.

So we have seen the error of Justin who said it all when he asserted that there is not, indeed cannot, be one specific proper name by which the Almighty should be called. And his assertion fails under the weight of the evidence, so it follows that there is just one specific proper name by which the Almighty should be called. It is that Name which He gave among men for us to know Him by, and it is - **YHWH.**

This is not to deny that there are other words and phrases with which we may and should refer to Him. But they are *relationship-words, role-titles*, words like "Father" and, more intimately, "Abba", and of course "Mighty One" as a constant reminder of where we should be turning for help - is He our last resort, or our first? And there are poetic contractions and emphatic adumbrations of His Name applicable to specific contexts. But His *Name* is uniquely, wonderfully, inherently and without reference to anybody or anything else, **YHWH.**

Option 4: The Mighty One of the TNK changed His mind about having people use His Self-chosen Name and left them to their own devices (*Judaism*)

For this insight I am indebted to Dr Ernest Martin, mentioned in an earlier Comment and writing in www.askelm.com/doctrine/d910501.htm - but I doubt that he would agree with all I am about to say. He asserts that YHWH revoked the privilege of using His Name in **Jer 44:26** *“Therefore hear the word of יהוה, all Yehudah who are dwelling in the land of Mitsrayim, ‘See, I have sworn by My great Name,’ declares יהוה, ‘My Name shall no longer be called upon by the mouth of any man of Yehudah in all the land of Mitsrayim, saying, ‘As the Master יהוה lives...’”* This revocation is regarded by devout Jews as global and in force until the coming of haMashiach to restore the Kingdom, in spite of its specific limitation to *all Yehudah who are dwelling in the land of Mitsrayim*. (This is only a mild example of how rabbinic authority often rides roughshod over the precise statements of the Torah.) It came to be thought that “Mitsrayim” (Egypt) symbolically extended out over the face of the earth, leaving only the Temple in Jerusalem (and, I suppose eventually, only the Holy of Holies in the Temple) to stand in contrast to Mitsrayim, and finally only that brief time when the High Priest entered the Holy of Holies on Yom Kippur to make atonement for the people with YHWH.

Consequently, on this premise it would have been utterly improper for any NT author or character to employ the Tetragrammaton, especially after the destruction of the Temple (by which time much of the AC had of course been written, so how relevant is this to our inquiry anyway?).

To quote Martin, *This prohibition was placed on them as a punishment for their refusal to obey what the prophet Jeremiah had commanded them to do.* Hmm. Dr Martin’s paper is most interesting, not least because it bears testimony to the fact that despite a lot of smoke and mirrors about any number of “names” and name-variants for their Mighty One the Jews do not in fact regard any other name as being THE name, but I think that in following orthodox Jewish understanding of this scenario he is failing to highlight a simple fact: the particular people in Jeremiah 44 had discarded all rights to assert YHWH as their Master, their Mighty One, and thus had denied the greatness of His Name. To believe that this is a blanket condition covering all Jews subsequently is surely unwarranted, even if it does perhaps characterise much of the behaviour of many Jews.

Let me say immediately that I have a deep sense of sympathy for Jews bound by that orthodox perspective, if only because it is so saddening to see such an implacable refusal, perhaps an incapacity, to engage in *t’shuvah*, repentance, to tear the heart rather than the clothes, to believe that there can be a new start, that *His favour is sufficient for you*. Because what is at issue here is the one fundamental issue of Judaism, of *emunah*, of salvation, of Kingdom citizenship, of following in the footsteps of Messiah: *Who, really and truly, is your Mighty One?* And that is what most of the book of YirmeYahu (Jeremiah) is about: Faith. Obedience. Submission.

Terribly short summary of the background: after 490 years of disobedience (= lack of faith) by the nation of Judah, they were being dragged off the land, primarily to Babylon, for 70 years to allow the land to catch up its 70 lost sabbath years when it should have been allowed to lie fallow (they had after all already been forgiven just as many times as Yahusha stipulated to Simon Peter). The point was clear: *You have to trust Me; like you had to collect a double helping of manna on the sixth day, you have to prepare yourself to allow the land to lie fallow in the seventh year* and, quite simply, they hadn’t. They hadn’t really believed that YHWH was their Mighty One and needed to be obeyed or would meet their needs if they obeyed, they’d brought in all sorts of other mighty ones for this and that purpose.

Jer 2:11-13 sums it up. They figured that by their technology they could escape the ridiculous requirements of the Mosaic law. Agricultural yields dropping? Drought threatening? OK, let’s be pragmatic, dig those water-storage cisterns... which unfortunately, after the manner of technological fixes, became cracked cisterns. Now judgement was knocking on the gates of Jerusalem, the spear-hafts and battering-rams of the Chaldeans. Pretty apt moment for the politicians to start consulting the religious sector and unify public opinion, right, what was that prophet’s name again? *YH shall rise?* Oops, oh well, he’s the only game in town, maybe his name means something good for us, call him in.

And repeatedly the young king and his nobles called Jeremiah in, and heard the instructions of YHWH, and rejected them in favour of counsel from cooler consultants. What really irked was the advice that they mustn’t fight their coming punishment, they should accept captivity by the Chaldeans and find their safety in submission to the judgement of YHWH. *Repent? Who, us? The Chosen People?* Faced with the choice between safe captivity in Babylon,

or death and destruction of their property and families in Jerusalem, the ruling elite stubbornly, disbelievingly, resisted and suffered the second option. But the occupying Babylonians proved to be comparatively gentle and compassionate, at least to the down-and-outs and no-hopers in the city - including Jeremiah in his prison cell - betrayed by the Jewish leaders, and gave them protected privileges under Gedalyahu (*YH has become great*, isn't that apt?), appointed as governor of the newly-subjugated Judean province. The prophetic meaning of the king's name (Zedekiah = *righteousness of YH*) was played out in ironic fulfilment, surely not in the sense he, full of his own righteousness, would have hoped:

Jer 39:6 And the sovereign of Babel slew the sons of Tsidqiyahu before his eyes in Riblah. The sovereign of Babel also slew all the nobles of Yehudah.

Jer 39:7 And he put out the eyes of Tsidqiyahu, (a dreadful irony, a parable of performance art? there are none so blind as those that will not see?) and bound him with bronze shackles to bring him to Babel.

Jer 39:8 And the Chaldeans burned the house of the sovereign and the houses of the people with fire, and they broke down the walls of Yerushalayim.

Jer 39:9 And Nebuzaradan, chief of the guard, exiled to Babel the remnant of the people who remained in the city and those who defected to him, with the rest of the people who were left.

Jer 39:10 But Nebuzaradan, chief of the guard, left in the land of Yehudah the poor people, who had naught whatever, and gave them vineyards and fields on the same day.

Jer 39:11 And Nebukadrettsar the sovereign of Babel gave an order concerning Yirmeyahu to Nebuzaradan, chief of the guard, saying,

Jer 39:12 "Take him and look after him, and do no harm whatsoever to him, but do to him even as he shall speak to you."

Jer 39:13 And Nebuzaradan, chief of the guard, and Nebushazban the Rabsaris, Nērgal-Shar'etser the Rabmag, and all the sovereign of Babel's chief officers sent,

Jer 39:14 and had Yirmeyahu taken from the court of the guard, and gave him to Gedalyahu son of Ahiquam, son of Shaphan, to take him home. And he dwelt among the people.

(Sorry, I have to add an aside: *YH has become great* was the son of *Brother of rising* who was the son of *Hiding in the Rock* (i.e. like a rock-rabbit) - now was *YH is rising* being protected by the right people or what?)

Interesting that Jeremiah received much more respect from the mighty and fierce Nebuchadnezzar than from his own puppet king in Jerusalem. *A prophet is not without honour except in his own country...* As 2 Chron 36 tells us, the Babylonian ruler had already stamped his authority on Jerusalem, and had visited the city previously to remove Egypt's nominee king and put his own (Zedekiah) in place. The fame of Judah's Mighty One was well spread through the surrounding nations, c.f. Pharaoh Necho of Egypt in 2 Chron 35 warning the otherwise almost irreproachable Josiah to stand back, get out of his way, and let him get on with *Elohim's* business:

20After all this, when Yoshiyahu had prepared the House, Neko sovereign of Mitsrayim came up to fight against Karkemish by the Euphrates. And Yoshiyahu went out against him. 21And he sent messengers to him, saying, "What have I to do with you, sovereign of Yehudah? I am not coming against you this day, but against the house with which I am fighting, for Elohim commanded me to make haste. Leave Elohim alone, who is with me, lest He destroy you."

Furthermore, our Babylonian monarch these few years later obliged his puppet to swear, not by the Babylonian deities, but by the Elohim of Israel. It seems that the pagan authorities had enough information to have much more respect for Yehudah's Mighty One than did Yehudah's top leadership, and this probably accounts for the special regard with which Jeremiah was handled.

Right, nearly there. Also into Gedaliah's care willingly come (Jer 40) Jews previously dispersed into neighbouring territories, significantly including Judah's military field commanders. One, Ishmael, is a traitorous assassin and kills Gedaliah in behest of the Ammonite king. The remaining military men realise that their futures are in danger because of their fellow-commander's treachery against Nebuchadnezzar's appointee, and turn to Jeremiah for advice from YHWH. Watch closely, please, these are men about to use up their (almost) very last chance:

Jer 42:5 And they said to Yirmeyahu, "Let יהוה be a true and steadfast witness between us, if we do not

do according to all the word which יהוה your Elohim sends us by you.

Jer 42:6 “Whether good or evil, let us obey the voice of יהוה our Elohim to whom we send you, in order that it might be well with us when we obey the voice of יהוה our Elohim.”

Are those words of clear intent or what? Total commitment, irrevocable obligation, coming from sincere hearts anxious to obey their Mighty One, if only He will tell them His instructions? Or are they words spoken with a forked tongue dripping sanctimonious honey? Read on...

Jer 42:7 And after ten days it came to be that the word of יהוה came to Yirmeyahu.

Jer 42:8 So he called Yohanan son of Qarēah, and all the commanders of the army which were with him, and all the people from the least even to the greatest,

Jer 42:9 and said to them, “Thus said יהוה, the Elohim of Yisra’ēl, to whom you sent me to present your petition before Him,

Jer 42:10 ‘If you would indeed stay in this land, then I shall build you and not pull you down, and I shall plant you and not pluck you up. For I have relented of the evil I have done to you.

Jer 42:11 ‘Do not be afraid of the sovereign of Babel, of whom you are afraid. Do not be afraid of him,’ declares יהוה, ‘for I am with you, to save you and deliver you from his hand.

Jer 42:12 ‘And I shall show you compassion, so that he has compassion on you and let[s] you return to your own land.’

Jer 42:13 “But if you say, ‘We are not staying in this land,’ and so disobey the voice of יהוה your Elohim,

Jer 42:14 saying, ‘No, but we are going to the land of Mitsrayim so that we see no fighting, nor hear the sound of the ram’s horn, nor hunger for bread, and there we shall stay,’

Jer 42:15 then hear the word of יהוה, O remnant of Yehudah! Thus said יהוה of hosts, the Elohim of Yisra’ēl, ‘If you indeed set your faces to enter Mitsrayim, and shall go to sojourn there,

Jer 42:16 then it shall be that the sword which you feared overtakes you there in the land of Mitsrayim, and the scarcity of food of which you were afraid clings to you there in Mitsrayim, and you die there.

Jer 42:17 ‘And so it shall be with all the men who set their faces to go to Mitsrayim to sojourn there: they shall die by the sword, by scarcity of food, and by pestilence, and not one of them shall survive or escape from the evil I am bringing upon them.’

Jer 42:18 “For thus said יהוה of hosts, the Elohim of Yisra’ēl, ‘As My displeasure and My wrath have been poured out on the inhabitants of Yerushalayim, so shall My wrath be poured out on you when you enter Mitsrayim. And you shall be an oath, and an astonishment, and a curse, and a reproach, and you shall see this place no more.’

Jer 42:19 “יהוה has spoken about you, O remnant of Yehudah, ‘Do not go to Mitsrayim!’ Know for certain that I have warned you this day.

Jer 42:20 “For you deceived yourselves when you sent me to יהוה your Elohim, saying, ‘Pray for us to יהוה our Elohim, and according to all that יהוה your Elohim says, so declare to us and we shall do it.’

Jer 42:21 “So I have declared it to you today, but you have not obeyed the voice of יהוה your Elohim in all which He has sent me to you.

Jer 42:22 “And now, know for certain that you shall die by the sword, by scarcity of food, and by pestilence in the place where you have desired to go to sojourn.”

That particular group of Yehudim had gone one step too far, they had knowingly and contractually, with perfectly clear understanding of the issues involved, discarded all rights to continue calling YHWH **their** Mighty One, to continue to swear by His Name. They had shown themselves to put no trust in Him and to repudiate their obligation to be obedient to Him; while pretending to ask for instructions, while pretending to have committed themselves to unconditional obedience, they were merely wanting a rubber-stamp approving their own choice. In YLT, Jeremiah assesses them: *ye have shewed yourselves perverse in your souls*. Well, that's it. No more chances. (Except if you repent and escape from Mitsrayim.) So what did these Yehudim say? Please don't fragment and atomise Jer 44, please read and understand their response and YHWH's reaction before you formulate your context for the application of YHWH's denial of privilege.

And please note that Yirmeyahu points out that the only people they were kidding was themselves, *he* wasn't fooled, nor was YHWH. They would have been better off just facing up to the fact that they had lost confidence, if ever they had it, in YHWH as their Elohim, than going through this charade to soothe their consciences.

Fascinating, impressive really, but we have to get back to our main thread. Does this ban in Jer 44:26 apply to other groups of Jews? To all Israelites? The rabbis say so, Dr Martin says so - who am I to query it? Only someone who reads the Scriptures with an eyebrow cocked, and sees that over in Babylon a few decades later, Ezekiel, Ezra, Nehemiah (even Cyrus, but then he wasn't a Jew, was he) are freely using the Tetragrammaton in the post-Nebuchadnezzar Exilic and Post-Exilic periods. Plainly they weren't troubled by such a consideration, the ban had not fallen on them. Clearly these Jews who chose Mitsrayim over YHWH were not representative of all Judah, let alone all Israel.

(You might argue that the Jews in Babylon might not have been aware of this incident related in Jeremiah's book. Well, Daniel himself refers by name to Jeremiah's writings [Dan 9:2], and they were the proximate cause of him praying for the disgrace of Jerusalem to be removed, so we must admit that they *were* known in Babylon by the Jews there during the Exile.)

I see that in vs 15 and 17 above, YHWH pronounced His judgement against those who *set their faces* to go down to Mitsrayim, in other words those who stubbornly, wilfully, consciously rejected the instruction, the advice, the wisdom (please read Proverbs), the *torah* of their Mighty One and thus declared him to really be not their Mighty One. (Did you notice that Jeremiah didn't receive the requested answer from YHWH for ten days - surely a cooling-off period during which the men could have seriously pondered whether to call off the request rather than belittle the Great Name by the perverse and superficial treatment they dealt it in the end?)

I see a conditional judgement against this group being stated over several verses from 42:16 to 42:22 (the condition itself is found in 42:15 and 17) and therefore I expect the provisions of vs18 to apply equally with those of 44:26; and I ask *If as a 21st century CE Jew you feel entitled to be back in Judea, Eretz Yisro'el, why do you not feel entitled to refer to your Mighty One by His Name again?* - now of course there are many Diaspora Jews who are strongly convinced that Jews should not return to Judea until haMashiach comes to set up His kingdom; and few if any of them are defying the ban on the Name; and I think that they are at least being consistent, even if in my insignificant opinion they are consistently mistaken.

I see in Jer 44:27 the same group of people being addressed as in Jer 44:26, and I ask myself how the two verses can justly be regarded as two different judgements, one pursuing the specific group to the grave, the other perpetual upon the entire nation of Judah, and extended out onto the 10 tribes of Israel too.

What about the ones envisaged in [Zeph 3:12](#) *“But I shall leave in your midst an oppressed and poor people, and they shall trust in the Name of יהוה”*? These surely are not those already rejoicing in the accomplished establishment of the liberating Messianic kingdom!

What about Zechariah, with his message from Jerusalem to the exiles in Darius' reign *after* Nebuchadnezzar had put Egypt in its place and in the process cleaned up that group of Judeans who had so hardened their hearts? He is specifically speaking into the current situation, although with flashes of prophecy into the distant future, and he is instructed in terms of [Zec 6:15](#) *“And those who are far away shall come and build the Hēkal of יהוה. And you shall know that יהוה of hosts has sent Me to you. And this shall be, if you diligently obey the voice of יהוה your Elohim.”* No hesitation there.

And then there is [Joel 2:26](#) *“Then you shall eat - eat and be satisfied - and shall praise the Name of יהוה your Elohim, who has done with you so wondrously. And My people shall never be put to shame.* This to come *before* what Peter, in Acts 2, identifies as occurring on that amazing Shavuot. And Peter expressly advises his hearers then, still quoting Joel, that *whosoever shall call on the Name of YHWH shall be saved*. It would appear that at least 3000 devout Jews were not unwilling to do this very thing that day, something one cannot imagine if they had in fact felt

an overriding prohibition against such an utterance.

We could look too into the book of Malachi, writing some time after the exile and reconsecration of the Temple, and learn that *then shall those who fear יהוה speak to one another, and יהוה listen and hear, and a book of remembrance be written before Him, of those who fear יהוה, and those who think upon His Name*. Is it conceivable that in this context the worshippers would *not* and should not be vocalizing His Name?

Speaking under correction, because I'm delving into a memory that doesn't always retrieve all it should, and I don't have a copy of the Apocrypha to refer to, I seem to recall glancing into a quote from 1 Maccabees and seeing that Mattathias Hasmon, the High Priest in Jerusalem at the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes who resisted the desecration of the Temple and the attempted philosophical enslavement of the people thus sparking off the successful Maccabean rebellion that brought down the Antiochian reign and dynasty and threw off the shackles of Greece, did so in the Name of the First Commandment. Maybe he knew something that his predecessors and successors have been reluctant to expose. This was about 200 years *after* the close of the usual canon for the TNK.

And of course, we have the witness of the Seventy translating the Septuagint from the Egyptian city of Alexandria: they clearly felt that the Jeremiad ban of a couple of hundred years earlier had lapsed, even if it had applied to their ancestors - they put the Tetragrammaton unhesitatingly into the LXX everywhere it appeared in the Hebrew TNK, and even put it there in Hebrew lettering.

I look with amazement at Dr Martin's remark (and I am sure he is merely reflecting the truth of the devout Jew's situation) that *of course, it was proper in private prayer and for fathers to teach their children at home to pronounce the Tetragrammaton properly*. (Note: this should be considered when anyone tries to suggest that the proper pronunciation of the Name has been lost!) But the prohibition was not against *public* use of the Name, it was against using it *at all* in regard to identifying Him as their Mighty One! To teach your children in private *YHWH is our Mighty One* and to refrain from the same assertion in public life would appear to be such dissimulation and hypocrisy as would but compound the original offence, the same *perverse*ness or vacillation of Jer 42:20 that had brought down the judgement on the group. Who would you be identifying with, the rebels or the King? The door was still open a tiny crack for the individual to repent; but that repentance would involve escaping from Mitsrayim, breaking most effectively, deliberately and clearly from the group stance in order to declare along with Yahusha son of Nun: **Jos 24:15** *“And if it seems evil in your eyes to serve יהוה, choose for yourselves this day whom you are going to serve, whether the mighty ones which your fathers served that were beyond the River (i.e. In Mitsrayim), or the mighty ones of the Amorites, in whose land you dwell. But I and my house, we serve יהוה.”*

Again, the judgement and thus the denial of privilege were to those who chose to disobey YHWH and to go for protection to Mitsrayim. Jeremiah went to Mitsrayim too - but in obedience to His Mighty One's instruction. I leave you to ponder whether he was silenced along with the rebels, or whether he witnessed by his speech and attitudes as to exactly who was his Mighty One, the One Whom he obeyed? (I put before you for your consideration also that Jeremiah was not, strictly speaking, a Judean - a Yehudite - but a Benjamite, or so it appears from the first verse of his book. Although Benjamin and Judah as tribes were generally grouped together to comprise the *nation* of Judah, there is a possible ambiguity to consider here: did the ban apply to *men of Binyamin* as well as *men of Yehudah*? By the way, the apostle Paul too was not a man of Judah, but a Benjamite.)

The Joshua challenge was obviously still valid in Jeremiah's day, and it is still valid today, for every individual and family. Does the devout Jew answer with Yahusha *I and my house, we serve יהוה* or does he say *I and my house, we serve haShem*? It is not my right or role to judge Another's servant, but I must say that from my perspective I see no objection to, indeed I see a need for, the devout Jew in repentance and faith to assert the former. And no less do I see a need for the Christian, coming from an environment in which many truths have been perverted, to get to grips with this assertion and to learn what it means and finally to make it his own lifestyle statement. Indeed, if the Christian accepts that Yahusha was a TNK foreshadow of the Messiah, and that he was speaking not only existentially but prophetically in our quote, then surely it is clear that the House of Yahusha the Messiah, the entire corpus of "New Testament" believers included, should be saying clearly and without prevarication or dissembling, *we serve יהוה*. Soon, as the One World Government / One World Religion forces clamp down, this is going to become the touchstone of truth, of faithfulness, of overcoming.

This does not square well with those, whether Christian or Jewish, who follow Option 3, the Shakespearean solution.

Speaking of Yahusha, you might also care to peruse Deuteronomy 1 as Moses reminds the Israelites of what had happened on their exodus from Egypt. Let The Scriptures pick up his narrative:

Deu 1:20 *“And I said to you, ‘You have come to the mountains of the Amorites, which יהוה our Elohim is giving us.*

Deu 1:21 ‘See, יהוה your Elohim has set the land before you. Go up and possess it, as יהוה Elohim of your fathers has spoken to you. Do not fear, nor be discouraged.’

Deu 1:22 “And all of you came near to me and said, ‘Let us send men before us, and let them search out the land for us, and bring back word to us of the way by which we should go up, and of the cities into which we would come.’

Again, while appearing to co-operate with the Master Elohim by doing a bit of due diligence, a SWOT analysis, get our resources organised optimally for this assignment, actually the Israelites have this hidden agenda: do we really want to be obedient, is this whole thing actually reasonable? And of course they found that it wasn't reasonable at all in spite of the minority report of the investigating committee, the threats and the(ir) own weaknesses far outweighed the opportunities and the(ir) own strengths. Far from wanting to obey, the people wanted excuses to do what seemed good to them. So they turned down the assignment, they refused the opportunity because they didn't really believe that YHWH was their Mighty One, determined to save and protect and bless them. Read it for yourself, and note how YHWH reacts:

Deu 1:35 ‘Not one of these men of this evil generation shall see that good land of which I swore to give to your fathers,

Deu 1:36 except Kalēb son of Yephunneh. He shall see it, and to him and his children I give the land on which he walked, because he followed יהוה completely.’

Deu 1:37 “And יהוה was enraged with me for your sakes, saying, ‘You do not go in there, either.

Deu 1:38 ‘Yehoshua the son of Nun, who stands before you, he shall go in there. Strengthen him, for he shall cause Yisra’el to inherit.

Please note specifically the next verse, because it makes it crystal clear that this punishment is only applicable to that specific generation of untrusting Hebrews.

Deu 1:39 ‘And your little ones and your children, who you say are for a prey, who today have no knowledge of good and evil, they are going in there. And to them I give it, and they are to possess it.

Think, perhaps, of a similar judgement in Acts 5: Ananias and Sapphira receiving their irreversible punishment because *they lied to the Ruach ha Kodesh*. In Peter's words, “Why have you agreed to try the Spirit of יהוה?” I see those Judeans in Jeremiah's time as doing exactly the same thing - pretending that they earnestly desired to be under the command of YHWH their Mighty One, to receive the guidance of the Spirit of יהוה, yet it was a lie. And let us note, that in Acts the judgement did not spread out among the entire believing community, it was limited to those specifically trying to get away with it. It would be well to note the consequence,

Act 5:11 And great fear came upon all the assembly and upon all who heard of this.

Act 5:12 And through the hands of the emissaries many signs and wonders were done among the people. And they were all with one mind in Shelomoh's Porch.

Act 5:13 But of the rest no one had the courage to join them, however, the people made much of them.

Act 5:14 And more believers were added to the Master, large numbers of both men and women,

Truly *the fear of YHWH is the beginning of wisdom*.

There are some threads that run right through the Scriptures, and *trusting YHWH as your Mighty One* is the essential behaviour, the simple overarching principle, that is required of mankind right from the perfect sinless state before the Fall through to the very last sentiment in Revelation referring to the perfect sinless state in eternity: *Rev 22:21* *The favour of our Master יהושע Messiah be with the set-apart ones. Amēn*. Indeed, the very rebellion of Satan and his angels is exactly a rejection of this same duty.

And there is a consistency of punishment for this recurring transgression, and it is limited to the specific generation of the transgressor. Otherwise how could any of us be pardoned, to enjoy the privileges and duties of citizenship of the Kingdom of heaven?

So to the question of whether the ban on using the set apart Name, the Tetragrammaton, was limited to the disobedient and perverse Yehudim who insisted on seeking refuge in Egypt in opposition to the advice, the *instructions* that they had requested, or whether it was of general applicability to Jews in times and places not specified in the ban, I say that the general ban viewpoint seems to me to be lacking in cogency and to fly in the face of any number of counter-examples and specific instances in the Scriptures. It is a far-fetched interpretation which is held together by a motivation which I do not have time to go into here, but have elucidated in another paper, a study on the book of Jonah, which I hope to complete soon.

Enough now of other people, you say. What about the example of our Perfect Example? Can we learn anything about this whole issue from His behaviour? This is of great significance for Messianic believer and Christian alike.

First let's look at His immediate forerunner, the Immerser crying out a challenge to repentance in Mat 3:3: *Prepare the way of YHWH, make His rutted paths well-levelled*. Does this mean anything other than that the traditional understandings of the way of YHWH at the time had wandered off-track and needed to be filled up, to give a smooth surface along which one can navigate according to the directions of Scripture rather than be diverted by the insidious repetitive incremental influences of oral tradition?

Consider please this parallel thinking (here in YLT, titles corrected):

Psa 50:22 Understand this, I pray you, Ye who are forgetting [the Mighty One], Lest I tear, and there is no deliverer.

Psa 50:23 He who is sacrificing praise honoureth Me, As to him who maketh a way, I cause him to look on the salvation of [the Mighty One(s)]!

Would this not have been good advice for those who chose Mitsrayim, who forgot their Mighty One and attributed their earlier comforts and successes to other causes, and who then were torn, and there was no deliverer? For people in such a situation there is a remedy, a starting-point of understanding for the walk of *emunah*, and it is this: to sacrifice praise, and to make a way. *Sacrificing praise* would by analogy with other sacrifices in the TNK mean giving up that which might primarily accrue to oneself as one's own asset, and hand it over to the Mighty One as due by right, exactly the opposite of reserving the credit for a good choice to one's own insight or political/business nous and acumen. Apply this please to our Egypt-seeking Judeans, who regarded their own political sense as more reliable than the instruction of the Omniscient.

Then, how about *making a way*? This is not an ad-hoc 'n boer maak 'n plan sense, devising an emergency fix with a piece of baling wire, but something carefully thought through, a consistent strategy, an intended behaviour pattern, plans for coping with expected situations, and committed to persistent action. The Hebrew word *derek* for way conveys the sense of a road (as trodden); figuratively a course of life or mode of action. How about *making*? Here the word *soom* is very rich, it has ingredients of to put, change, consider, determine, hold, ordain, purpose, regard, tread down. So YHWH through Asaph tells us, He tells today's devout Jew who is being torn without a deliverer as He told those Judean military men, drop your self-centered pride, esteem Me above yourself and all others, formulate a deliberate strategy to make that your course of life and stick with it.

Let your repentance be real, solid and deep. That's *emunah*. Are you, dear reader, stuck in Egypt in the view of the rabbis, don't you dare speak the set-apart Name? You can *sacrifice praise*, you can *make a way* and walk right out of that Egypt-trap. What will be your reward? He will cause you *to look on the salvation of the Mighty One(s)!* And that salvation includes a complete covering of your offenses against His Torah, including the First Word, through imputing the perfect righteousness of His Son to you.

You will know that you are free to use and rejoice in the most precious set-apart Name. Because *the salvation of YHWH* is exactly *Yahusha*, the Messiah, the Anointed One who died on an execution-stake outside Jerusalem nearly two millenia ago. He is the salvation of the Mighty One Who will cause you *to look on His salvation* if you *make a way*.

Allow me to say that that same Yahusha came in the first instance to offer the return of the Kingdom. There can be no doubt that His offers were sincere, but they were repeatedly repudiated and rejected by the Jewish leadership of the time. With great pride they refused to engage in *t'shuvah* and submit to the authority of the One who at the very weakest interpretation declared Himself to be the agent of the Almighty and whose claim was substantiated in every possible way, including by His resurrection. As the Galilean Kepha said to a multitude of Jews at Shavuot,

Act 2:36 "Therefore let all the house of Yisra'el know for certain that Elohim has made this יְהוֹשֻׁעַ, whom you [empaled], both Master and Messiah."

Act 2:37 And having heard this, they were pierced to the heart, and said to Kēpha and the rest of the emissaries, "Men, brothers, what shall we do?"

Act 2:38 And Kēpha said to them, “Repent, and let each one of you be immersed in the Name of יהושע Messiah for the forgiveness of sins. And you shall receive the gift of the Set-apart Spirit.

Act 2:39 “For the promise is to you and to your children, and to all who are far off, as many as יהוה our Elohim shall call.”

It was a speech that resulted in three thousand Jewish men, called by YHWH, drawn by the *Ruach haKodesh* out of the prevalent worldly mindset via repentance into a commitment to be *set-apart*, stepping over the Mitsrayim barrier; and shortly afterwards, perhaps just five or six hours afterwards, having healed a lame man in the Temple precincts, Kēpha addressed another crowd:

Act 3:19 “Repent therefore and turn back, for the blotting out of your sins, in order that times of refreshing might come from the presence of the Master,

Act 3:20 and that He sends יהושע Messiah, pre-appointed for you,

Act 3:21 whom heaven needs to receive until the times of restoration of all matters, of which Elohim spoke through the mouth of all His set-apart prophets since of old.

Act 3:22 “For Mosheh truly said to the fathers, ‘ יהוה your Elohim shall raise up for you a Prophet like me from your brothers. Him you shall hear according to all matters, whatever He says to you.

Act 3:23 ‘And it shall be that every being who does not hear that Prophet shall be utterly destroyed from among the people.’

Well, the people did hear *that Prophet*, through the agency of Kēpha, and another two thousand Jewish men stepped out of Mitsrayim, presumably taking their families with them. (It was a pattern, a landslide, an exodus, that continued until a hefty percentage of the population of Jerusalem had in defiance of their leaders called upon the Name of YHWH as encapsulated in the Name of the Messiah, Yahusha.) Did this meet with understanding and repentance at the leadership level? Not really, immediately after the above speech the leaders tossed the pesky rabble-rousers into jail overnight and summoned a full council hearing for the next day, cross-questioned them and concluded they could not press charges, but let them off with a warning:

Act 4:18 And they called them and commanded them not to speak at all nor to teach in the Name of יהושע

Act 4:19 But Kēpha and Yohanan answering them, said, “Whether it is right in the sight of Elohim to listen to you more than to Elohim, you judge.”

In this rejoinder, Peter and John are actually speaking directly to the issue of whether the ban on the Name is valid or not. It is a question of authority - who has the right to say whether they may use the Name or not? The council, or the Mighty One (*Elohim*)? They are saying “By whose authority do you prohibit us from speaking in this Name? Yours, or the authority of the Mighty One Whose Name is at stake? Just how mighty are you anyway?” May I point out that if the council had in fact been inwardly persuaded that they were imposing the ban, and their predecessors had been imposing the ban for centuries, *on the authority of Elohim*, why, here was the perfect moment to make it clear. But the council dared not, because they knew the continuation of the ban was unwarranted except by their own choice for their own ends.

Act 4:23 And having been released, they went to their own people and reported all that the chief priests and elders said to them.

Act 4:24 And having heard that, they lifted up their voice to Elohim with one mind and said, “יהוה, You are Elohim, who made the heaven and the earth and the sea, and all that is in them,

Act 4:25 who by the mouth of Your servant Dawid have said, ‘Why did the gentiles rage, and the people plot in vain?

Act 4:26 ‘The sovereigns of the earth stood up, and the rulers were gathered together against יהוה and against His Messiah.’

Act 4:27 “For truly, in this city there were gathered together against Your set-apart Servant יהושע, whom

You anointed, both Herodes and Pontius Pilate, with the gentiles and the people of Yisra'el

Act 4:28 to do whatever Your hand and Your purpose decided before to be done.

Eventually the popular movement in favour of *Yahusha haMashiach* was checked in Judaea by the obstinacy of the leadership, which was in turn punished by the Roman assault on Jerusalem and the tearing down of the Temple, to be followed after another 60 years or so by the ill-advised barKochba revolt, when the undiscerning Rabbi Akiva tore out from under himself the support of tens of thousands of trained soldiers, Nazarene believers, dooming the revolt to failure by declaring the guerilla leader Shimon barKochba to be *haMashiach*, attempting to displace Yahusha haNatz'ret from His Elohim-bestowed title. But long before this the number of Jewish Nazarene believers in Jerusalem alone had to be numbered in tens of thousands, amounting to perhaps a quarter or even a half of the standing population of the city. Many, many Jews looked on *the salvation of [the Mighty One]* - but the leaders were mainly reprobate.

(Josephus in his *Wars of the Jews* chapter 9 gives a careful accounting of the floating population of Jerusalem in 70CE, when it was "cleansed" by Titus and the Temple torn down: (420) *Now the number of those that were carried captive during this whole war was collected to be ninety-seven thousand, as was the number of those that perished during the whole siege eleven hundred thousand, (421) the greater part of whom were indeed of the same nation [with the citizens of Jerusalem], but not belonging to the city itself; for they were come up from all the country to the feast of unleavened bread, and were on a sudden shut up by an army, which, at the very first, occasioned so great a straitness among them that there came a pestilential destruction upon them, and soon afterward such a famine, as destroyed them more suddenly.* So it seems that the population during one of the Pilgrim Festivals was about 1,2 million, leading to a reasonable guess at the standing population of below 500 000 and indeed possibly around 200 000. This would also be reasonable in view of the statement of Hecateus, about 200BCE, quoted by Josephus in *Against Apion* Book 1, 22, that "*There are many strong places and villages [says he] in the country of Judea; but one strong city there is, about fifty furlongs in circumference, which is inhabited by a hundred and twenty thousand men, or thereabouts; they call it Jerusalem.*)

You have to follow this through Sha'ul's career as he met and taught and disputed with Israelites Hebraic and Hellenistic far and wide. Time and again the people heard and largely accepted the Messianic good news he brought, but the leading lights in the Jewish community rejected his message. Eventually, falsely charged by some such with treason against Caesar, he insisted on his right as a Roman citizen to be heard by Caesar and was escorted under guard to Rome, a journey that took quite a long time. On his way he wrote a letter to prepare the ground for his arrival, his *Epistle to the Romans*, in which he declares

Rom 1:18 ... the wrath of Elohim is revealed from heaven against all wickedness and unrighteousness of men, who suppress the truth in unrighteousness,

Rom 1:19 because that which is known of Elohim is manifest among them, for Elohim has manifested it to them.

Rom 1:20 For since the creation of the world His invisible qualities have been clearly seen, being understood from what has been made, both His everlasting power and Mightiness, for them to be without excuse,

Rom 1:21 because, although they knew Elohim, they did not esteem Him as Elohim, nor gave thanks, but became vain in their reasonings, and their undiscerning heart was darkened. (My emphasis)

The same theme, I do believe, as in Jeremiah circa chapter 40. What happens when he gets to Rome? You have to read in the last chapter of Acts:

Act 28:17 And it came to be after three days that Sha'ul called the leaders of the Yehudim together...

Act 28:23 And having appointed him a day, many came to him where he was staying, to whom he was explaining, earnestly witnessing about the reign of Elohim, and persuading them concerning יהושע from both the Torah of Mosheh and the Prophets, from morning until evening.

Act 28:24 And some indeed were persuaded by what was said, but some believed not.

Act 28:25 And disagreeing with one another, they began to leave, after Sha'ul had spoken one word, "The Set-apart Spirit rightly spoke through Yeshayahu the prophet to our fathers,

Act 28:26 saying, 'Go to this people and say, "Hearing you shall hear but by no means understand, and seeing

you shall see but by no means perceive,

Act 28:27 for the heart of this people has become thickened, and with their ears they heard heavily, and they have closed their eyes, **lest they should see with their eyes and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and turn back, and I should heal them.**” ’

Act 28:28 “Therefore let it be known to you that the deliverance of Elohim has been sent to the gentiles, and they shall hear!”

Act 28:29 And when he had said these words, the Yehudim went away and had a great dispute among themselves.

Act 28:30 And Sha’ul stayed two entire years in his own rented house, and was receiving all who came to him,

Act 28:31 proclaiming the reign of Elohim and teaching about the Master יהושע Messiah with all boldness, unhindered.

It could appear that the Jewish leadership in Rome had eventually and finally severed the primary claim of Judah to the reign and deliverance of Elohim because it was being modulated through His Chosen One, *the Master יהושע Messiah*. Again, as with Jeremiah’s Judeans, a refusal to let YHWH be their Mighty One, to have Him decide - without inviting *their* opinions - what should take place and how ... *although they knew Elohim, they did not esteem Him as Elohim, nor gave thanks, but became vain in their reasonings, and their undiscerning heart was darkened.*

But again please note the last two verses, for another two years Sha’ul continued showing *the deliverance of YHWH to all who came to him*, not turning away Jews merely because their leaders had turned away YHWH’s Messiah.

And note also please the careful translation by Dr Young, who puts *Act 28:28* as saying ‘*Be it known, therefore, to you, that to the nations was sent the salvation of [Elohim], these also will hear it;*’ removing the sense of a consequential connection between the rejection by the Jews and the mission to the Gentiles. Instead there is a reminder of a long-standing historical imperative for the Gentiles to be instructed (*learn Torah*) in the ways of YHWH; now - it is an issue of comparison - the Gentiles will be receptive ahead of the Jews to the message in a manner never before known. On the other side, the increase in the attention and study given by the Jews to the non-TNK writings and the Oral Torah, including rabbinic authority, men’s opinions exalted at the expense of the written Torah, has led to a darkening of the undiscerning Jewish heart towards *the deliverance of Elohim*.

I believe that the greatest threat to rabbinic Judaism is paradoxically enough the TNK. Let us not forget that Sha’ul was *explaining, earnestly witnessing about the reign of Elohim, and persuading them concerning יהושע from both the Torah of Mosheh and the Prophets, from morning until evening.* (Sha’ul perfectly exemplified his Master’s comment, *Mat 13:52* *And He said to them, “Therefore every scholar of Scripture taught in the reign of the heavens is like a householder who brings out of his treasure matters, renewed, and old”* where treasure refers specifically to the TNK.) Even today the rabbis will steer you away from parts of the TNK, lest you see your Messiah identified there. Has anything changed since some Yerushalayimites pondered (*Joh 7:26*) “*And see! He speaks boldly, and they say none at all to Him. Could it be that the rulers truly know that this is truly the Messiah?*”

So this is not the death-knell of grace and favour from Elohim towards His chosen people of Israel.

But back to our quest. Do we find our Example using the Tetragrammaton, or don’t we? If not, why not?

In the Gospels there are relatively few instances of Yahusha likely using the Name YHWH of Himself to refer to His Heavenly Father. Most of the time He referred via the relationship-title “My Father” and He used it in such an intimate way as to incense His more critical hearers. This too hints at the likely use of Hebrew or Aramaic in the original, because of the term *Abba* which corresponds to the intimate endearment *Dad* or *Daddy* in English. (As an example of this please consider *Mar 14:36* *And He said, “Abba, Father, all is possible for You. Make this cup pass from Me. Yet not what I desire, but what You desire.”* whereas Matthew merely records the phrase “my Father”. Since this same phrase is frequently used elsewhere in Matthew, it may well be covering for other uses of “Abba”, lost to the Greek with its arid choice between the hierarchical *kurios* and the biological *pater*. (Luke simply uses “Father”, John does not record this prayer-in-the-garden. BTW, when you think about it, it is difficult to conceive of the parable of the Prodigal Son being uttered without a healthy sprinkling of “Abba”s, even though I’ve never heard it done that way). Although Yahusha often referred, c.f. The Disciples’ Prayer, to Elohim as the (heavenly) Father of His hearers - even of the Pharisees - there seems to have been some different slant in the way in which He referred to Him as *His* Father in Heaven, and perhaps it lies in this word “Abba” derived from the plain *Ab* or *Av* = *Father*.

This emphasis on the familiar relationship-title deserves more thorough study, and I intend to give it that if I am

spared for the purpose, in the meanwhile please consider John 5:17 *et seq*, and much of John 8, at the least. But in this study let me step through the historical record in the Gospels and concentrate more on those fewer occasions where it appears that the Messiah may well have used the Tetragrammaton despite what has filtered through the Greek manuscripts to us; although as always I may deviate slightly now and again from this narrow remit.

He announced the onset of His ministry with a reading from Isaiah in which the Father's Name figured prominently. Since He was reading from either the Hebrew or Septuagint scroll, He would have had the Name before His eyes, and I leave it to you to consider whether He read it out loud or did a Masoretic sidestep some 700-odd years *before* that became formalized. But before this public outing, He had - recorded in the same 4th chapter of Luke's Gospel - a confidential confrontation with a being whose name has remained remarkably and suspiciously consistent over many centuries and many languages and many translations and copies: *Shaitan*, the Deceiver, who is accorded supreme worship in many folk-religions - even though they acknowledge there is a Greater, Ultimate Being beyond and above this one, yet He is regarded as unattainable and unapproachable and so they settle for worshipping the one they *can* contact. What a choice to have to make!

In this confrontation Yahusha used quotations from the TNK in which the Tetragrammaton participated indivisibly. Can you seriously imagine Him parrying the fiery darts of the Deceiver with bloated generalities, helium party balloons, like *It has been written, You shall worship Kurios your theos and Him only shall you serve?* (Especially since it had not yet been so written at that time, as far as I know!) Can you imagine the theological thrashing that would have ensued in the miasma of multiple meanings of these terms? Where, pray tell, is the "only-ness" in "Kurios" and "theos"?

If you are to serve *only* a particular being, surely that Being must be uniquely identifiable, His Name must surely be "set apart", not shared with an indeterminate horde of other and incompatible possible objects of worship! How can there be any validity in the commands quoted by Yahusha from the TNK unless there is exactly such a Name set apart from all other names, by which we may know and identify and through which we may call on the One Who is set apart from all others? What *has been written* is and was just (making allowances for a small difference between English and Hebrew!) *You shall worship YHWH your Mighty One[s] and Him only shall you serve.* While I can imagine the sophisticated deceiver sliding his obsessive intimations into Yahusha's consciousness via the medium of swoopy Greek, I cannot possibly imagine the Son replying in any terms other than those His Father caused to be inscribed on Moses' stone tablets in spiky palaeo-Hebrew. No room here for dynamic equivalents, only for exactly what the Son had heard His Father stipulate, and had Himself in turn transmitted to Moshe for a perpetual record. No debate needed, no debate possible, just an abrupt snubbing of the devious tempter pinned down by the prongs of precise unchanging unchallengeable truth. No wonder he hates to hear that Name! It reminds him of the unbridgeable gap between his status as a created being, and the nature and exalted position of *I AM THAT WHICH I AM, I WILL BE THAT WHICH I WILL BE, I WILL DO WHAT I WILL DO, I WILL BRING ABOUT WHAT I WILL BRING ABOUT. YHWH!*

YHWH!

Stepping then through Yahusha's ministry roughly chronologically, and grouping together like passages from the various gospels, we may start with the Sermon on the Mount:

Mat 5:17 "Do not think that I came to destroy the Torah or the Prophets. I did not come to destroy but to complete.

Mat 5:18 "For truly, I say to you, till the heaven and the earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall by no means pass from the Torah till all be done.

Mat 5:19 "Whoever, then, breaks one of the least of these commands, and teaches men so, shall be called least in the reign of the heavens; but whoever does and teaches them, he shall be called great in the reign of the heavens.

Immediately we ask, where in *these commands* of the Torah does a *jot* appear most significantly? Now *jot* is English for the Greek *iota*, which in turn stands for the Hebrew letter *yod* or *yud*. And the great significance of *yud* is that it is **the first letter of the Tetragrammaton!** Wherever the Name of Israel's Mighty One appears in the Torah, Yahusha here declares that He has not come to destroy it. And most significantly, it appears in the First of the Ten Commands:

Exo 20:2 "I am יהוה your Elohim, who brought you out of the land of Mitsrayim, out of the house of slavery.

Exo 20:3 "You have no other mighty ones against My face.

This is the core thought, the rationale, of all righteous living: *YHWH is our Mighty One.* Break that down, destroy that, nullify that, and you are left in the final analysis with no absolute standards, only humanistic relativism, only

democratic opinion, mere sociological pragmatism, on which to base your ethics. Or - terrible thought - some “other revelation” from some other being...

Did Yahusha say anything different in Matthew 5 than what was inscribed on the stone tablets, in the Third Word? -

Exo 20:7 “You do not bring the Name of יהוה your Elohim to naught, for יהוה does not leave the one unpunished who brings His Name to naught.

Surely not! If the trivialising of the least of the commands brings such diminution of standing in the Kingdom, what will the fracturing of the Greatest Commandment of all, the summary of the First Table, bring? -

Deu 6:4 “Hear, O Yisra’el: יהוה our Elohim, יהוה is one!

Deu 6:5 “And you shall love יהוה your Elohim with all your heart, and with all your being, and with all your might.

Just which, pardon me asking, of those three *jots* would you think you might remove with impunity? Whom would you feel free to teach *It's OK to drop those jots, those yuds, those yud-hei-vav-heis, those YHWHs, and replace them with “the L-RD”s*? And, with a straight face, can you tell me that you really think that Yahusha, having said what He did in Matt 5:17-19 would, a few brief verses later, resort to a generic *kyrios* when quoting Moses again? -

Mat 5:33 “Again, you heard that it was said to those of old, ‘You shall not swear falsely, but shall perform your oaths to יהוה.’

Remember what we are busy with here: we are asking *Did our Perfect Example follow the Martin Dictum, the Jewish Self-ban, and refrain from vocalising the Tetragrammaton in His public speaking? Did He thus admit that He regarded Himself as being “in Mitsrayim” as the leaders had taught His fellow-Jews to regard themselves?* If so, He must have used some other name, the Greek generics *kyrios* and *theos* if we are to believe the Greek NT manuscripts, and contradicted Himself utterly a few verses later when He taught His disciples how to pray...

Mat 6:9 “This, then, is the way you should pray: ‘Our Father who is in the heavens, **let Your Name be set-apart,**

Set-apart means anything but *put-aside, to be replaced by some pirate part!* It means being treated as unique, precious and specific, to be applied for its intended use, and not able to be replaced by any substitute.

Mat 7:21 “Not everyone who says to Me, ‘Master, Master,’ shall enter into the reign of the heavens, but he who is doing the desire of My Father in the heavens.

Mat 7:22 “Many shall say to Me in that day, ‘Master, Master, have we not prophesied in Your Name, and cast out demons in Your Name, and done many mighty works in Your Name?’

Mat 7:23 “And then I shall declare to them, ‘I never knew you, depart from Me, you who work lawlessness!’

At the very least, this should serve as a cautionary note of the possibility of mistaken identity. It should be clear from this that those who *work lawlessness* are mistaken if they think that because of their *mighty works* they recognise and are recognised by the Master. What then is *lawlessness*? One could say much about this, but let's be concise: it surely includes rejection of the law and its applicability to one!

Mat 10:22 and ye shall be hated by all because of my name, but he who hath endured to the end, he shall be saved. (YLT)

I have used Young's translation here because it clarifies a simple point: the reason for Yahusha's disciples being hated is *because of His Name*, not for “His name's sake”, whatever that may be interpreted to mean, as found in many translations. The point is that it is *His Name* that causes the offended reaction, and I refer the reader to my earlier remark concerning how the Deceiver hates the Name - in which Yahusha has come, and in which His Father's own Name is embraced. Those who hate the Father's Name will likewise hate the Name of the Son.

This verse does not give much comfort to those who argue that *name = character* or *reputation* since few if any people seem to dislike let alone hate the character of Yahusha, or at least what they perceive that character to be; but negative reactions ranging well into the “hate” zone are regularly encountered by those who assert the true

Name of our Saviour, since it slashes away at so much of the trappings that Christianity has borrowed from its pagan associates, and rebukes all those who like Marcion have fashioned their own G-d to suit their own liking.

Mat 12:14 But the Pharisees went out and took counsel against Him, so as to destroy Him.

Mat 12:15 But יהושע, knowing it, withdrew from there. And large crowds followed Him, and He healed them all,

Mat 12:16 and warned them not to make Him known,

Mat 12:17 in order that what was spoken by Yeshayahu the prophet, might be filled, saying,

Mat 12:18 “See, My Servant whom I have chosen, My Beloved in whom My being did delight. I shall put My Spirit upon Him, and He shall declare right-ruling to the nations.

Mat 12:19 “He shall not strive nor cry out, nor shall anyone hear His voice in the streets.

Mat 12:20 “A crushed reed He shall not break, and smoking flax He shall not quench, till He brings forth right-ruling forever.

Mat 12:21 “And the nations shall trust in His Name.”

This passage perhaps gives us the insight that enables us to make good sense of the Jewish ban theory recounted by Dr Martin. With merely four words in vs14, an economical hint indeed, Matthew dredges the entirety of Psalm 2 up into the consciousness of his Hebrew readers, and then sets against it the not-so-obvious passage from Isaiah 42. Why? To assert that the dramatic confrontation, the power-play of Psalm 2, is not yet in the delivery phase. First there must be the time spoken of by Yeshayahu, the time announced to the synagogue of Nazareth in Luke 4, a time of not striving or crying out, a time when the the voice of the liberator does not yet ring out imperatively through attentive alleys and suppliant streets, a time of nurturing and cherishing the faithful but weak witnesses struggling to survive in the ghetto, to *endure to the end* as in the previous quote, *till He brings forth right-ruling forever*. That is when the derision and wrath of YHWH will be focussed on the rebellious power-structures, the confederacies, the multinational unions, the global economy based on blind technologies - that is when He instructs His Son,

Psa 2:8 ‘Ask of Me, and I make the gentiles Your inheritance, And the ends of the earth Your possession.

Psa 2:9 ‘Break them with a rod of iron, Dash them to pieces like a potter’s vessel.’ ”

But in the meantime Matthew had observed the Anointed One busy with a covert mission, the mission of establishing His credentials in their completeness so that He could be shown competent to become the perfect Passover Lamb, fulfilling the promissory notes of the centuries of animal sacrifices, covering His people from the judgement of a righteous and offended Mighty One for all their sins against His Torah. Before this was done, before the *Mashiach ben Yoseph* role is carried through to its climax, it would have been very premature to implement the imperative *Mashiach ben Dawid* mission. Without salvation secured by the Blood of the Lamb, without the charge-sheet against us nailed to His death-stake, how would any of us survive His coming to rule and to judge? How could Yehudah ever again bring near an offering in righteousness, pleasant to YHWH? Even with our atonement undertaken, *the day of His coming* is going to be searching, painful, very, very serious:

Mal 3:1 “See, I am sending My messenger, and he shall prepare the way before Me. Then suddenly the Master you are seeking comes to His Hēkal, even the Messenger of the covenant, in whom you delight. See, He is coming,” said יהוה of hosts.

Mal 3:2 “And who is able to bear the day of His coming, and who is able to stand when He appears? For He is like the fire of a refiner, and like the soap of a launderer.

Mal 3:3 “And He shall sit as a refiner and a cleanser of silver. And He shall cleanse the sons of Lēwi, and refine them as gold and silver, and they shall belong to יהוה, bringing near an offering in righteousness.

Mal 3:4 “Then shall the offering of Yehudah and Yerushalayim be pleasant to יהוה, as in the days of old, as in former years.

So you and I watch as YHWH's Messenger prepares the way before Yahusha, calling people to repentance. (Soon He

will come, suddenly, to the Hekal.) What is the strategy for now? Another covert mission, establishing His credentials in their completeness so that He can be shown competent to rule as King of kings. How so? By His careful nurturing of His kingdom, the kingdom of righteousness, in the hearts of a relatively small group of faithful ones who seek righteousness, Torah-obedience, whatever the cost, whatever the opposition, whatever the democratic numbers-game in the opinion polls, the political elections, the economic processes. For now it is the time of nurturing and cherishing the weak witnesses struggling to survive, to *endure to the end till He brings forth right-ruling forever*.

And what does this all have to do with His Name? Simple: If the highlighted characteristic of the Messianic Reign is that *the nations shall trust in His Name*, surely a highlight of the survival of the weak witnesses in the interim must be that they *trust in His Name*? His Name means *YHWH's salvation*, how can they survive if they do not trust in that?

Having said this, perhaps we can now start to understand: the time has not yet come for a very widespread and general knowledge and understanding and use of the true Names, and until that time comes His Name is for those who are truly His *talmidim*, His disciples, His taught-ones. Yes, there is a great rediscovery going on of the Names right now - not without controversy - which I believe is necessary in order for people generally to be without an excuse when the False Messiah comes in his own name, and people - as usual - prefer to believe a lie rather than the truth. This ramping-up is indicative of the shortness of the time that is left before YHWH's Messiah comes to put an end to global rebellion. In the meantime, consider if you will how often how many people casually and trivially cite the name or title of their mighty one - "O L-rd, is it really so late?" or "My G-d, what a day at the office!" This is the behaviour of people lacking in proper reverence for whichever one it is that they hold to be over them - let us be grateful that the same indiscriminating treatment is not widely applied to the Set-apart Name.

But is this not an argument for keeping the Tetragrammaton out of the AC? I think not. The Psalmist said *Thy word is truth* and for the AC *in the original* to misinform its readers about the deepest fundamental of its message would invalidate it as Elohim-breathed scripture in my view. What this argument does provide is a neat explanation of the observed facts: when the Gentile believers started taking over the faith and introducing their choice chunks of pagan disobedience into it, the point came when YHWH said as it were *OK, if that's what you want that's what you can have* and did indeed, as the statement of this Option suggests, leave them to their own devices, their own foolish beliefs, in regard to His Name as well as many other things. But He did not rescind His third commandment, the one that says *YHWH shall not hold him guiltless who makes His Name of no effect*.

Well, let's move on through the gospel records and see what happens when the King rides in to Jerusalem on the back of a young donkey:

Mat 21:9 And the crowds who went before and those who followed cried out, saying, "Hoshia-na to the Son of Dawid! Blessed is He who is coming in the Name of יהוה! Hoshia-na in the highest!"

Mar 11:9 And those going before and those following cried out, saying, "Hoshia-na! 'Blessed is He who is coming in the Name of יהוה!'"

Mar 11:10 Blessed is the coming reign of our father Dawid - in the Name of יהוה! Hoshia-na in the highest!"

Luk 19:37 And as He was coming near, already at the descent of the Mount of Olives, the entire crowd of the taught ones began to praise Elohim, rejoicing with a loud voice for all the miracles they had seen,

Luk 19:38 saying, " 'Blessed is the Sovereign who is coming in the Name of יהוה!' Peace in heaven and esteem in the highest!"

Luk 19:39 And some of the Pharisees from the crowd, said to Him, "Teacher, rebuke Your taught ones."

Joh 12:12 On the next day a great crowd who had come to the festival, when they heard that יהושע was coming to Yerushalayim,

Joh 12:13 took the branches of palm trees and went out to meet Him, and were crying out, "Hoshia-na! Blessed is He who is coming in the Name of יהוה, the Sovereign of Yisra'ël!"

Mat 21:15 But when the chief priests and scribes saw the wonders which He did, and the children crying out in the Set-apart Place and saying, “Hoshia-na to the Son of Dawid!” they were greatly displeased,

Mat 21:16 and said to Him, “Do You hear what these say?” And יהושע said to them, “Yea, have you never read, ‘Out of the mouth of babes and nurslings You have perfected praise?’”

Here we see that the welcoming crowds, asserting their acceptance of the true Passover Lamb, are not shy to use the Tetragrammaton, much to the annoyance of the religious leaders, who with sour faces demand that the upstart Messiah shut them down. But no, He rather rebukes the leaders, saying that this praise is perfect, perfectly appropriate. The children know something that the leaders are too rigid to contemplate, and in the age-old manner of children who do not know that they should not say something, they are cheerfully saying it out loud. *Of such is the kingdom of heaven...* If ever there were a moment for Yahusha to put a protective screen around the Tetragrammaton, this is it. But the time has arrived for His political confrontation with the leaders, and He wants them to be sure that they know Whom He claims to be before they decide whether they are going to accept or repudiate His claims. For this again, the Name is precisely at issue.

Now the Sadducees are having their turn to try to find a flaw in the people-chosen Passover Lamb, and they choose their favourite jousting-ground: *the resurrection, true or false?* Yahusha pierces their sophistry in its heart with a brief quote from the founding statement of the nation of Isra'el:

Luk 20:37 “But that the dead are raised, even Moseh showed at the bush when he called יהוה ‘the Elohim of Abraham, and the Elohim of Yitshaq, and the Elohim of Ya'aqob.’”

What does this evoke in the minds of His hearers, steeped in the Torah? Why, the double-punch of Exodus 3: 15 and 16, the repeated ‘יהוה Elohim of your fathers, the Elohim of Abraham, of Yitshaq, and of Ya'aqob’ . Since this is what He is quoting, since there is no departure from the Hebrew Tetragrammaton in either the Hebrew TNK or the Septuagint, surely His lips emitted the Name exactly, without error. So why, if Luke is a faithful chronicler of the occasion (and Luke scores very highly on any historian's marksheet for the accuracy of his records, he has been vindicated any number of times against his critics), can it be thought that he did not write down exactly the Tetragrammaton in his original? And if the particles of Greek manuscript that the translators rely on to patch together the earliest available texts of the AC show something else other than the Tetragrammaton, is that not just a very blatant signal that they are *not* the original texts?

The same argument holds just a few verses later, as Yahusha takes the offensive and presses the issue of His identity. With the inquisitors silenced and abashed, He throws the avowedly messianic Psalm 110 at them, quoting again the Tetragrammaton. Why then is it not in the early Greek texts and not in your “New Testament”?

Luk 20:42 “For Dawid himself said in the Book of Psalms, ‘יהוה said to my Master, “sit at My right hand,

Luk 20:43 until I make Your enemies a footstool of Your feet.” ’

Luk 20:44 “Dawid then calls Him ‘Master,’ how is He then his Son?”

We may ask the same about the following quotes from Psalm 118:22,23:

Mat 21:42 יהושע said to them, “Did you never read in the Scriptures, ‘The stone which the builders rejected has become the chief corner-stone. This was from יהוה, and it is marvellous in our eyes?’

Mat 21:43 “Because of this I say to you: the reign of Elohim shall be taken from you and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits of it.

Mar 12:10 “Have you not read this Scripture, ‘The stone which the builders rejected has become the chief corner-stone.

Mar 12:11 ‘This was from יהוה, and it is marvellous in our eyes?’”

Why is the Name not in the early Greek texts that we know of, and also not in your “New Testament”?

As if that is not enough, please take careful note of the following:

Mat 22:37 And יהושע said to him, “ ‘You shall love יהוה your Elohim with all your heart, and with all your being, and with all your mind.’

Mat 22:38 “This is the first and great command.

Mat 22:39 “And the second is like it, ‘You shall love your neighbour as yourself.’

Mat 22:40 “On these two commands hang all the Torah and the Prophets.”

Mar 12:29 And יהושע answered him, “The first of all the commands is, ‘Hear, O Yisra’el, יהוה our Elohim, יהוה is one.

Mar 12:30 ‘And you shall love יהוה your Elohim with all your heart, and with all your being, and with all your mind, and with all your strength.’ This is the first command.

Luk 10:26 And He said to him, “What has been written in the Torah? How do you read it?”

Luk 10:27 And he answering, said, “ ‘You shall love יהוה your Elohim with all your heart, and with all your being, and with all your strength, and with all your mind,’ and ‘your neighbour as yourself.’ ”

Luk 10:28 And He said to him, “You have answered rightly. Do this and you shall live.”

These quotations may possibly refer to three separate incidents and questioners, but it hardly matters, for Matthew says his enquirer was one of the Pharisees who was a lawyer, expert in the Mosaic law; Mark has a scribe, undoubtedly rather expert too in the same law because of his trade of drafting legal contracts in writing, and possibly too of making copies of the Torah scrolls for use in the synagogues - the scribes were actually called *Sopherim* or “counters”, because they would perform numeric checks on the words in the original document and in the copy, similar to the CRCs or Cyclic Redundancy Checks that are essential although mainly unnoticed in today’s massive volumes of computer communications, making sure that what is sent is what is received - and would undoubtedly have had a very close association with the Pharisees and might well have been used by them as an “expert witness”, ready to jump up and shout “Foul!” if Yahusha deviated in the slightest in His reply from what had been written so many centuries before, and so he would also have been an expert on the content if not the interpretation of the Mosaic law; finally Luke merely refers to a “lawyer” which would not be in any conceivable conflict with Matthew’s account.

Consider please the joy with which the Son, one in heart and mind with His dear Father, would pronounce His true Name to the scribe. Imagine, if you can, the same Son bearing a false witness of His Father by speaking out a pagan name or an embarrassed Hebrew subterfuge like *haShem*. Imagine, if you can, the same Son commending the lawyer for having *answered rightly*, if that learned person had read the Torah to be saying (and remember, he could only have read it in the Hebrew/Aramaic or an LXX version with the Tetragrammaton) one of these other abominations. The lawyer, and haMashiach in the other encounter, would only have pronounced the true Name; therefore, our current accounts of this incident, and all the intervening chain of documents, should reflect this fact and reveal the true Name.

Yet again we have witnesses of Yahusha quoting the ancient texts incorporating the Tetragrammaton, and must ask *Why do the early Greek texts not reflect the simple facts accurately?*

Mat 22:41 And when the Pharisees were gathered together, יהושע asked them,

Mat 22:42 saying, “What do you think concerning the Messiah? Whose Son is He?” They said to Him, “The Son of Dawid.”

Mat 22:43 He said to them, “Then how does Dawid in the Spirit call Him ‘Master,’ saying,

Mat 22:44 ‘יהוה said to my Master, “Sit at My right hand, until I make Your enemies a footstool of Your feet”’?

Mat 22:45 “If then Dawid calls Him ‘Master,’ how is He his Son?”

Mar 12:35 And יהושע responding, said, while teaching in the Set-apart Place, “How is it that the scribes say that the Messiah is the Son of Dawid?”

Mar 12:36 “Dawid himself said by the Set-apart Spirit, ‘יהוה said to my Master, “Sit at My right hand, until I make Your enemies a footstool of Your feet.” ’

Mar 12:37 “Dawid himself calls Him ‘Master.’ In what way then is He his Son?” And the large crowd heard Him gladly.

If Yahusha started off His public ministry with reading the Tetragrammaton from the scroll of the prophet Yeshayahu, should we be surprised that He punctuated it similarly, from Psalm 118, in precise prophecy of His triumphal entry into Jerusalem from the Mount of Olives?

Mat 23:39 for I say to you, from now on you shall by no means see Me, until you say, ‘Blessed is He who is coming in the Name of יהוה!’ ”

Luk 13:35 “See, your House is left to you laid waste. And truly I say to you, you shall by no means see Me until the time comes when you say, ‘Blessed is He who is coming in the Name of יהוה!’ ”

Again we have direct quoting from Tetragrammaton-true texts. Why are the Greek texts, and the English translations, not likewise true?

Luk 2:22 And when the days of her cleansing according to the Torah of Mosheh were completed, they brought Him to Yerushalayim to present Him to יהוה -

Luk 2:23 as it has been written in the Torah of יהוה, “Every male who opens the womb shall be called set-apart to יהוה” -

Luk 2:24 and to give an offering according to what is said in the Torah of יהוה, “A pair of turtledoves or two young pigeons.”

Yet again a direct quote, this time as an editorial footnote by the gospeller, from a text containing the true Name. Even if Luke, possibly targeting Greek readers, had lifted this from the LXX, it would still have had the four Hebrew letters there.

Joh 6:45 “It has been written in the prophets, ‘And they shall all be taught by יהוה.’ Everyone, then, who has heard from the Father, and learned, comes to Me.

The mind boggles at the thought that Yahusha would have blandly intimated that the prophets expected the people to be taught by a pagan mighty one, a *kurios* or *theos*.

Another instance of Messiah quoting the TNK and using the true name, yet being misreported in the early Greek and the current English and who knows how many other languages, follows:

Joh 12:37 But though He had done so many signs before them, they did not believe in Him,

Joh 12:38 that the word of Yeshayahu the prophet might be filled, which he spoke, “יהוה, who has believed

our report? And to whom has the arm of יהוה been revealed?"

In His high-priestly prayer, Yahusha refers three times to the Father's Name:

Joh 17:6 "I have revealed Your Name to the men whom You gave Me out of the world. They were Yours, and You gave them to Me, and they have guarded Your Word."

Joh 17:12 "When I was with them in the world, I was guarding them in Your Name which You have given Me, and I watched over them, and not one of them perished except the son of destruction, that the Scripture might be filled."

Joh 17:26 "And I have made Your Name known to them, and shall make it known, so that the love with which You loved Me might be in them, and I in them."

Far from being reticent about the Name, He seems to regard it as the primary focus and essential equipment of His ministry. To the men whom Father gave Him *out of the world* (and, please note, these were all pretty normal Jews) He *revealed [Father's] Name*. Didn't they know it then? No, of course they knew it, it had been drilled into them since their earliest years. But it would seem they didn't quite appreciate the importance and significance of it. Having been given this, they carefully *guarded Your Word*. How does one get from this assessment to the conclusion that Matthew and John, and possibly Peter recounting these things to the young writer Mark, would have shrugged off the true Name as freely interchangeable with any convenient generic, no matter how polluted with pagan content?

Somehow knowing and understanding and continuing to know the true Name seems to be an important component of harbouring the actual love with which the Father loved the Son. This is a profound rebuttal of those who suggest it really doesn't matter which name you use. And the preceding verse, John 17:25, is a severe reprimand to those who think that because, like the *talmidim*, they are born and bred Jewish, they have a right to control and hide the Name: "*O righteous Father, indeed the world did not know You, but I knew You, and these knew that You sent Me*". Even the Jewish disciples were part of the world system, until Father took them out and gave them to His Son, and His Son made Father's Name known to them.

It may be useful to point out here that *know* is but rarely used in the Scriptures in the bland sense of *having an entry in the the mental database for the object known*. More often, as here, it conveys an urgent sense of *recognising and being vividly aware of the intimate and essential character of the object known*. And how better in this context is this character conveyed and summarised than by using that particular Name which the Father has chosen to make Himself *known* by? YHWH, not *Th--s* or *K-r--s*! Give it a moment's thought, please: how did Yahusha *know* the Father - as *K-rios*, or as YHWH? What would *K-r--s* have conveyed to Him? How immeasurably much more wouldn't YHWH have conveyed to Him? And it should be so for us too!

Finally, in our journey through the Gospels in search of Yahusha's attitude towards using the Tetragrammaton, we come to a couple of incidents which are most thought-provoking:

Joh 8:58 יהושע said to them, "Truly, truly, I say to you, before Abraham came to be, I am."

In this instance, Yahusha provoked more than thought in His hearers, He provoked a most violent reaction of outrage, so much so that they picked up stones to cast at Him, to kill Him. This is interesting, because actually in evangelical terms this should have been His altar-call, His teaching had just made a tremendous impression on this group of Jews and it was now time to call for commitment to Him, right? Vs30-31 tells us *As He was speaking these words, many believed in Him. So יהושע said to those Yehudim who believed Him...* a number of things which really put their backs up. From *believing Him* a couple of minutes earlier, they were now so enraged that they were actually starting to apply summary judgement for blasphemy. What had He done to justify this specifically? Why, He had just uttered the Set-apart Name (in short form = *I am*) and applied it to Himself. Please note what He did *not* do: He did *not* say "I am *K-rios*" or "I am *haShem*". Specifically, what He said should be recorded in writing as *YH*. Nothing else can account for what the almost-converted Yehudim tried to do to Him. So that's what He said, and there was no way for a faithful gosseller to record this incident without resorting to the shortened version of the Tetragrammaton. Nor is or was there any way for a copyist or translator to do his task faithfully without doing likewise.

Ten chapters later the time for keeping His identity under wraps is past; a general rabble and the company of soldiers and court officials (this was probably a company of the Temple Guard, not Roman soldiers but Jews) sent to arrest

Him winds up the path to the garden where He has been in anguished prayer.

Joh 18:4 יהושע, then, knowing all that would come upon Him, went forward and said to them, "Whom do you seek?"

Joh 18:5 They answered Him, " יהושע of Natsareth." יהושע said to them, "I am." And Yehudah, who delivered Him up, was also standing with them.

Joh 18:6 When, therefore, He said to them, "I am," they drew back and fell to the ground.

Joh 18:7 Once more He asked them, "Whom do you seek?" And they said, " יהושע of Natsareth."

Joh 18:8 יהושע answered, "I said to you that I am. If, then, you seek Me, allow these to go,"

Please do not mistake what is going on here. It's not Yahusha is saying "What's it all these people want in the middle of the night?", that the police captain is asking "So who around here is יהושע of Nazareth, hey?" (Judas had already singled Him out with a kiss, remember) and Messiah is saying "Right, that's Me, is there anything I can help you with, officer?". (You might get that impression from reading the KJV, with its little inserted italicized *he* to make "I am *he*".) Actually, He is challenging them to understand what they are doing. (He never asked questions for information, He knew all things, when He asked a question it was to bring illumination, awareness, to His hearers.) He says without any perplexity or uncertainty *Who is it that you are after? Do you know Who you're looking for? And they say, Sure, it's יהושע of Nazareth.* And He *doesn't* say *That's Me*, instead He says *YH. I'm not making this easy for you. You want יהושע of Nazareth, you get YH.* No wonder that (vs 6) when He said that, they *drew back and fell to the ground.* Why? Because every Jew knew that YH was supposed to be his Mighty One. Please read vs7,8 with this insight, and understand the underlying significance.

While that's powerful stuff in its own right, it's time to turn from the exposition and again to face the issue of whether the Tetragrammaton should appear in the AC or not. Once again, there was no way for a faithful gospeller to record this incident without resorting to the shortened version of the Tetragrammaton. Nor is or was there any way for a copyist or translator to do his task faithfully without doing likewise.

Dr. Brad Young, arguably the pre-eminent authority on Yahusha's parables, writes,

"Since the linguistic medium of the rabbinic parables was Hebrew, it is only reasonable and at least a high probability that [Yahusha] also employed Hebrew in telling his story illustrations and that they would have been recorded and preserved in the Hebrew language" (The Parables, by Brad Young).

Joseph Frankovic writes,

"From the available evidence, it is almost certain that during the first century AD Hebrew as well as Aramaic, and to a lesser degree Greek were the spoken languages of the Jews in Israel.

"The question of the language in which Jesus primarily communicated to his people also involves the question of [in] which language a biography of Jesus would have been originally recorded. Archaeological data and linguistic research are tipping the scales in favor of Hebrew. A recently published tenth-century Arabic document, which is partially based on an earlier fifth century Aramaic document, identifies the language of 'the prophets,' 'Christ,' and 'the true Gospel' as Hebrew. Furthermore, it excoriates the non-Jewish Christians for discarding Hebrew in favor of foreign languages not spoken by the Savior" ("An Introduction to the Research of Robert Lindsey - Part II: Synoptic Theory and Trends in NT Scholarship" by Joseph Frankovic, Yavo Digest, Vol. VII, No. 4, p. 12).

Regarding the current Option, I must say that it has a whiff of plausibility on first encounter. There is some validity in the thought that by being omitted from the Greek AC and all the translations descending from it, the Tetragrammaton and He Who owns it, blessed be His Name, have been spared much abuse, mainly within what one can only call the Christian Church. One sympathetic friend has likened it to not casting pearls before swine. The Option also may seem to have some value as a counter to the charge that *to say the Names were allowed to be dropped from the AC is to deny the doctrine of preservation by the Almighty of the source text.* But as one turns it over and examines it from various sides, it becomes clear that this defence of the Option is unneeded.

My humble opinion is that the source text has indeed been preserved somewhere, either with or against the desire of men. A hundred years ago, who could possibly have predicted the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls and their impact

on our understanding of the Scriptures? Who then can rightfully assert that the source text of the AC does not exist and cannot be discovered? Maybe, unlike the Dead Sea Scrolls, its whereabouts are actually known to a very few individuals who have a massive investment in keeping its existence secret but who dare not destroy it. Now that *would* be a conspiracy! - and I refrain from speculating any further, I mention the idea just to encourage you to keep an open mind, the book is not yet closed on what we know and don't know about the Word of YHWH. We should note the experience of Bacchiocchi, a doctoral student admitted to the archives of the Gregorian University in Rome, researching the history of the subversion of the Sabbath to the first day of the week, and discovering early and original documents on the topic whose existence surprised even the Jesuit trustees of these invaluable assets - this on a doctrine which the Roman Church is more than happy to trumpet its contribution to, indeed its copyright and sole legitimate ownership of. If they had overlooked these resources which so clearly substantiated their claims in a matter of which that Church is so proud, what are the chances that they would be well aware, or would admit to being well aware, of resources which clearly testify against the common basis of New Testament translation and scholarship, and in particular give the lie to the thought that we may willy-nilly assign to the Almighty names, titles and labels which contradict and hide the specific names, titles and labels which He has unarguably assigned to Himself for our use?

In fact, if I understand at all the prophecies that address this matter in the context of the end-times, the false names are absolutely essential to the strategy of the Deceiver and Enemy of men's beings to herd multitudes of humankind down the broad road that leads to destruction. The Anti-Messiah will be so well accepted *because* he comes in the false names that have been so persistently imprinted, since post-apostolic times, in the minds of Christians of every point on the theological spectrum. When Israel under a great delusion says *Blessed is he who comes in the name of the L-rd* and receives a false and deceptive peace, I fear that Christians around the globe will rejoice to share that same delusion. So who will be waiting for the sore-pressed nation to turn their backs on over two millenia of rabbinic teaching to say loud and clear, *Blessed is He Who comes in the Name of YHWH*? As things stand at the moment, despite all the masses of clear and undeniable evidence for the True Names, very, very few believers. (But that is changing.)

The One Who created all things, including you and me, does not need His actions to be defended by you or me. He will vindicate Himself in due course, every objector will be silenced. But we may ask, could or would YHWH allow His Name to be dropped from the AC because people wanted to stray after pagan "mighty ones", to integrate their pagan past with their hoped-for future?

Yes, I conclude, in a universe which has its beginnings in moral considerations and ethical value-judgements; in space-time history which is steadily being guided towards the ultimate moral denouement, we should not be surprised to find something like this happen in the short term. It is a great mistake to imagine that there are only ultimate and no short-term consequences arising from rebellious choices, we need to see the analogy with the plight of the ancient writer making representative confession:

Lam 5:1 Remember, O יהוה, what has come upon us. Look, and see our reproach!

Lam 5:2 Our inheritance has been turned over to strangers, And our houses to foreigners.

Lam 5:3 We have become orphans, fatherless, Our mothers are like widows.

Lam 5:4 We had to pay for our drinking water, And our wood comes at a price.

Lam 5:5 We have been pursued close onto our neck, We have laboured and had no rest.

Lam 5:6 To Mitsrayim we have given a hand; To Ashshur, to be satisfied with bread.

Lam 5:7 Our fathers sinned, they are no more. We have borne their crookednesses.

Lam 5:8 Servants have ruled over us; There is no one to deliver from their hand.

Lam 5:9 With our lives we bring in our bread, Because of the sword of the wilderness.

Lam 5:10 Our skin has become as hot as an oven, Because of the burning heat of scarcity of food.

Lam 5:11 They have humbled the women in Tsiyon, The maidens in the cities of Yehudah.

Lam 5:12 Rulers were hung up by their hands, And elders were not respected.

Lam 5:13 They have taken young men to grind, And youths stumbled under loads of wood.

Lam 5:14 Elders have ceased from the gate, Young men from their song.

Lam 5:15 The joy of our heart has ceased, Our dancing has turned into mourning.

Lam 5:16 The crown has fallen from our head. Woe to us, for we have sinned!

Lam 5:17 Because of this our heart has been sick, Because of these our eyes have become dim,

Lam 5:18 Because of Mount Tsiyon which is laid waste; Foxes have gone roaming in it.

Lam 5:19 You, O יהוה, remain forever, Your throne from generation to generation.

Lam 5:20 Why do You forget us forever, Forsake us for length of days?

Lam 5:21 Turn us back to You, O יהוה, And let us turn back, Renew our days as of old.

Lam 5:22 You have been wroth with us, exceedingly!

To those who say with horror *Surely the Almighty would never let His Name be laid waste, therefore this cannot be His true Name* I reply *Neither did the Jews imagine that the Almighty could ever let Mount Zion be laid waste, yet He did, and indeed He has said He has fixed His Name on Mount Zion so we in turn should not be taken by surprise.* The absence of His Name from the AC Greek is a reproach to us and our fathers. Existentially people will have to admit, through the centuries *to Mitsrayim [they] have given a hand; to Ashshur, to be satisfied with bread* - they have chosen the "prudent" worldly-wise course and repudiated the claim of YHWH to be their Mighty One. And this then has been reflected in the texts that teach them of their mighty one whom they have chosen.

And I have to go further, and say that not only could the Almighty allow Mount Zion to be laid waste, but He could allow the very Temple, the Hekal, to be ruined as was the earlier place of worship at Shiloh - **for His Name's sake** (He will not allow His Name to be associated interminably with abominations, flagrant defiance of His commandments), as He says through Jeremiah in Chapter 7:

8"See, you are trusting in false words, which do not profit -

9stealing, murdering, and committing adultery, and swearing falsely, and burning incense to Ba'Al, and walking after other mighty ones you have not known.

10"And you came and stood before Me in this house which is called by My Name, and said, 'We have been delivered' - in order to do all these abominations!

11 "Has this house, which is called by My Name, become a den of robbers in your eyes? Look, I, even I Myself have seen it," declares HWHY.

12"But go now to My place at Shiloh, where I set My Name at the first, and see what I did to it because of the evil of My people Yisra'Al.

13"And now, because you have done all these works," declares HWHY, "and I spoke to you, rising up early and speaking, but you did not hear, and I called you, but you did not answer,

14"I shall also do to this house, which is called by My Name, in which you trust, and to this place which I gave to you and your fathers, as I did to Shiloh.

15"And I shall cast you out of My presence, as I have cast out all your brothers, all the seed of Ephrayim.

16"And you, do not pray for this people, nor lift up a cry or prayer for them, nor make intercession to Me, for I do not hear you.

17"Do you not see what they are doing in the cities of Yehudah and in the streets of Yerushalayim?

18*"The children are gathering wood, the fathers are lighting the fire, and the women are kneading their dough, to make cakes for the sovereignty of the heavens, and to pour out drink offerings to other mighty ones, to provoke Me.*

19*"Is it Me they are provoking?" declares HWHY. "Is it not themselves - unto the shame of their own faces?"*

20*Therefore, thus said the Master HWHY, "See, My displeasure and My wrath is poured out on this place, on man and on beast, and on the trees of the field and on the fruit of the ground. And it shall burn and not be quenched."*

21*Thus said HWHY of hosts, the Elohim of Yisra'Āl, "Add your burnt offerings to your slaughterings and eat meat.*

22*"For I did not speak to your fathers, or command them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Mitsrayim, about matters of burnt offerings or slaughterings.*

23*"But this word I did command them, saying, 'Obey My voice, and I shall be your Elohim, and you be My people. And walk in all the ways that I have commanded you, so that it be well with you.'*

24*"But they did not obey or incline their ear, but walked in the counsels, in the stubbornness of their evil heart, and went backward and not forward.*

How relevant this is also to the Christian world! - lovingly preparing pagan festivals, baking little round cakes for the sovereignty of the heavens with the sign of her son, the cross of Tammuz - hot cross buns, decorating and hiding little fertility symbols in honour of Astarte, believing that because of the salvation they perceive in "J-s-s", there is no longer any need for obedience to certain inconvenient elements of the Ten Commandments, for walking in the ways which He has commanded us through Moshe! Why should He persist in preserving His Name clearly in the travestied translations which conceal as much as they reveal? Only after much painful repentance does the heart become prepared to receive and rejoice in this truth of the true Name.

And I have to go further than say it could have happened, I have to say that **YHWH Himself caused that same Yirmeyahu to prophesy that it would in fact happen:**

Jer 5:30 "An astounding and horrible matter has come to be in the land:

Jer 5:31 The prophets have prophesied falsely, and the priests rule by their own hand, and My people have loved it so. And what are you going to do at the end of it?

Jer 6:13 "For from the least of them even to the greatest of them, they are all greedy for gain. And from the prophet even to the priest, all act falsely.

Jer 6:14 "And they heal the breach of My people slightly, saying, 'Peace, peace,' when there is no peace.

Jer 6:15 Were they ashamed when they had done abomination? No! They were not at all ashamed, nor did they know how to blush. Therefore they shall fall among those who fall. They shall stumble at the time I visit them," said יהוה.

The theme is repeated in chapter 12:

Jer 12:10 "Many shepherds have destroyed My vineyard, they have trodden My portion under foot, they have made My pleasant portion become a deserted wilderness.

Jer 12:11 "They have laid it waste - a waste, it mourns to Me. All the land is laid waste, because no one takes it to heart.

Jer 12:13 "They have sown wheat but reaped thorns, they have exhausted themselves - they do not profit. And they shall be ashamed of your harvest because of the burning displeasure of יהוה."

After thus prophesying the Exile, the Almighty prophesies a Return and Ingathering thus:

Jer 12:15 “And it shall be, after My plucking them out, I shall return, and have compassion on them and bring them back, everyone to his inheritance and everyone to his land.

Now please read carefully, a most awesome thing:

Jer 12:16 “And it shall be, if they learn well the ways of My people, to swear by My Name, ‘As יהוה lives,’ as they taught My people to swear by Ba'al, then they shall be established in the midst of My people.

But just who is this “they”? It would be very easy to think it is the prophets and priests, maybe the “shepherds” of earlier verses. Who are dispersed, who are brought back? It would be very easy to imagine it is the Yehudim. But no! - we have to back up a verse or two for the sake of understanding:

Jer 12:14 Thus said יהוה, “As for all My evil neighbours who touch the inheritance which I have caused My people Yisra’el to inherit; see, I am plucking **them** out of **their** land, and I shall pluck out the house of Yehudah from their midst.

Jer 12:15 “And it shall be, after My plucking them out, I shall return, and have compassion on them and bring them back, everyone to his inheritance and everyone to his land.

Jer 12:16 “And it shall be, if they learn well the ways of My people, to swear by My Name, ‘As יהוה lives,’ as they taught My people to swear by Ba'al, then they shall be established in the midst of My people.

Jer 12:17 “But if they do not obey, I shall pluck up, pluck up and destroy that nation,” declares יהוה.

Here then is a prophecy, not for Israel; but for the **Gentile** nations, the “**evil neighbours**”, who have taught His people Yehudah to swear by Baal - to depart from their allegiance to the One Name YHWH and to identify their Mighty One by such labels as “G-d”, “The L-RD”, “D-s”, “Th-s” and many others which trace right back to the object of pagan worship. And here is a simple and heart-breaking observation on my part: While for many centuries the Jews have been hiding the True Name behind evasive circumlocutions such as *haShem*, *The Name*, *Heaven’s Name* and have been failing in their appointed task of revealing Him to the Gentiles, said Gentiles have recently been very effective in replacing even these circumlocutions in Jewish conversation and discussion with the full pagan names. Turn to the rabbis’ weekly pages of commentary on the regular *parsha* readings from the Torah and you are no longer faced with the circumlocutions, but with the blatant pagan terms.

It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that Christianity, particularly that of the English-speaking West, has taught the Yehudim that it is OK to swear by Ba-al, to take G-d as their mighty one. There will be a serious reckoning for the “evil neighbours” who have accomplished this, unless they learn well the ways of My people, to swear by My Name, ‘As יהוה lives. On the other hand, if the evil neighbours do learn and turn, if they repent of using the false names and bringing worship to one who deserves no worship instead of the One Who deserves all worship and praise, there is something far more precious promised to them than merely to be left alone in their neighbourly position: they shall be established in the midst of My people. How can this be? Surely, by identifying with the core proposition of the children of Yisra’el, *Hear, o Yisra’el, YHWH your Mighty One is One*, these neighbours identify with Yisra’el at its very heart.

(If any Jewish reader finds this document offensive - and I can imagine that possibility - may I plead in mitigation that I am only trying to bring about the sentiments of the last paragraph in my own experience. I have been amongst the “evil neighbours”, and I am repenting, and I am trying to identify with the essential heart of Israel which is not rabbinic Judaism.)

But **how** could it have happened? *Who* did it?...

Option 5: The Mighty One of the TNK is the same as that of the AC, and caused the inspired writers of the latter to use His true Name, but this was replaced with malicious intent by various people (Conspiracy)

This is the option for which our anonymous critic of the translators of the Jehovah's Witnesses' *New World Translation* could find no supporting evidence despite making a careful search. First he examined the source documents and concluded that all the earliest (available) documents are indeed written in Greek; that rumours of original documents in Hebrew or Aramaic are discredited; and that there is no evidence of conspiracy to destroy or conceal such non-Greek documents, or appearances of say the Tetragrammaton written in Hebrew characters in Greek documents. It is a classic instance of failing to see the wood for the trees, it is notably naïve. Surely the following observation should be given full weight:

A conspiracy is rarely, if ever, proved by positive testimony. When a crime of high magnitude is about to be perpetrated by a combination of individuals, they do not act openly, but covertly and secretly. The purpose formed is known only to those who enter into it....Unless one of the original conspirators betray his companions and give evidence against them, their guilt can be proved only by circumstantial evidence...and circumstances can not lie."

ARGUMENT OF JOHN A. BINGHAM, Special Judge Advocate.

IN REPLY TO THE SEVERAL ARGUMENTS IN DEFENSE OF MARY E. SURRETT AND OTHERS, CHARGED WITH CONSPIRACY AND THE MURDER OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN, LATE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, ETC. [Quoted in The Trial Of The Conspirators, Washington, 1865, also available in The Trials of the Assassins by Documentary Evidence, <http://spirituallysmart.com/lincoln9.htm>]

Now, I have used this word *Conspiracy* to summarise this option knowing that a conspiracy in most people's minds needs conscious agreement between participants (who then are *Con-spira-tors*, "together-breathing-people", not that tautologous USA monstrosity *Co-conspirators*) regarding a desired goal and the means of achieving it, and is usually regarded as implying a lot more common ground between them too, including conscious co-operation. This is not necessarily implied by my subtitle, which actually requires only that various people maliciously desired to achieve the same goal, and different people with different reasons and means may have undertaken somewhat independent actions at different times towards the same end. Thus it may appear that *conspiracy* is used rather loosely here, perhaps *common purpose* would have been better, maybe *democracy* would have been even better. So you can argue with my semantics, but it hardly matters: read on.

Let's take a quick look at the period from the start of the Book of Acts, i.e. from just after the Resurrection, through to about 400CE, when Jerome was busy translating the definitive Latin Bible, the *Vulgate* (382-405, to be more precise). Perched then on Acts 1:1, and first taking a quick look back over our shoulders, we see that the itinerant Galilean teacher Yahusha barYosef, whose teaching had caused such a stir in Judea as to result in His death on a Roman stake, had consistently over the past 3 years or so preached a political gospel: *Repent, for the Kingdom of YHWH is at hand*, as had His forerunner Yochanan the Immerser. Sometimes He would perhaps phrase it as *the Kingdom of Heaven*, a common alternative phrasing. (Encapsulated in this political gospel was a lot of teaching about how He would die as the perfect Lamb of the Mighty One for the remission of sins, but this was a means to the end of the political gospel, it could never on its own have been cause for His execution.) Looking forward for the next forty days, we see from Luke's third verse that the one theme on His mind to explain in great detail to his disciples was the same thing: *the reign of Elohim*, i.e. the Kingdom of YHWH. *This was the keystone completing the perfect archway of His teaching of the past several years, inserted with all the accuracy and authority of His status as the resurrected Master.* At the end of this 40-day masterclass, there was just one question unresolved in His students' minds: not How, not Where, not What, not Why nor Who, but *When?* And this was the one thing He wasn't free to reveal, even if He had known it.

What language was He using in His three years of teaching? Probably not just one. We know He spoke Hebrew, it was the language He resorted to in the deepest depths of His agony on the execution-stake, it most likely was His mother-tongue. It was also the language He used to present His credentials from Heaven to the arch-Pharisee Sha'ul. He was able to debate the TNK with the sharpest minds of the Jewish leadership in the Temple, and we may be sure that they didn't mess with a translation like the LXX when getting down to the fine details; but He was also able to debate Moses with a Shechemite nobody, and she would probably have been talking Aramaic, similar but not identical to Hebrew, and contributing many words to the Hebrew in daily use in Judea and Galilee.

(Throughout this document I have, for the sake of those readers who believe that the Septuagint was much used by Yahusha and His associates, given generous room to the possibility that the LXX was afforded equal respect with the Hebrew TNK by the Jews in first-century Judea and Galilee. In fact, this possibility seems vanishingly remote in the light of the following observations by, again, Dr Ernest L Martin, in Chapter 3 of *Restoring the Original Bible*, a project published on <http://askelm.com/restoring/>:

In the New Testament we consistently read that the Jews possessed THE Scriptures. Observe the definite article that I place before the word "Scriptures." This is the manner in which the definition is shown on

numerous occasions in the New Testament. It was taken for granted in New Testament times, without argument or qualification, that a commonly understood body of books was in existence which the Jews recognized to be the sacred and authorized scriptures. There is a good deal of contemporary testimony to substantiate this. Josephus, who was a priest and thoroughly conversant with Jewish affairs in the 1st century, referred to the standard copy of the Holy Scriptures which was deposited in the archives of the Temple and under the supervision of the priests. Among the Jews this copy was known as "The Book of the Court" because all official synagogue scrolls were based on the text of this approved archetype. The Book of Deuteronomy had long before stated that such a standard copy should be retained by the priests in the sanctuary of the Tabernacle and later the Temple (Deuteronomy 17:18; 31:9-12).

These sacred books were looked on as the "constitution" of the Jewish people. They not only recorded religious duties for Jews to perform (but more important to our discussion on the canonization), they were also the basis for all civil, financial, agricultural, and social activities. In a word, the Jewish state in Palestine (no matter who was governing it) was reckoned a theocracy and the heart and soul of its government had to rest, by popular demand, squarely upon their understanding of the words in the sacred scriptures.

This point is vital in comprehending matters concerning the canonization of the Old Testament because the Temple scriptures not only contained religious teachings, they provided laws and principles involving human politics – laws pertaining to the daily living of all Jews. Such basic "constitutional" documents would have been well known and of necessity they must have been kept with a purity of contents. It is a foregone conclusion that people are keenly aware of laws that govern their daily affairs. Let us note how this fact can testify to the reliability of the Temple scrolls.

There were probably 8 to 10 million Jews in the world in the 1st century, and about 3 million were in Judaea. Just like our own legislative or judicial systems, there were by the time of the 1st century countless codified laws based upon the "constitutional" laws of the Temple. With hundreds of professional lawyers in daily practice constantly involved in disputes and/or other matters of law, are we to imagine that it was possible for a single letter or syllable of the basic laws of Moses to be changed? Such a belief would be absurd. Indeed, there were also a battery of precedential laws which developed over the years, supposedly based upon the scriptures, and even those could not be changed without due process. But certainly, no "constitutional" laws could be altered unless it was done in a legal manner.

That would be like American politicians trying to change the United States constitution without the due process of law as allowed in the constitution itself. If such changes were done outside of public approval, a revolution would develop among all peoples in the state. It would not make any difference if someone secretly tried to modify the original text of the constitution a hundred times over, there are literally thousands of copies in city and school libraries alone of what the original stated. If a single syllable of intended meaning in the constitution were tampered with, without due process of law, there would be a public outcry (even revolution). Surely the Jews in Judaea (and throughout the world) would have reacted in the same way if the standard copies of their "constitution" would have been corrupted by unscrupulous persons. True, constitutional laws can be changed, but not without the knowledge and approbation of the people.

This is an important point in regard to the canonization of the standard texts of the Old Testament. The fact is, the Mosaic laws represented the teaching which dominated the civil government, as well as the societal and religious rituals and/or ceremonies that thoroughly ruled the lives of all Jews everywhere. Since matters of money, property and daily social activities were governed by those laws embodied in the Holy Scriptures (or the many precedential laws in existence based upon biblical legislation), we can be certain that all copies [of] the "constitution" were the same throughout the country of Judaea, and even throughout the entire Jewish world. No priest or king could (or would) have revised the basic words of the Temple scrolls. Even if this were remotely possible at the capital in Jerusalem, there were scores of copies of the scriptures [in] the synagogues located over the land. All these combined Scriptural scrolls rendered some good checks and balances for the continued purity of the Temple scrolls and the synagogue writings based on them.

Another point needs to be made. Ancient synagogues in Palestine were not simply places in which to worship on the Sabbaths and holydays. They were nothing less than the Superior and Local courts of the nation. Are we to imagine that the synagogues (which were courts) had basic constitutional laws (and even precedential laws) which differed from one another? Hardly. This fact has a great bearing on the matter of Old Testament canonization. This means that one should look to Palestinian Judaism as maintaining proper manuscripts of the Old Testament because in Judaea their writings were not simply religious documents; they were also a part of the civil and government codes of Jewish national life.

The manuscripts of the Old Testament were under constant scrutiny by professional lawyers who would see to it that no word was changed. True, there might be a score of ways to interpret the words, but the words themselves could not be tampered with. For example, to give clients every advantage of winning any legal

case, Jewish lawyers could not pass what we call today the bar exam unless they could “prove” a hundred ways that pork was proper to eat, yet no lawyer could change the words of Moses to say that swine was now permissible. Interpreting the law to one’s advantage was one thing, but to change the actual words of the law was quite another. This was impossible without due process.

This guarantee of purity would not extend to those texts of sectarians who wished to reside outside mainline Judaism, or if they lived under the jurisdiction of Gentile governments in Egypt, Rome, Parthia, etc. Take for example the Dead Sea sects. Their documents show that they did not agree with many Temple regulations or its priesthood. And though some of their scrolls did match remarkably with later Masoretic texts which reflected the early (and official) synagogue versions of the Old Testament, they also allowed into their libraries a mixture of “non-mainline” books (some agreeing with Samaritan or Egyptian Versions). Those Jews who joined such private communal societies outside normative Judaism were prone to adopt their own rules and regulations. That’s why they could use unauthorized texts to govern their activities.

The same could be said of the manuscripts of the Law maintained by the Samaritan communities. Those texts were indeed legal documents (as were those in Jerusalem) but they governed Samaritan society, not Jewish! It is said that Ezra the priest, back in the 5th century B.C.E., deliberately copied every Old Testament manuscript in his possession into the square Aramaic script, rather than maintain the old Hebrew form of the letters. Ezra did this in order for all people in Judaea to recognize the official Jewish texts from those of the Samaritans who refused to accept the Aramaic letter styles for their holy books.

Also, the early translations of the Hebrew Old Testament into Greek (intended only for the literary curiosity of King Ptolemy II of Egypt) were never used as legal documents for the functioning of the theocratic state in Judaea. Since this was the case, it is not to be expected that they would have as much professional scrutiny applied to their accuracy as those retained by the Palestinian courts (synagogues). When later Hellenistic Jews, who had lost much of their Hebrew language abilities, wished to consult the scriptures in Greek, this was possible, but this was done only for curiosity or for private religious devotions. In no way could such unauthorized translations be used in matters of court. Imagine Jews in Judaea having to rely on a Greek text in law matters when the Hebrew was easily available and it was the original. No citizen of Judaea would think of placing his legal rights affecting his daily life on some Greek translation – especially an Egyptian one translated only for purposes of information. The only texts which those in Judaea would naturally accept were the original Hebrew ones deposited in the courts (synagogues) and the Temple. We must look to Jerusalem for the authorized Old Testament books and not resort to versions created outside of Judaea.

Please note then in what follows my own conviction that YHWH's Mashiach would have been teaching mainly in Hebrew; and in debate with the scribes, Pharisees and lawyers would almost certainly not have been trifling with the second-best LXX version. Where I have appeared to give the LXX equal time, it has been out of possibly excessive courtesy to those readers who may not share this conviction. I know that there seem to be many echoes of the LXX in the Greek AC manuscripts, but this of itself proves nothing, one would expect Hebrew-poor/Greek-rich translators of Hebrew AC originals into Greek to make liberal use of existing work in the form of the LXX to include “pre-authorised” TNK quotes from the existing translation where needed.)

We know He lived in Galilee for about thirty years, working for some time as a skilled craftsman and no doubt trading and involved with the commercial system of the area, which means that He would almost certainly have had some contact with *Koine* Greek. There were Roman roads in the area, and Capernaum hosted a Roman garrison, so Latin was a distinct possibility. Trade routes ran through the Galilee, He may have learned bits of other languages too. But one should not expect too much, it may be that Greek was not terribly common amongst the Galilean Jews, as this quote from <http://www.yrm.org/trinity-fact-fiction.htm> suggests:

It is documented from the well-known Hebrew historian Josephus that the Greek language was largely foreign to the Hebrew people in and around Galilee where [Yahusha] spent His life and ministered. This first-century priest said of himself, "I have also taken a great deal of pains to obtain the learning of the Greeks, and understand the elements of the Greek language, although I have so long accustomed myself to speak our own tongue, that I cannot pronounce Greek with sufficient exactness" (Antiquities, Book XX, Chapter XI).

(This hardly seems likely to be an insertion by early Christians, there doesn't seem anything to be gained by them having Josephus detract from the popular picture of the Jewish nation happily speaking, reading and writing the Apostolic Commentary in Greek - BEF)

Josephus was one of the most educated Hebrews of his time, yet he was mostly unfamiliar with the Greek language. Now if a learned man like Josephus hardly knew the Greek language, how could the uneducated apostles know the Greek tongue, and even know it well enough to write fluently on many difficult subjects? These were not Greeks but Hebrews from rural Israel, therefore they spoke their native tongue, Hebrew or

Aramaic. If they spoke Hebrew or Aramaic then they obviously wrote their New Testament books and letters in that language as well.

The referential density of Yahusha's recorded teachings to the TNK was extremely high, He was constantly quoting the written Hebrew Scriptures, and He might well have known both the Hebrew originals *and* the Septuagint Greek translation. But whether the quotations were from Hebrew or Greek sources, they would have had one thing in common: **the Name of the Mighty One of Israel, His heavenly Father, would at the time have been written there as the Tetragrammaton, probably in Hebrew or even palaeo-Hebrew letters.** All the currently-known copies of the LXX from that period have the Tetragrammaton occurring frequently, Hebrew letters written in the middle of Greek, never replaced by a Greek generic.

Did He know His Father's Name, "YHWH"? Yes, He did. He knew it from the Scriptures that He constantly quoted. He also knew it from His own Name, which incorporates His Father's Name, and from the derivation of His Name. He instructed His disciples in their Great Commission to baptize their taught-ones in the Name that is common to Father, Son and set-apart Ruach. Not several individual names, but "the Name", His Name which incorporates the Father's Name; which they indeed did, if you care to check the book of Acts from beginning to end.

Let us then ask, did He *teach* using the Father's Name, or did He conceal it under some evasive subterfuge, did He use Greek versions of the names of pagan false mighty ones, such as *Kurios* or *Theos*? This would have been a ground-breaking innovation, causing not so much a stir as an upheaval! (The acceptable Jewish substitutes have historically been *Adonai* and *haShem*, and sometimes *Heaven*. Not even the Jewish rabbis used *Greek* generics.) Bear in mind, please, that He had come to *reveal* the Father, not conceal Him; to distinguish Him, not to blur Him with the deities of the surrounding peoples, not to conceal His incomparable attributes under generic stickers. He had come to be obedient to His Father, and that included refraining from using the names of pagan mighty ones. What name(s) did His audiences, His disciples, hear coming from His lips? Aliases drawn disobediently from the pagan pantheon, or the one unique Name specifically given to Israel in YHWH's self-revelation throughout the TNK?

The apostles seem to have got the message, as we proceed through the Acts of the Apostles we find them steadily preaching exactly this gospel, rather contrary to the popular Marcionic misconception that they were preaching some new-fangled gospel of Love. Indeed, because of their insistence on using the Name, they attracted a lot of opposition from the Jewish rulers, who for centuries, since the captivity in Babylon, had been trying to restrict the public use of it. Were they preaching the kingdom of Yeshua? Of Christ? Or of YHWH? Sha'ul was quite adamant: *If any man preach any other gospel, let him be damned.* Only the gospel of the Kingdom of YHWH, of which the "gospel of salvation" is but a sub-theme, was on the table.

When they wrote their gospels, then, did the writers take the liberty of changing what they - and myriads of others - had heard from the lips of their Teacher, the quotations from the TNK (and perhaps the LXX) replete with the Tetragrammaton? Did they think they knew better than their Master how to show people His Father Whom He had come to reveal? Did they renege on their own practice and depart from the example of Him Whom they took as their Example? I don't believe that they did in so any of the respects that we can check, and I don't believe that they did so in regard to the Name.

If not they, then who did? Perhaps a brief look at some writings of the "Early Church Fathers" will prove enlightening...

- Tony Robinson, in "Seeds of Separation II" notes that *One of the earliest records of the developing antagonism between Torah-submissive Jewish believers and non-Jewish believers concerns statements by Ignatius, Bishop at Antioch, approximately 98-117 CE. Ignatius argued against the Judaizing tendencies of his territory, which, not far geographically from Palestine, had suffered the influences of the synagogue and of the Judaeo-Christians. In this statement Ignatius is lamenting the fact that some of the practices in Antioch had been influenced by the non-Messianic and Messianic Jews. With our knowledge of the Torah-based lifestyles of the early Messianic believers we should not be surprised that [m]any customs, ceremonies or practices within the body of Messiah would reflect Judaism. What is surprising however is the lament by Ignatius concerning the influence of the Jewish believers. Elsewhere Ignatius writes if we are still practicing Judaism, we admit that we have not received God's favor and it is wrong to talk about Jesus Christ and live like the Jews. In these statements Ignatius has certainly made Jewish practices and the Christian lifestyle mutually exclusive. However, as we shall see, what Ignatius rejected as Jewish were actually the commands of ADONAI from the Torah...*

(My note: Perhaps it is no coincidence that, as the Book of Acts relates, *the disciples were first called Chrestiani in Antioch.* Antioch was founded by Seleucus I Nicator, progenitor of Antiochus Epiphanes, around 300 BCE near the Mediterranean in modern Turkey, as a center for military control and **for the diffusion of Hellenic culture** in Syria. Is it possible that Ignatius was deliberately trying to put distance between his flock and those Nazarenes as did Marcion so few years later? Thinks: how would the *ekklesia* at Antioch have fared on **their** report card in Revelation 2 or 3, if they had been rated? Not very highly, I fear. Perhaps some prominent congregations that set the style and course of the *Christian* church were sailing so far off the

scriptural bearings in order to join the pagan fleet that they were already over the horizon. Quite possibly these congregations had already dispensed with the synagogal form of meeting described in 1 Cor 14 and no longer even had a *chazzan*, an *angel of the congregation*, to ensure that the Master's letter would be properly read and discussed; perhaps the *dominant-preacher/leader* form had already taken root there and was choking the life out of the members - we know that even in two of the letters to the congregations the *Nikolaïtes*, those who vanquish and dominate over the ordinary people, are discussed negatively; and indeed Ignatius himself was quite blatant about requiring the unconditional submission of his flock to their overseer, namely himself... Let me say this as simply as possible: *Ignatius was, as I understand things, a Nicolaitan*. The apostle John in his third epistle, vs9 onwards, shows us the barrier that he found to his intended pastoral comments in a largely Greek assembly. If you agree that people get the leaders they deserve, it may well be that the *ekklesia* at Antioch was already preparing themselves for the shackles of Ignatius by shrugging off the yoke *that is easy, and the burden that is light*. In his opposition to *Judaizing tendencies* amongst his not-yet *Christians* Ignatius perhaps showed that "his" flock had already fallen off the list of assemblies worthy of a letter from their Master. Bear in mind too, his phrase has a political spin on it: it gives the impression that *Jews* are trying to oblige the not-yet *Christians* to adopt the old forms of worship, whereas the truth of the situation is that Ignatius and his like were trying to rid their flocks of the Jewishness of the gospel, thus paganizing the pure religion that had survived for millenia already.)

(I've taken liberties with swapping between italic and normal typefaces for subquotes and emphases in the quotations from Robinson.)

While Robinson is probably accurate in what he points out, what he *fails* to point out is perhaps even more important for our quest: in Ignatius' mind, there was a sharp separation between the very name "Jesus Christ" and living like the Jews. "Jesus Christ" was a mark of the "new faith", the "New Testament" (although this was likely before Marcion had surfaced with his "New Testament" literary solution to the quandary), and not of the belief of the Nazarenes, or (perhaps more accurately at that stage, before the razing of Jerusalem) the Nazarene Jews. Let's ask then: if those wretched Nazarene Jewish believers ought not to use the name "Jesus Christ", what Name *might* they be allowed to use? How about a Hebrew name that wouldn't offend Hellenic ears, one that Hellenists would be delighted to *avoid* using - say, *Yahusha ha Mashiach*? (Which, dear reader, if you're not quite up to speed on all this, does incorporate the Tetragrammaton.)

- Robinson then quotes another quite well-known gentleman writing about 2½ centuries later (apparently those pesky Nazarenes were taking a long time to fade away): *Some of the most revealing statements concerning the Messianic Jewish believers of his time were made by the Church Apologist, Epiphanius of Salamis, 370 CE.*

"We shall now especially consider heretics who call themselves Nazarenes; they are mainly Jews and nothing else. They make use not only of the New Testament, but they also use in a way the Old Testament of the Jews; for they do not forbid the books of the Law, the Prophets, and the Writings so that they are approved of by the Jews, from whom the Nazarenes do not differ in anything, and they profess all the dogmas pertaining to the prescriptions of the Law and to the customs of the Jews, except they believe in Christ. They preach that there is but one God, and his son Jesus Christ. But they are very learned in the Hebrew language; for they, like the Jews, read the whole Law, then the Prophets. They differ from the Jews because they believe in Christ, and from the Christians in that they are to this day bound to the Jewish rites, such as circumcision, the Sabbath, and other ceremonies. Otherwise, this sect of the Nazarenes thrives most vigorously in the state of Berea [My comment: where the Jews were "more noble" than those in Thessalonika, and received the word with all readiness of mind, every day examining the Writings whether those things were so. Note please what happened when they did this: many, indeed, therefore, of them did believe. The proper consequence of examining the Writings (TNK) is belief in Messiah!], in Coele-Syria, in Decapolis, around Pella, and in Bashan. After they departed from Jerusalem, they made their start from here, as all the disciples dwelt in Pella, having been admonished by Christ to depart Jerusalem and emigrate because of imminent danger."

Faced with this sour testimony, it would be difficult to deny that the Nazarene believers were for several centuries adhering closely to the TNK and were well learned in the *Hebrew* scriptures, not just the LXX but the actual Hebrew version, thus inevitably being exceedingly familiar with the Tetragrammaton even as the 5th century approached and Jerome was about to receive his commission to revise some old Latin translations of the Old and New Scriptures, leading to a rather thorough new translation from which the Tetragrammaton was totally missing, a translation which formed the staple reading of the (eventually) Roman Catholic Church worldwide for well over a thousand years.

(One or two side issues must not escape our attention. First, Epiphanius complains that the Nazarenes **do not forbid** the TNK. This could only be a cause for remark let alone complaint if the church of the time in

general **did** effectively *forbid* the TNK - obviously Marcion had had his effect, even though superficially his underlying dualist philosophy had been rejected! For Epiphanius - and how many others? - it was very clearly a case of "New Testament good, Old Testament bad". Second, about 50 years after the Council that gave the thumbs-up to Athanasius instead of Arius, and thus to the doctrine of the Trinity, it seems that those Hebrew-based Nazarenes were not following the party line, but still were preaching *that there is but one God, and his son Jesus Christ* - I use these terms here in quotation because it is too much to expect that Epiphanius himself would have used the correct terms even if the Nazarenes did - which is a formulation much closer to Hebrew monotheism than to the conventional assertion of a Trinity.)

So the problem is not that the New World translators imposed (their version of) the true Name on the Apostolic Commentary in their translation in order to make it compatible with the TNK; the problem is in fact that like Jerome almost all translators have unfairly removed the true Name from the TNK in *their* translations, in order to make it compatible with AC Greek sources which come to us from a context in which every effort was being made by a great majority of preachers and canonists and apologists and congregational leaders to distance themselves and their followers as rapidly and as far as possible from the Jews and their TNK.

(It should not be forgotten that Jerome started off his mammoth task by revising *the Old Latin text of the four Gospels from the best Greek texts* - Wikipedia, as have so many translators after him - starting with the Greek NT, they have committed themselves to a nomenclature void of the Tetragrammaton, and on later turning their attention like Jerome to the Hebrew TNK, have persisted in the fault to which they had already committed themselves most publicly. Let's take an example that's only about 50 years old at time of writing: For those who were impressed with JB Phillips' fresh and refreshing translation of the gospels in the middle of the last century, followed by the entire AC in similar vein - with the Greek names, of course - I offer this thought for your consideration: *What would his extensive and enthusiastic readership have said if, when he later turned his attention and talents to the Psalms, he had brought out a translation with nary a G-d or L-RD to be seen anywhere on its pages?* It would have made an enormous impression on a very large number of educated, intelligent lay students of the Scriptures as to their shock they discovered that *G-d* and *the L-RD* have no place in the overwhelming majority of the original texts of the Scriptures!.. If Phillips felt the same surprise he concealed it well from his readers.)

Is that not the conspiracy or common purpose/democracy that the commentator could find no trace of? And has anything changed?

Option 6: The Mighty One of the TNK is the same as that of the AC, and caused the inspired writers of the latter to use His true Name, but translators and copyists rapidly replaced it with "dynamic equivalents" (*Entropy*)

It is nearly impossible to avoid the conclusion that the change from Tetragrammaton in the TNK to pagan terms in the remaining early fragments of Greek texts on which most AC translations are based, was driven by the pressures there were on believers to dissociate themselves from any allegations of "Jewishness", especially after about 70CE when Jerusalem was attacked and the Temple destroyed by the Romans. The fact that these pagan terms are found in *early* texts is thus not valid evidence that the Tetragrammaton was absent from the *original* texts, since there is compelling reason to believe that its continued presence would soon, maybe within years rather than decades, have become a most unwelcome obstacle to the process of "Christianizing" the pagan world by putting a bland non-judgemental face on Nazarene Judaism. The very name YHWH is inextricably mixed into the description "Yahudite" from which our "Jew" is derived. You cannot retain YHWH as your Mighty One without placing yourself uncomfortably close, even in those times and many subsequent times perilously close, to the Jew since YHWH proclaims *Hear, o Isra'el, I YHWH am your Mighty One, and besides Me there is no other*. That's not the kind of thing any Caesar, any *Pontifex Maximus*, likes to hear at all.

New Gentile believers, with one eye on the marketing issues and another on the survival issues, felt a need to soft-pedal the similarities and highlight the differences between themselves and the Jews, and no more urgently than in relation to the name and identity of the divinity involved. By using familiar although hardly neutral terms like "L-rd" and "G-d" (*Kurios* and *Theos*) they lowered the barriers to acceptance in the Greek-speaking world and established distance from the worship of the Jews who were such a thorn in the side of imperial Rome. These terms may have seemed very natural and innocent (for example, when in Acts 16:1 we are introduced to a young half-Jewish believer named Timothy, we are told that his father (*kurios*) was a Greek; but two verses later we are told everyone knew that his father (*pater*) was Greek. So *kurios* is being used almost interchangeably with *pater*, although the latter word broadly covers the parental relationship while the former highlights the authority aspect); the problem with using

them was two-fold: first, they replaced and therefore hid the true terms. Second, they were the names of pagan deities and therefore using them was and is forbidden to the children of the King.

So this tactic was clever. And fraudulent. And disobedient. Likely to allow false doctrines to creep in, don't you think? Consider the following quote regarding the late-first century and early-second century:

- "What happened during this time? Obviously, it was a time of many heresies. The Church Fathers come on the scene in the second century to tell us vociferously who the heretics were and where the 'orthodox Church' was. These men (may I, B.E.F., make this clear: the author is referring here to the Church Fathers specifically) claimed to be the followers of the apostles, but their theology was different and seemed to blend Hellenistic philosophy and Babylonian religious custom with Christianity.
- It was certainly a far different theology from that of the Jerusalem Church which Paul said he had taught the Gentiles to follow (Acts 15:2, 22-28; 1 Thessalonians 2:14). It is interesting that the descendants of the Jerusalem Church, the Nazarenes, were labeled as heretics and persecuted for their regard of the Mosaic law when they were merely carrying on the tradition of the Church (sic) of Peter and James."⁴

A lot of the details of first-century apostolic worship have been lost to history. However, we do know from the Bible and from history what the Nazarenes generally believed about Yeshua, about Paul, and about the Written Torah and Oral Torah. They believed in Yeshua's virgin birth, His divinity, and His resurrection. They recognized Paul as a legitimate apostle and accepted his writings. They believed that the Written Torah should still be followed, but they viewed the Oral Torah as a "very burdensome yoke of Jewish traditions."⁵ Jerome tells us how the Nazarenes understood the prophecy about [Yahusha] ministering in the land of Naphtali in Isaiah 9:1: "The Nazoreans venture to explain this passage as: When [Messiah] came and His preaching was glittering especially the land of Naphtali was delivered from the errors of the scribes and Pharisees, and He struck off from its neck the very burdensome yoke of Jewish traditions."⁶

Some man-made Jewish traditions are harmless. Some are actually helpful, and can be used in a meaningful way to affirm our faith in the Messiah. If a Jewish tradition is not contrary to the Scriptures, it is permissible. However, just because a tradition is permissible and Jewish does not necessarily mean that it has some intrinsic value for believers in the Messiah. If Jewish traditions become a burdensome yoke, then we need to let the glittering Word of [Yahusha] strike them off from our necks.

(This quote is from Dr Daniel Botkin's article *Re-evaluating the Wisdom of Using Extra-Biblical Jewish Traditions for Messianic Worship* on the website www.joyintheworld.info)

It is clear from the above that even Jerome, translating the entire Scriptures into Latin for the sake of the (not-quite Roman) Catholic church, must have realised that Paul, in keeping with His Master, was not repudiating the entire (written) Torah in his epistles, but striking at *the errors of the scribes and Pharisees* which were distracting believers from "the pure milk of the word", which, if I may be pardoned a little repetition, was in Sha'ul's time recognised exactly as being the TNK. However this realization does not seem to have carried much weight, either with Jerome as a translator (and his influence was enormous, let us bear in mind that his *Vulgate* held an unchallenged monopoly in the Western marketplace for two-and-a-half times as long as the King James Version has been with us) or his colleagues and spiritual heirs all the way through the Reformers and *their* heirs, who have been almost unanimous in declaring that the cross on Calvary put an end to the prescriptive power and relevance of the Torah to tell us how to behave.

According to these multitudes of authoritative people we have been set free from *the Torah*, whereas the true meaning would appear to be rather that we have been set free from the guilt and slavery of our transgressions and sinful nature *in order to be able to enjoy the freedom of living life according to the Torah* - life, in other words, as YHWH planned and specified it to be lived. Not in order to follow man-made rules whether invented by the scribes in Babylon, the Pharisees, the Rabbis, the Popes or your local church council.

(Equating *Torah* merely to Law in a juridical, *how-can-we-find-them-guilty!* sense is unjust because *Torah* carries a strong sense of *teaching, advice, wisdom, example*. There is nothing arbitrary about it, it is beautifully balanced and goal-directed, **Col 1:28** is a succinct definition of *Torah*: *Whom we announce, warning every man and teaching every man in all wisdom, in order to present every man perfect in Messiah יְהוֹשֻׁעַ* and of course Messiah Yahusha is and was the exact embodiment of *Torah*, if ever a Hebrew original of John's gospel comes to light I should not be surprised to see it starting with *In the beginning was the Torah ... and the Torah became flesh and dwelt among us*. But the juridical component of *Torah* should not be ignored, because the same Yahusha Who came to show us how to live the perfect life, will be our Judge and assess whether we did or did not follow His teaching accurately.)

Back to the issues of making distance between the Church and the Jews, let's ask the inevitable question loudly and

clearly: Could this desire for differentiation have been so strong that those early believers might have approved of tampering with the text when copying and translating the apostolic letters and gospels that were in circulation in the first century? Certainly possible, I regret to report - just consider the evidence.

There is clear evidence of tampering in regard to the following issues amongst others:

1. That word *cross*: an interesting and misleading choice of word by Jerome, since the Greek word merely means a *stake* or *pole*, with no particular implication of a crossbar. (For a real cross, the Greeks would have said *xylon*.) Now the specific Latin word that translates the Greek *stauros* is *palus*, from which we get, e.g., our *palisade*: so why did Jerome select the extremely specific word *cross* - *crux* in Latin - to translate this non-specific word when he must have been quite well aware that the *cross* specifically was already and had been for many centuries the recognised symbol of *Tammuz* in his many aliases? If I were into interpreting hidden meanings and implications, I would say this looks like a coded or subliminal message that the Jewish Messiah was overcome by a pagan deity, just as Christmas that purports to commemorate Mashiach's birth actually commemorates the ritual annual rebirth of Tammuz...

Of course I understand that the Romans, who perfected but did not invent *crucifixion*, often used either a T-shaped cross, with the crossbar at the top of the pole, or a "real" cross with the crossbar somewhat lower down the pole, and Jerome may have been misled by the predominant practice - as well as any subliminal forces - to choose this awkward translation instead of sticking to the text. But the Romans did use plain stakes too, as well as some other variations including actual trees, and so I make the following observation: Few efforts seem to be applied to inquiring why, if *cross* is the right word, the TNK incident that Yahusha drew His prophecy from in John 3 - *For as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up* - was such an awkward and inaccurate foreshadow of what happened on Golgotha. The TNK tells us plainly that Moses put the brazen serpent on a *pole* or *stake*, not a cross: *Num 21:8-9* And יהוה said to Mosheh, "Make a fiery serpent, and set it on a *pole*. And it shall be that everyone who is bitten, when he looks at it, shall live." So Mosheh made a bronze serpent, and put it on a *pole*. And it came to be, if a serpent had bitten anyone, when he looked at the bronze serpent, he lived. Either YHWH gave Moses the wrong instructions, or Yahusha didn't have quite as much insight into the prophecy as did Jerome later on, and neither of those conclusions is anywhere as tenable as the very obvious fact that Jerome went (literally) out on a limb by selecting *crux* to translate *stauros*; he misled many, many generations of believers by his chosen symbolism. How easy it would have been for YHWH to tell Moses to put up a cross, in order to accord with Jerome many centuries later! How easy it would have been for Jerome to translate *stauros* accurately as *palus*, *pole*, in order to accord with YHWH many centuries earlier! It's not the prophecy that was weak, it was the translation. The translation was done to accord with the translator's predilections.

Here is a quote from Dr Randall Price, concerning the archaeological evidence for "Easter", pardon my using his reference:

With respect to the fact of crucifixion, the method of execution perfected by the Roman government to punish criminals, archaeology has vividly revealed its existence in Jerusalem at the time of [J-s-s]. In 1968 the remains of a crucified man from Giv'at ha-Mivtar, a northern suburb of Jerusalem, was discovered in an ossuary from near the time of [J-s-s]. The name of the man, from an Aramaic inscription on the ossuary, was Yohanan ben Ha'galgol, and from an analysis of his skeletal remains he was in his thirties, approximately the same age as [J-s-s] at the time of His crucifixion. His ankle bone was still pierced with a 7 inch-long crucifixion nail and attached to a piece of wood from a cross. Apparently the nail had hit a knot in the olive wood patibulum (the upright section of a cross) and become so lodged that the victim could not be removed without retaining both the nail and a fragment of the cross. According to one anthropological analyst, there were also marks of nails on the wrist bones and of a board had been used to support the feet. This find reveals afresh the horrors of the Roman punishment as recorded in the Gospels. They indicate that the position the body assumed on the cross was with the legs nailed on either side of the upright stake. Therefore, rather than the body being straight, it was pushed up and twisted, causing terribly painful muscle spasms and eventually death by the excruciating process of asphyxiation. This discovery supports the biblical statement of nailing crucified victims, refuting a previous theory they were simply tied to the cross. In addition, the fact that the bones of Yohanan were found in secondary burial within a tomb also disproves an old hypothesis that state criminals were cast into a common grave, for this crucified victim, like [J-s-s], had received a proper Jewish burial in a family tomb.

Pardon my question, but does the rather detailed evidence cited here not seem to lack information concerning a crossbar for the arms? Is there anything there that might clash with the thought that the man was nailed to a *stake*? And anyway would the specific form of cruel device on which this particular individual died be necessarily the same as that on which Yahusha was put to death nearly 40 years earlier? The evidence is merely that this individual, one of many thousands known to have been executed in various ways by the

Romans, was executed on a stake or (less likely) a cross, not that Yahusha was *not* empaled.

2. Admittedly Jerome was a bit later than the period we are focussing on, but because of his importance as the earliest translator of a non-Greek version that had enormous influence and lasting-power, his example needs to be noted in this study, if only because he knew “what would fly” with his sponsors and readership at the time. (In many ways he was an excellent translator, and certainly there was a strong grass-roots tradition he would have been aware of, that the Romans *did* in fact use a “proper” cross to execute the Messiah. To me it seems he esteemed the tradition more highly than being word-faithful to the TNK.) But how about some earlier gentlemen? Certainly, let’s see how they dealt with the freely-admitted fact that Moses’ right-hand man, known to many of us as “Joshua the son of Nun”, had **exactly the same Hebrew name as our Saviour**, many, many centuries before there was a Greek or a Roman sandal treading the soil of Canaan. Would they concede then that haMashiach should then also be known by that Hebrew name, which should unquestionably appear numerous times in the Old Testament text and particularly as the name of the book attributed to Nun’s son? No, quite blatantly they turn it around and say in effect “because we want to say the name of the Son of Man was [J-s-s], we will also say that the name of the son of Nun was [J-s-s]”, an anachronism so breathtaking that it knocks away all sympathy for those who want to insist that haMashiach *was* in fact called “[J-s-s]” by His parents, family and friends. I bring you the following quote (perhaps 150CE) from Justin Martyr against whom I have already taken up cudgels (but Barnabas and Irenaeus say similar things, even as early as about 100CE):

Moreover, in the book of Exodus we have also perceived that the name of God Himself which, He says, was not revealed to Abraham or to Jacob, was [J-s-s], and was declared mysteriously through Moses. Thus it is written: "And the Lord spoke to Moses, Say to this people, 'Look, I send My angel before thy face, to keep you in the way, to bring you into the land which I have prepared for you. Give heed to Him, and obey Him; do not disobey Him. For He will not draw back from you; for My name is in Him.' " (4) *Now understand that He who led your fathers into the land is called by this name [J-s-s], and first called Auses (Oshea). For if you shall understand this, you shall likewise perceive that the name of Him who said to Moses, "for My name is in Him," was [J-s-s]. For, indeed, He was also called Israel, and Jacob's name was changed to this also. Now Isaiah shows that those prophets who are sent to publish tidings from God are called His angels and apostles. For Isaiah says in a certain place, "Send me." (6) And that the prophet whose name was changed, [J-s-s] (Joshua), was strong and great, is manifest to all. If, then, we know that God revealed Himself in so many forms to Abraham, and to Jacob, and to Moses, how are we at a loss, and do not believe that, according to the will of the Father of all things, it was possible for Him to be born man of the Virgin, especially after we have such (7) Scriptures, from which it can be plainly perceived that He became so according to the will of the Father?*

What he is saying then, is that *in the OT the Almighty was constrained to use that inadequate Hebrew language to provide a name for Moses' successor, which we enlightened people are free to change to a Greekish name because even the Almighty felt free to change Jacob's (actually, Ya'acov's) name to another name.* Of course, Justin cannot claim that Ya'acov's new name was a Greek one, “Isra’el” is about as Hebrew as they come, but as we have already seen he does not seem to be deterred by inconvenient facts. If a political spin is required, too bad if it is a full 180 degrees, Justin will make it happen.

Which is a great pity because Justin could have had the makings of a seriously good argument here, it just needs the replacement of “[J-s-s]” with the true Name *Yahusha*. So, dear reader, I am sure that you will note that Justin here is trying not merely to remove the Saviour’s true Name from the NT but also to impose that false Greek name on the TNK - as have so many after him. This looks terribly like arrogance born of the fact that already the Name has been edited out of the gospels and epistles that are being included in canons like Marcion’s.

(Perhaps I am coming across as inadequately respectful of Jerome. Let me redress the balance by quoting, again, the KJV translators in their Epistle and Dedicatorie to the 1611 Version:

There were also within a few hundred years after Christ translations many into the Latin tongue; for this tongue also was very fit to convey the Law and the Gospel by, because in those times very many countries of the West, yea, of the South, East, and North, spake or understood Latin, being made provinces to the Romans. But now the Latin translations were too many to be all good; for they were infinite: (Latini interpretes nullo modo numerari possunt, saith St. Augustine.) Again, they were not out of the Hebrew fountain, (we speak of the Latin translations of the Old Testament) but out of the Greek stream; therefore the Greek being not altogether clear, the Latin derived from it must needs be muddy. This moved St. Hierome, a most learned Father, and the best linguist without controversy of his age, or of any other that went before him, to undertake the translating of the Old Testament out of the very fountains themselves; which he performed with that evidence of great learning, judgment, industry, and faithfulness, that he hath for ever bound the Church unto him in a special remembrance and thankfulness.

But even *the best linguist without controversy of his age* is caught out in imprecise translations that pander to some expectations created by two or three centuries of poor translations and perpetuate them with a far greater impetus because of the great esteem attached to his name... it appears that King James' translators may have followed in the footsteps of the Jerome that they so greatly admired.)

3. The doctrine of the Trinity has been regarded as at the core of Christianity ever since the Council of Nicaea, about 325CE, when Arianism was rejected in favour of the Athanasian viewpoint. (This by the way was the same council, the same people, that prepared the constitutional way for putting an end to Sabbath observance by the believers, by imposing a Sun Day day of rest throughout the Roman Empire. Not good credentials at all.) However, this doctrine certainly didn't make many waves before that, which is strange when you think about it. Why not? It would have been the ideal point of repudiation by the Jewish Rabbis wishing to get rid of the Nazarene sect, it certainly is the major ideological point at which Christianity offends religious Jews today. And why didn't it puzzle the pagan theologians greatly?

In answer to the first, we have to say, I think, that the apostolic teachings did not come across to the Jews as being clearly trinitarian in the sense that Christians now see them in. The concept of the incarnation was quite strong, perhaps not exactly as we tend to see it, but there are ways of accommodating this within Jewish monotheism which do not require the trinitarian explanation. How about the pagans? A quick quote from Max Mitchell can give us some perspective:

The doctrine of the Trinity is pagan in origin. The concept of a triad in deity worship began in Babylon and was patterned on Nimrod, his wife Semiramis and their son Tammuz. Later cultures such as the Egyptians adopted this belief, which can be seen in their worship of Osiris, Isis and Horus.

Now of course you may wish to point out that a triad is not the same as a trinity, and therefore you disagree with the first sentence of the quote. Yes, but hold on there. The historically irreducible fact is that deity-triads are amazingly numerous in pre-Christian pagan religions, and when you remember that many different names could be and were given to the same deity, the difference from the Christian trinity concept becomes trite and trivial. (Tammuz, for example, was sometimes regarded as an incarnation of his father Nimrod.) Whether you think that the Christian trinity was a novel concept or not, you have to concede that pagan religions, not Judaism, not the TNK, not Torah, provided the conscious conceptual template for it. Therefore, if we are looking at ways in which the AC sources may have been tampered with in order to make them more acceptable to pagans rather than Jews, why, this has to be an area calling for our close scrutiny. And what do we find? Look, please, at Matthew 28:19, the verse that has sent many a Christian out onto the mission-field:

Matt 28:19

(KJV) Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost:

(The Scriptures '98) "Therefore, go and make taught ones of all the nations, immersing them in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Set-apart Spirit,

(YLT) having gone, then, disciple all the nations, (baptizing them--to the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit,

It has also stood proud as the clearest single reference, non-circumstantial evidence, of three Persons to be worshipped, three persons with but a single Name. So is the Greek text here reliable or not? Let's note the experience of the authoress of www.lebtahor.com when she started to inquire concerning this issue:

I first came across MaththiYahu [Matthew] 28:19, which stated, " Go, therefore, and make talmiydiym [students, disciples] of all the goyim [nations]; and immerse them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Ruach HaQodesh." Now this verse from the Peshitta seems to imply a listing of the three. The odd thing is, that Mark, Luke and Yahuchanan do not mention this at all. So in the Testimony, there was only one single reference. I then checked the Shem Tob version of Matthew. There is no reference to the Father, Son and Ruach HaQodesh, in that verse. No other verse in the NT, lists the Father, the Son and the Ruach HaQodesh.

Unfortunately the picture seems pretty clear, that the text has been altered to support the doctrine. Shades of Marcion! Her curiosity provoked, Kathryn Kern investigated further:

Then I began to look into the early church father writings. I could not find the word "trinity", until Tertullian. Tertullian (Quintus Septimus Florens Tertullianus) was born around 150 CE, in Carthage (Northern Africa). He became interested in Christianity when he was in Rome, but did not become a

convert (195), until he returned to Carthage. Tertullian believed that the son was lesser than the Father, in his earlier days, but after he left the Orthodox church, he joined a group called the Montanists. They stressed the "Holy Spirit" and prophecy. As a result, Tertullian then added the "Holy Spirit" and developed the Trinity (trinas), making the Holy Spirit, lesser than the Son.

Tertullian writes in Against Praxeas, Chapter XXXI, Retrograde Character of the Heresy of Praxeas. The Doctrine of the Blessed Trinity Constitutes the Great Difference Between Judaism and Christianity (my emphasis, BEF), "But, (this doctrine of yours bears a likeness) to the Jewish faith, of which this is the substance - so to believe in One God as to refuse to reckon the Son besides Him, and after the Son the Spirit. Now, what difference would there be between us and them, if there were not this distinction which you are for breaking down?"

The further into Church history you go, the use and frequency of trinity, increases, especially after the Council of Nicea. The Council of Nicea declared the Nicene Creed, in 325 CE, headed by the Roman Emperor Constantine...

So for something like 100-150 years at least, it would seem likely that Matthew's gospel gave no offence to the Jews on this particular doctrine of the trinity. (Indeed, while an Orthodox believer, Tertullian *believed that the son was lesser than the Father*, which would not have offended the Jews at all, and doesn't seem to have offended the Orthodox church, although it would certainly have offended most current trinitarians, and I am sure many readers of this document will be offended by my even remarking about this here.) Now it is the most abrasive of texts. What changed? The Jews or the text? How did it change? Why did it change?

Flavius Josephus was a renowned and largely respected Jewish historian in the second half of the 1st century CE. In his writings is a passage that some people interpret as meaning that Josephus was a believer in Jesus as divine (obviously a pre-condition, although not a sufficient condition, for the trinitarian belief). But you may read the following on the *Jews for Judaism* website:

*Josephus' alleged positive statement about Jesus is spurious. The attestation that Jesus was the Messiah, the suggestion that he was more than human, the acceptance of his resurrection and the affirmation that his activities were foretold by the Hebrew prophets is a third century Christian forgery. Origen (c. 280) explicitly states that Josephus "did not believe in Jesus as Christ" (Contra Celsum Book 1. 47). Eusebius (c. 324), however, does know of this passage (Ecclesiastical History 1. 11). Quoting from the Christian interpolated text of Josephus, Eusebius writes: "About the same time, there was a certain Jesus, a wise man, if indeed it is proper to call him a man. This was Christ. Pilate . . . inflicted the punishment of the cross upon him . . . [but] those who had been attached to him before did not, however, cease to love him: for he appeared to them alive again on the third day, according to the holy prophets, who declared these and innumerable other wonderful things respecting him" (Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History 1. 11). **Apparently, a change was made in the text during the interval between 280 C.E. and 324 C.E. whereby it was no longer obvious, as it was to Origen, that Josephus did not believe in Jesus.** (My emphasis).*

Can it be that Christians would have messed with the text of Josephus? Dr Ernest Martin, studying the question of the exact location in Jerusalem of the historical Temples, had to battle with an assertion in Josephus which pointed to the wrong position (and Josephus was actually with the Roman forces at the gates of Jerusalem in 70CE when Herod's Temple was broken down, so his account carries great weight) but turned out to be a false inclusion:

Of course, no one would think a decent and upright Christian would insert something into the text of Josephus that the Jewish priest/historian would never of himself stated. Oh? The fact is, brethren, that erroneous and mischievous statement got into the text of Josephus when our dear Christian copyists had control of the texts. This shows that they thought nothing of lying when it suited their purpose. As a matter of fact, look at the fallacious quote even in the New Testament itself found in I John 5:7 and 8. That part about the Trinity is a pure insertion by so-called pious Christians who wanted even the Scriptures to support the ridiculous Trinity doctrine that the Chalcedon bunch of ignoramuses promoted. These heretics were bold enough to try to enter the doctrine into the very text of the Holy Scriptures. Their plan did not work in the long run. Though you find the spurious and inserted text in our King James Version, it is accepted by all modern scholars that the part about the so-called Trinity of the Nicene and Chalcedon conclusions is pure fabrication and in no way should it be in the text of the New Testament. Neither should the bit about Mount Zion being on the southwest hill in Jerusalem be accepted (and it is NOT) by anyone with common sense.

If you look carefully at the last quoted version from Matt 28:19 above, from YLT, you'll note an opening parenthesis before *baptizing*, which is not closed in the quote. The closure comes a little later, in verse 20, and it would appear that the punctilious Dr Young was marking out those several words as being a possibly dubious inclusion.)

Second in the lineup of trinity proofs is what Dr Martin refers to - **1John 5:7,8: because three are who are testifying in the heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit, and these--the three--are one; and three are who are testifying in the earth, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood, and the three are into the one.** I've taken this quote from Young's Literal Translation. Robert Young compiled an *Analytical Concordance* of words used in the TNK and AC (he did call them the Old and New Testaments) which is preferred to Strong's by some students, and he produced a valuable and meticulous translation of the entire Scriptures called *Young's Literal Translation*, a most handy study aid even today although the English of more than a hundred years ago is rather dated now. It is very close to being a word-for-word translation (of the Textus Receptus, for those who would like to down this comment as being based on a controversial Greek base like Westcott and Hort), and very occasionally does Young include (in light italic text) a word not in the Greek source but needed in order to make sense in the target language of English.

What you see in the above quote from 1 John 5 is a most exceptional deviation from the standards of his generally upright translation: almost an entire verse clearly inserted reluctantly - not warranted by the best early texts but found in less trustworthy texts - in order to make sense (to a trinitarian reader familiar with, e.g., the KJV, that is). And this was not some new thought by Dr Young in the late 1800s, it was apparently the experience too of Desiderius Erasmus in the early 1500s: In his 1516 edition of the Greek AC, *the first available printed version*, the (equivalent of the) light text is absent, in his 1522 edition it is added. Why? It seems he came under a lot of pressure in those 6 years to add it, and responded "*If you can find a Greek manuscript with that content, I'll publish it*". It looks from here as though only one such manuscript could be found, but it was found, dating from only about 200 years earlier, and Erasmus capitulated, much against the weight of the evidence. Hardly confidence-inspiring. (Erasmus' 1522 Greek edition became a main pillar of umpteen influential translations into e.g. European languages, including English, as would-be translators looked for a convenient compact Greek source to translate *from*.)

I am not here addressing the question of whether the doctrine of the Trinity is true or false, that's a massive study that I plan to undertake when I am prepared for it. Here we are looking at *tampering*, and I am simply pointing out that whatever *you* may think the Scriptures say on the topic, it was never consciously formulated in the recorded sayings or writings of the Apostles or even of Yahusha Himself, instead it took until nearly 200CE before people started writing about a Christian Trinity and after that it took a fair bit of meddling with texts sacred and secular to make the point stick with most seekers after truth; but for the sake of a preferred doctrine, particularly a doctrine that would distinguish the Christians from the Jews, that meddling was undertaken.

4. For a brief sample of other instances of tampering, read on:

John 19:40, "They took the body of Christ" to "they took the body of God"
 Luke 2:26 changed to "Christ, namely God." Old Latin ff
 Luke 9:20 "the Christ of God" changed to "Christ, God" Coptic
 Mark 3:11 "You are the Son of God" changed to "You are God, the Son of God." MS69
 Luke 7:9 "when Jesus heard this" changed to "when God heard this" 124
 Luke 8:28 "Jesus, Son of the highest God" changed to "Jesus, the highest God" 2766
 Luke 20:42 "the lord said to my lord" changed to "God said to my God" Persian Diatesseron
 2 Peter 1:2 changed to "in the knowledge of God, our Lord Jesus" P72
 Jude 5 changed to "Jesus" or "the God Christ" who saved the people from Egypt P72
 Gal 2:2 "Son of God" changed to "God the Son" MS1985
 Acts 20:28 "church of God" changed to "church of the Lord" or "church of the Lord and God" various
 1 Cor 10:5, "God was not well pleased: for they were overthrown in the wilderness" changed to "Christ" MS81
 Rom 14:10, "we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of God." changed to "judgment-seat of Christ" 048, 0209 Byz etc
 Matt 24:36, "But of that day and hour knoweth no one, not even the angels of heaven, neither the Son, but the Father only." The Byz mss omit "neither the Son." Interestingly, the Codex Sinaiticus originally had "neither the Son", but [it] was removed by a later scribe...and then was restored by yet another scribe.

All this may be distressing, but it is not new; back in Jeremiah's time, the prophet had to take issue with some people who thought they were wiser than the Author of the Scriptures:

Jer 8:8 "How do you say, 'We are wise, and the Torah of יהוה is with us'? But look, the false pen of the scribe has worked falsehood.

Jer 8:9 "The wise shall be put to shame, they shall be broken down and caught. See, they have

rejected the Word of יהוה, so what wisdom do they have?

The self-termed *wise* were relying on versions of the Torah which had been corrupted by the *false* (or lying) *pen of the scribe*. The point of this is, by accepting a false rendition, *they have rejected the Word of יהוה, so what wisdom do they have?* The rules were quite clear, every new king of Yisra'el/Yehudah had to make his own personal copy of the Torah and keep it with him so that he could rule the nation in terms of the laws written there. It appears that some of them may have contracted this rather onerous task out to the professionals (and indeed some of the kings were too young to read, let alone write, when their reign began) and who knows what slants may have been introduced by the paid lackeys with or without the connivance of the new ruler. However it may be, it seems that the people commissioning these copyists did not exercise adequate quality control on the products they were paying very high prices for. The result was that they were deprived of wisdom because they had not regarded it highly enough to take the trouble to ensure that their copies were faithful to the originals. What a challenge to us, who are surrounded by a multitude of translations to suit every taste, but extremely few of them apparently trying to hew absolutely as closely as possible to the originals! A slap in the face, perhaps, to the KJV translators in their rather relaxed attitude to quality (as appears in the quote above); basically they themselves were saying *any translation is better than no translation and we've just been trying to improve an already good translation*.

For some examples of blatant Christian mistranslations, whether of the TNK itself or of TNK quotes in the AC, read on:

ISAIAH 9:6 Hebrew version: *"For unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given, and the Government is upon his shoulder. And; The Wonderful Counsellor, Mighty Strong, Everlasting Father; He called his name 'PRINCE OF PEACE'"*. The KJV is far from alone in misrepresenting this as *"and he shall be called"*, and attributing the qualities and nature of YHWH to the Messiah, instead of making it clear that it was the Everlasting Father Who called His Son's name "Prince of Peace". Guess which side of the Trinitarian controversy this automatically favours in most people's minds?

2 SAMUEL 21:19 Hebrew version: *"And there was again war with the Philistines at Gob; and Elhanan the son of Jaare-oregim the Beth-lehemite slew Goliath the Gittite, the staff of whose spear was like a weaver's beam."* For some strange reason, the translators almost invariably insert *the brother of* before Goliath. Read around this verse, you'll see that this Goliath was one of the four sons of Goliath of Gath whom the young Dawid famously slew with his sling. I don't know and can't guess at the motivation for this corrupt translation, but there it is. (Young to his credit again puts it in faint print to indicate it is not in the original. The Scriptures simply omit it.)

ISAIAH 8:14 Hebrew version: *"And it will be for a sanctuary and for a stone of stumbling and for a rock of offense to both the houses of Yisrael, for a trap and for a snare to the inhabitants of Yerushalem"*. To assess the impact of the corruption in for example the KJV, one needs to see it in full: *"And he shall be for a sanctuary; but for a stone of stumbling and for a rock of offense to both the houses of Israel, for a gin and for a snare to the inhabitants of Jerusalem"* This is not an easy passage to interpret even from a strict translation, the "it" could be referring to a number of possible subjects raised in the preceding verses, quite possibly the oncoming invasion by Assyria, but it is totally gratuitous to replace this impersonal pronoun with the personal pronoun "he" and turn this into an anti-semitic proof-prophecy. The conjunction "but" should be "and".

ISAIAH 28:16 The Scriptures version: *Therefore thus said the Master יהוה, "See, I am laying in Tsiyon a stone for a foundation, a tried stone, a precious corner-stone, a settled foundation. He who trusts shall not hasten away.* In Romans 9:33 Paul is represented as totally misquoting this, a typical (well, for its honesty, YLT is not quite typical) translation from the Greek AC reads *according as it hath been written, 'Lo, I place in Sion a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence; and every one who is believing thereon shall not be ashamed.'* A careful check on the TNK reveals no other possible sources for this quote. Either Sha'ul quoted it properly from the Hebrew, and the translators into Greek had a field day getting it wrong, or Sha'ul got it spectacularly wrong himself. Peter got it right in 1 Peter 2:6.

JEREMIAH 9:23 The Scriptures version: *Thus said יהוה, "Let not the wise boast in his wisdom, let not the mighty boast in his might, nor let the rich boast in his riches, Jer 9:24 but let him who boasts boast of this, that he understands and knows Me, that I am יהוה, doing kindness, right-ruling, and righteousness in the earth. For in these I delight," declares יהוה* This thought is not quite repeated in 1 Cor 1:31: *that, as it has been written, "He who boasts, let him boast in יהוה."* In fact, it is rather distorted, giving rise to a similar comment as the previous example generated.

PSALM 14:1 *The Scriptures version: The fool has said in his heart, "There is no יהוה."* They have done corruptly, They have done an abominable deed, There is no one who does good." This verse is quoted in Romans 3:10: *As it has been written, "There is none righteous, no, not one!"* (The next verses make it clear that the quote is from Ps 14...) Again we have to ask, why the discrepancy, why a significant shift in meaning, particularly since the Romans 3:10 sentiment - as it stands - contradicts the assessment of other scriptures, including Yahusha's own words in e.g. Matt 13:17 and Matt 23:35, and oddly even Psalm 14:5, as well as various AC people, of persons being righteous.

HABUKKUK 2:4 *The Scriptures version: the righteous one lives by his steadfastness.* What we find in Romans 1:17 is significantly different: *as it has been written, "But the righteous shall live by belief."* There is undoubtedly a major difference between the Hebrew thought of *stedfastness* and the intellectual Greek concept of *belief*, one which the translators of The Scriptures were undoubtedly sensitive to, but were obliged to reflect by the Greek word used there. Consider also the significance of omitting the *his* in Romans. A similar problem with this reference is found in Galatians 3:11,12.

MATTHEW 1:22 and 23 (KJV): *Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us"* Why this is brought into the announcement to Yosef is puzzling because it was in direct conflict with the instruction of the preceding verse, and the obedient action in the subsequent verse, i.e. to name the child Yahusha. We don't have any records of AC people actually calling Him by the name *Emmanuel* or *Immanuel*. Historically, *Immanuel* was indeed the name that was given to the prophet Isaiah's son, and the purpose of this was to give King Ahaz a very short window of opportunity before judgement from the north came knocking on Judah's door. Read Isaiah 7. YHWH had instructed Ahaz to ask a sign of Him, *his Mighty One*, a miraculous indication of His protection, and Ahaz had rather arrogantly said, *No, well, we're fine, I don't need to bother you for a sign, El is with us thank you very much.* To which YHWH responded sarcastically, if I may interpret, *Right, you don't want a sign, you don't want to me show my protection of you, you don't want to declare your dependence on Me, well, I'm giving you a sign nevertheless. A virgin shall conceive and bear a son who will be given the name your very Laodicean attitude is implying, and you know what? Before the babe is old enough to prefer yummy food over baby mush the judgement on your lack of submission/faith/dependence will be on you. Oh, and by the way, when he does get to that stage, he will be able to distinguish between good and evil. Which is more than you've achieved in spite of your age and privilege.* You need to read this in the further context of Isaiah 8, and 2 Kings 16, and, for more detail, 2 Chronicles 28.

{This leaves us of course with the question of *why* the birth of Yahusha is then regarded as fulfilment of the Isaiahic prophecy, if it was not to stick the "Immanuel" label on the new baby as His actual name. Can we regard the Isaiah-Immanuel situation as being prophetic of the Yoseph-Yahusha situation in a functional kind of way, namely that the birth of Yahusha, clearly proclaimed to be "King of the Jews", was intended (amongst many other things, of course) to be a warning sign to Herod not to follow in Ahaz' smug satisfaction but to get real in a hurry and learn the difference between right and wrong? Of course we all know how Herod reacted to the challenge! I think this is a reasonable interpretation of the Isaiah prophecy.}

5. Having looked at Josephus for examples of the kind of tampering that took place, surely we can also look at something a little earlier and a little closer to the Scriptures: the *Apocrypha*, and specifically the books of 1 Maccabees and 2 Maccabees. These two books relate aspects of the Hasmonean revolution, in about 160BCE, that succeeded in throwing off the perverted Greek rule of Antiochus Epiphanes who was intent on breaking down and eradicating any teaching or practice of *Torah* amongst the Jews, and on establishing in its place the empire-wide standard Greek religion (in its widest sense, including all sorts of cultural behaviours which would not cause an eyebrow to be raised across most of the Western Christian world as I write). So they fall into the so-called "silent centuries" between Malachi and Matthew, silent because the canonists have decided that the contents of books like 1&2 Maccabees were not inspired. But it was not always thus, these two books (and some others) were regarded highly by sections of the early church, and they were not definitively discarded until Jerome (again!) left them out of his translation of the entire Bible into Latin around 400CE. He called them *libri ecclesiastici* rather than *libri canonici*.

What historical light do we have on our question from the Maccabean books, without needing to decide whether they were inspired or not? Several interesting things... First, although the originals were (not surprisingly, and quite undisputedly) written in Hebrew, certainly not in the hated Greek! yet the Hebrew originals or early Hebrew copies from before or during the Ante-Nicene period are totally missing, all that we have is a Greek version. Let me quote from *The Anchor Bible Dictionary, Vol. 4, David Noel Freedman, Editor-in-Chief, Doubleday, New York, item "Maccabees, Books of", p.440*: "1 Maccabees was originally composed in Hebrew, as both Origen and Jerome attest [*several references given*]. The only surviving text is a Greek

version containing many Hebraisms and translation errors [ref], as, for example, in 10:1: 'Alexander ... the Epiphanes.' The Greek documents are retroversions, not the *verbatim* transmitted originals."

The same source, on p439, says "Both 1 Maccabees and 2 Maccabees were regarded as more or less authoritative by the early Church (Abel and Starcky 1961:8)".

Now I have never heard of anyone alleging that there was a "conspiracy" aimed at destroying Hebrew copies of the Maccabean books and allowing only Greek translations to survive; but this is exactly what happened in fact, conspiracy or no conspiracy. The fact that there are no Hebrew manuscripts does not lead to people asserting that the originals were Greek, however. It is readily accepted that Hebrew originals and early versions perished during many centuries of anti-Jewish prejudice while Greek ones survived. This same consideration rarely seems to be extended, even in principle, to possible Hebrew originals of the AC. With books that are not regarded as canonical, it seems that the stakes are not so high for claiming a Greek provenance and denying the possibility of *Greek retroversions*. This on the word of only two ancient witnesses, whereas there are at least eight, some of them hostile witnesses, for a Hebrew original for Matthew's gospel.

6. Here is another example of direct tampering with the TNK itself by Christians: the organization and number of books in the canon. No, I am not talking now of the contents of the TNK, but how those contents are arranged and organized and internally related. When Ezra, back in Jerusalem, the Temple rebuilt, took on himself the obligation of supplying an authoritative full text of the TNK for the Temple repository, he drew up a canon of 22 books instead of "our" 39, arranged as first 5 books of the "Law" or Torah (the "T" of TNK), then all the 6 books of the Prophets or Nevi'im (the "N" of TNK), finally the 11 books of "Writings" or Ketub'im (the "K" of TNK). This was not merely a convenient grouping, it had great symbolic purposes.

- First, the "22" is very much a number of completeness; in terms of the Hebrew alphabet, with 22 letters, each book corresponds to one letter, a complete acrostic, signifying the completeness and perfection of the TNK - there were no more letters available for adding anything to it.
- Second, the three groups of books demonstrate a ranking or hierarchy of importance - first and foremost the Torah, then the prophets, and finally the, if you like, commentaries on and reactions to the Law and the Prophets.

Only 6 "prophets"? No, all the prophets were there, but our so-called Minor Prophets were incorporated into a single book, a consortium with a big impact, sitting on the same bench as Isaiah and Ezekiel, instead of being fragmented and scattered behind the wardrobe of Psalms, Proverbs and so forth. Why weren't they left like that? You tell me, otherwise I'll have to guess. And my guess is, that in order to make a place for the NT in the overall Bible, some people felt it was essential to break down the claim of the TNK to be complete, otherwise the NT might be repudiated. (For more details on the canonical issues, please refer to Dr Martin on *Restoring the Original Bible*.) Another desirable outcome would be to make the "Christian Old Testament" to appear significantly different from the Jewish TNK. Whatever the motive, the outcome is not in doubt: the Christians, not the Jews, tampered with the structure of the TNK and made it very, very difficult for us to learn some lessons that we should simply be imbibing with our mothers' milk. Would it surprise you to learn that this too was a corruption implemented by Jerome, that overly-influential translator into Latin?

(Quick aside: obviously this puts an interesting slant on Messiah's words in Matt 5:

17 "Do not think that I came to destroy the Torah or the Prophets. I did not come to destroy but to complete.

How could He complete what was already perfect and complete? His hearers must have wondered. Well, maybe by adding 27 books of AC to the 22 books of TNK, to bring about $49 = 7 \times 7$ books. 7 is the number of completion, and 7×7 is therefore an intensifier of the completeness... the TNK was complete at its own level, but Messiah added depth to it and brought about completeness in an additional dimension, a supercompleteness. On the other hand, $27 + 39 = 66$, which is merely an intensification of the number of Man, well on its way to becoming the number of the Antimesiah.)

Well, we have seen from different quarters how the "Early Church Fathers" after (and sometimes overlapping with) the apostles were at pains to reject any appearance of Jewishness. Have things improved significantly?

The difficulty with being an honest and exact translator of the Scriptures, true like Dr Young to your available sources, is of course that you will land up producing an “Old Testament” that refers liberally to YHWH (although Young, like a number of other translators of a hundred years ago, used the unhappy form *Jehovah*), not to “G-d”, and a “New Testament” that refers liberally to “G-d” and not to YHWH. With a glaring discrepancy like this, even your most unsophisticated readers might ask “Why this difference between Old and New?” and you would have to come up with some sort of explanation. (Unfortunately not many unsophisticated readers use YLT.)

Since you are translating for a target audience which for generations has been totally conditioned to expect “God” and “Jesus Christ” and you have umpteen previous translations setting a well-defined precedent out there in the marketplace, you take the broad road, hide the problem under some academic waffle about “traditional” or “familiar” in your Translators’ Preface and force the TNK to fit the AC, instead of the obviously more defensible route of saying “Well, the TNK was there first, and established the ground rules for everything that followed, and the text of the TNK is much better established than the scrappy evidence we have for the AC, so the only fair way to do this is to say we believe that the TNK has precedence textually over the AC and so we are making the AC fit the TNK. There is room for doubt that the original AC writings are properly represented in regard to the Tetragrammaton in the source manuscripts that we have available, but there is not the same room for doubt about the TNK sources. Most logical would be to have the AC follow the example set in the TNK.”

Doubt about your source documents is not widely encouraged in Christianity, and possibly would not go down well with the buying public. But doubt there is room for, and it would be better to handle it openly and on a balance of probabilities than to cover it with a thick swath of tradition.

(In the early centuries of the Common Era, when many believers were familiar with Hebrew and the Septuagint version of the TNK was relatively widely available, and a strong precedent had not yet formed, the strategy appears to have been a little different: forbid and disparage the “Old Testament”, identify it with the “Jews” and establish the maximum difference possible between Jews and, what shall we call ourselves, we may as well go with “Christians”. Of course, this strategy hasn’t entirely outlived its usefulness even in our day.)

Or else you should be as bold as Marcion and say, “I do not believe that these two sets of writings are referring to the same Mighty One, so different names are appropriate”.

So our investigation must take another look at the basic issue: are the AC and the TNK actually telling us about the same Mighty One, or was Marcion perhaps right after all? Are the AC and the TNK on an equal footing of inspiration, or is one to be regarded more highly than the other?

Option 7: The AC is just commentary, wonderful not inspired, its terminology not above suspicion (*Canonicity*)

Related Query: Could Marcion have been right? Or are the TNK and the AC not equally inspired?

Marcion felt that you could not and should not worship the Mighty One of the TNK because of His violent and punitive nature (Marcion’s view!). Instead, he wanted a Mighty One that was much more sympathetic and loving, and he compiled a “New Testament” of heavily edited Gospels and Pauline Epistles showing just that kind of Mighty One being revealed in Jesus Christ (his terms, transliterated into English), getting as far away as he could from Judaism.

We now have to face the crunch, or several crunches actually: (i) was he right? Should we turn our backs on the TNK Mighty One and find one more suited to our preferences? (ii) if he was right, should we still drag around this heavy and irrelevant Old Testament in front of our beloved New Testament? (Many Christians don’t bother, you know.) (iii) if he was wrong, should we still respect this Apostolic Commentary bursting out from over 400 years of silence after the completion of the TNK which on its own is sufficient?

(Clearly, (ii) and (iii) between them cover the possibilities of the TNK and AC being not equally inspired.)

To give him his due, as far as I know Marcion didn’t directly deny the truth of the TNK, he merely made that truth

irrelevant for (and I quote directly from Paul as translated in the KJV, as this is appropriate) *all who will live godly in Christ Jesus*. And this unquestionably is how many Christians live their lives, regarding the TNK as effectively irrelevant. After all, it talks of issues like creation and ancient Jewish history that are neither here nor there for us today, are they, it goes on and on about a Law that is impossible to keep and which just gets in the way of saving faith and a life of dependence on the Spirit that brings life rather than on the letter that kills. And it's full of lists of names and obscure prophecies that no one can make head or tail of. Who needs it, we're New Testament Christians! It needs a big red stamp that says *Of historical interest only*. It records a Plan A that failed, and Plan B is so much better, thank you, that there's not much practical value in digging around in the dusty archives of Plan A.

The trouble with that attitude, apart from being quite wrong on each point, is that while the TNK can cope without the AC, the AC cannot exist or be meaningful in the absence of the TNK. Yes, you can get away without the TNK for a few generations, you can live in terms of a TNK-sparse interpretation of the AC if you don't much worry about what the Scripture says, but the result is a degenerative slide of morals and ethics, a shift into hedonistic paganism, as the believers forget or never realise that the *purpose* of YHWH's favour expressed through Yahusha haMashiach and His substitutionary death is **Torah-obedient living**, a doctrine which is to be found all over the AC if you will but open your eyes to it. This pattern has recurred numerous times in church history right from Day One, the "New Testament Church" (there wasn't one initially, it was the Nazarene sect of the Judaism of the Apostolic era, "churches" came much later) had by the middle of the second century already become almost unrecognizable with the help of anti-TNK leaders like Marcion, Irenaeus and Ignatius, as Daniel Botkin reminds us:

"What happened during this time? Obviously, it was a time of many heresies. The Church Fathers come on the scene in the second century to tell us vociferously who the heretics were and where the 'orthodox Church' was. These men (may I, B.E.F., make this clear: the author is referring here to the Church Fathers specifically) claimed to be the followers of the apostles, but their theology was different and seemed to blend Hellenistic philosophy and Babylonian religious custom with Christianity.

So if the TNK is essential and inspired, is the AC or isn't it? Is the AC merely commentary, or does it bring new revelation, and if it does, does that new revelation countermand anything the TNK tells us?

Well, this surely is an enormous topic and I'm not going to do detailed justice to it here. I do want to highlight a few significant points though.

First, the TNK is in a way incomplete. Although it is sufficient *to make you wise unto salvation*, it is full of prophecies and promises which still needed to be fulfilled at the time when its last book had been written - and many of them *still* await fulfilment. Thus there *is* a sense in which a further revelation was - and is - required for completeness' sake. For example, the *how* of salvation is not entirely clear to all readers of the TNK, just as the *how* of the Messiah's Return and Millennial reign is not entirely clear to all readers of the AC (particularly if they neglect the TNK).

Second, although the AC is *not necessary* for salvation (and that is what Sha'ul very plainly says to Timothy), it or something similar *is* essential for us to know what YHWH did historically, in time and space, at the point when the promised Messiah was, in terms of the TNK prophecies, due to come. Did He follow through on His TNK promises or didn't He? Did He allow His Chosen One to *see corruption* or did He free Him from the bonds of death? During the Apostolic Era there were eye-witnesses, many of them, to the facts. While they were alive, they could tell the enquirers and the sceptical, *What was from the beginning, what we have heard, what we have seen with our eyes, what we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, concerning the Word of life: And the life was manifested, and we have seen, and bear witness, and announce to you that everlasting life which was with the Father and was manifested to us. We announce to you what we have seen and heard, so that you too might have fellowship with us. And truly our fellowship is with the Father and with His Son* יְהוֹשֻׁעַ Messiah. Do we, many years later, need to hear the same things? Yes, of course, although not for our salvation, but certainly for our understanding, for our *halachah*, our walk. (It may puzzle you that I say that hearing the AC is not necessary for salvation. Elsewhere I have written extensively - although not as extensively as the Scriptures - about *emunah* (sometimes translated *faith* because of the scrawny Greek vocabulary forcing the fuzzy use of *pistis*), through which we are saved by grace. It is far too big a topic to go into here, suffice it to say that it clarifies how we may expect to see the TNK-faithful in the company of the redeemed. And please note that we are *not* saved by faith, it is **by grace** you are saved, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of the Mighty One.

Also, we need to hear these same things so that we distinguish between prophecy already fulfilled and prophecy awaiting fulfilment. And so that we may give better-informed praise and esteem to the Father and to His Son.

Undoubtedly these testimonies and teachings and expositions needed to be recorded in written form to persist down the centuries. Without the AC, we would join the Ethiopian in asking *about whom does the prophet say this, about himself or about some other?* With it, Philip and the others bring to us *the Good News:* יְהוֹשֻׁעַ!

Further, the teachings of יהושע recorded in the AC are absolutely precious, sweeter than the honeycomb. As is the TNK. I haven't space to develop the reasons why we need AC and TNK both, please read Psalm 119 and let it speak to you as it speaks to me.

For the AC we must be grateful indeed, but to put it above or ahead of the TNK is a serious mistake. The AC bears witness to Yahusha benYoseph as the entire fulfilment of the Messianic prophecies (even though many still await fulfilment), but it is the TNK that contains the prophecies that bear witness to Him. Without the prophecies and the principles and the history of the TNK we would have a very unbalanced understanding of the role and purpose of haMashiach, and indeed this is exactly what prevails in so much of Christianity. Both the TNK and the AC are needed to validate and give depth to *the Good News*: יהושע!

Is the AC optional, nice-to-have-but-not-really-essential? It is essential for proper understanding and proper behaviour, and that means it is essential for maturity and fullness of faith, of *emunah*-faith. No way should we despise or undervalue the AC. It is no more an arbitrary canon than is the TNK. And there is a point here that needs to be highlighted. **The AC needs to be read in its fullness and in the context of the TNK lest it defeat itself.** One could read parts of the AC, especially if carefully shepherded by men who have been taught to promote a replacementist interpretation, and conclude - as so very many have done over the centuries, following in the mental footsteps of Marcion - that the Messiah came to preach and implement a gospel of salvation which implies salvation from the Torah of the TNK. Yet if one reads the AC in its fullness without prejudice, and seeks back into the TNK to find out what the concepts used in the AC mean, one is drawn irresistibly to the conclusion that haMashiach came to preach the gospel of the Kingdom of Elohim and to accomplish the righteous act of salvation in Phase I of the two-phase process of bringing about that very Kingdom globally, its rule spreading visibly and forcibly over the entirety of rebellious mankind in Phase II which will be the period often called the Millennium, bringing about massive changes in personal, familial, social, corporate, national and international behaviour in order to line all these things up exactly with the Torah that we see already laid down in the TNK and explicated in many ways in the AC. *The rule will go out from Yerushalayim.*

In short, yes, we do need the AC, but as a complement to, not a replacement for, the TNK. I believe that YHWH who inspired and gave us the TNK did so equally with a follow-up, which the AC as we now have it may well approach quite closely. Marcion did a corrupt thing for an evil reason, but it was the corruption of a good thing. Has the corruption been totally removed from the AC as we have it? No, I don't think so, I think the AC was and is still bent by men for their own purposes, and the absence of the Tetragrammaton from your Bible is prime but not sole evidence of this. Should we soon be blessed with discovery of the authentic AC autographs or true copies thereof, it would set the cat among the Jewish and Christian pigeons alike.

There is an interesting near-parallel with a great controversy that rocked the faith of many Christians toward the end of the 19th and early in the 20th centuries CE, namely the so-called Documentary Hypothesis, which challenged the authorship of the Pentateuch on the basis of the fact that in various portions of Genesis the Almighty is referred to by the roletitle *Elohim*, while in other places the Tetragrammaton is used to identify Him. Not distinguishing between a roletitle and a proper name, some scholars argued that the use of two different forms of address meant that there were different authors of different portions of the book, so that it could not have been the work of Moses as claimed, therefore the work contained a false claim, therefore it was spurious and untrustworthy and an unsuitable basis for faith and belief. Some readers of this paper will no doubt assert that I am introducing a similar obstacle to acceptance of the AC, but it is clear, I hope, that my assessment is nowhere near accomplishing that. It serves rather as a caution to read the AC most carefully in the light of the TNK, rather than put a mental block on everything in the TNK (including the Tetragrammaton) which does not seem to be supported in the AC as widely published in various forms and translations today.

Summary and Afterthoughts

When I started on a study reacting to some unnamed person's assessment of the work of the translators of the Jehovah's Witnesses' *New Word Translation* that I quoted in the introduction, I had not the faintest suspicion of the paths it would lead me down. I had in mind selecting a few crisp historical references which would be sufficient to raise a reasonable doubt in any unprejudiced reader's mind, a couple of evenings' work perhaps. But as I gathered more material, the question reformulated itself into a need to describe why so fundamental and unifying an issue as the identity of the One Who is to be worshipped is so thoroughly covered up by all those main branches of religion that claim to be worshipping Him on the basis of believing all or part of the Bible. This took me into some areas of history and Scripture that are often soft-pedalled or simply ignored, and required distinguishing between different motives for achieving the same effect.

Perhaps one could draw a parallel with the Sabbatarian issue: should we rest on the seventh day of the week, or hold the first to be holy? (And in fact we *should* draw a parallel - the Sabbatarian issue is the Fourth Commandment, the Tetragrammaton issue is the Third Commandment.) In a couple of pages, one can easily show from Scripture that the

seventh-day Shabbat is still to be observed by believers in YHWH's Messiah; but to answer the legitimate curiosity of someone who wants to know why it then has been almost entirely replaced in Christianity by "Sunday" takes the doctoral study of a Bacchiocchi. Likewise, to argue effectively that there is only one Name given in Scripture for us to know our Creator and Mighty One by can be achieved in a very short space; but it leaves the question of this study unanswered. Well, this is no doctoral dissertation and I am no Bacchiocchi, but I hope I have gone some way to explaining how and why the cover-up took place. It seems that Gerard Gertoux may have done for the Tetragrammaton what Samuele Bacchiocchi did for the Sabbath, but Gertoux's exhaustive book is currently inaccessible to me and I have done briefly what I could with the time and resources available that were available.

The fact is that there were and are many influential people who for their own reasons did not and do not want the Tetragrammaton to be widely known let alone used. (These people have probably unwittingly followed the example of the Tempter, the Deceiver, who in the Garden of Eden carefully steered Eve's attention away from the Creator's Name by confining the discussion to His role-title. Study Gen 3:1 thoughtfully...) It seems to have started with the Babylonian Exile (but it didn't affect Ezra as he wrote his own book and gathered together the canon of the TNK). Later, in the first century CE, Jewish leaders were trying to push the Messianic Nazarenes out of the stable and to close the door behind them. The Christians (note the Greek terminology?) were trying to maximise the apparent differences that Rome could see between them and the fractious Jews. The assemblies of believers were rapidly swamped with pagan converts, many of them deeply steeped in the principles and thinking of their paganism, who found it much more natural to view biblical truths through the kaleidoscopic allegorical prisms of their earlier beliefs than through the strict interpretive principles of the Nazarenes. It would be well to take note of Gertoux's comment in *Paradox of the Anonymous Name*:

The Christian translators (of heathen origin) not understanding Hebrew exchanged the Tetragram with Lord; Marcion in 140 C.E. even modified the expression «Let your Name be sanctified» into «Let your spirit be sanctified». On the other hand, some Christians (of Jewish origin) such as Symmachus kept the Tetragram written in Hebrew inside the Greek text (in 165). Eusebius clarified that Symmachus was an Ebionite, that is a Judeo-Christian, and that he had drafted a comment on Matthew's book (Ecclesiastical History VI:17). However, the Judeo-Christians were completely rejected after 135 of our era by the "Christians" as Jewish heretics.

Thus many colourful distortions of scriptural principles were brought in, and with them corresponding terminology, to dilute, subvert and eventually displace the real thing as Christianity developed its own distinct characteristics, many of them blatantly transgressing the boundaries of the faith laid down in scripture. (For a compact overview of many of these distortions, please read *Fossilized Customs* by Lew White, available in South Africa through the Institute for Scriptural Research, <http://www.isr-messianic.org/>)

Obviously this then raises the question of whether Christianity is Scriptural or not. It is easy to answer this, with a simple "No" based on many, many facts. What is not so easy is to say how critical this is to the life and faith of individual believers who are deeply within the embrace of the(?) Christian Church. (At the time of writing, approximately 34000 flavours/denominations/sects of Christianity have been identified, and it seems a bit presumptuous to speak of the Christian Church.) I have no right or desire to judge any servant of Another, I have my hands full judging myself, I am all too conscious of my own shortcomings and that in any process to short-list the great saints of the past and present I would probably not even make it as far as the preliminary rounds. So I do not and will not go around saying or even thinking "You, and you, and you - shape up and use the right Names or you are damned!" Nevertheless every believer has some obligations towards all those who claim to base their belief and walk on the Scriptures: Jude instructs us to *earnestly contend for the belief which was once for all delivered to the set-apart ones*.

If language means anything at all, this belief had already been delivered in its entirety by the time Jude wrote. If history means anything at all, probably Peter, Paul and John were still busy writing letters to the Messianic believers when Jude wrote his, most likely before 63CE - although the canonical order of the NT books, putting Jude second-last of all the books and just before Revelation which is admittedly very late in the historical sequence although probably not the very last, seems carefully organised to hide this from the normal reader who is not obsessive about getting things straightened out and in order. Even *Acts* was probably still unpublished when Jude wrote. Consequently he is here not putting a conscious seal on the New Testament canon, he is referring to a belief which has *already* been delivered, pointing in my mind to the revelation of the TNK with the apostolic insight added of *the Good News*: יהוה *haMashiach!* For this reason too I prefer to refer to the *Apostolic Commentary* rather than to the *New Testament*. (As the Jewish novelist and apologist Herman Wouk noted, there is the Torah, or five books of Moses, and everything else is commentary - which includes the Prophets and the Writings. It would not be unfair to refer to the Tanakh as consisting of the *Torah* or Pentateuch, the *Prophetic Commentary*, the *Historic/Literary Commentary* - and then see how easy it would be to slip in the *Apostolic Commentary*!) Any subsequent deviations, additions or subtractions in relation to the TNK must therefore be contended against, and this is what I have been doing in this study with particular regard to the fact that the Name of the Creator and Master of all, and Father of our Saviour Yahusha the Messiah, in English lettering "YHWH", has fallen into disuse. (Did it fall or was it pushed?) Such a radical shift, a neglect of the absolute foundation of the faith, goes far beyond the remit of any possible commentary, particularly since it has been done without any note or justification, and must attract most searching suspicion from you as a seeker after truth unless you are more than a little comfortable with the Marcionic proposition.

On a different track: in the process of writing and early dissemination of this pamphlet I have been able to read more about the Watchtower (Jehovah's Witnesses) perspectives regarding the Name(s), and it might interest readers to view a quotation or two from their own literature (I have only a couple of photocopied pages, without title or publishing data, perhaps a JW reading this might identify it for me):

Was the name Jehovah used by the inspired writers of the Christian Greek Scriptures?

Jerome, in the fourth century, wrote: "Matthew, who is also Levi, and who from a publican came to be an apostle, first of all composed a Gospel of Ch---t in Judaea in the Hebrew language and characters for the benefit of those of the circumcision who had believed." (*De viris illustribus*, chap. III) This Gospel includes 11 direct quotations of the Hebrew Scriptures where the Tetragrammaton is found. There is no reason to believe that Matthew did not quote the passages as they were written in the Hebrew text from which he quoted...

So far, so good. This makes sense, making it easy - all too easy - to believe that the following is just as trustworthy:

Which form of the divine name is correct - Jehovah or Yahweh?

No human today can be certain how it was originally pronounced in Hebrew. Why not? Biblical Hebrew was originally written with only consonants, no vowels. When the language was in everyday use, readers easily provided the proper vowels. In time, however, the Jews came to have the superstitious idea that it was wrong to say [G-d's] personal name out loud, so they used substitute expressions. Centuries later, Jewish scholars developed a system of points by which to indicate which vowels to use when reading ancient Hebrew, but they put the vowels for the *substitute expressions* around the four consonants representing the divine name. Thus the original pronunciation of the divine name was lost.

Many scholars favor the spelling "Yahweh," but it is uncertain and there is not agreement among them. On the other hand, "Jehovah" is the form of the name that is most readily recognized, because it has been used in English for centuries and preserves, equally with other forms, the four consonants of the Hebrew Tetragrammaton.

Note that emphasis on, that repetition of, *the four consonants* of the Hebrew Tetragrammaton? Warning: Here be smoke and mirrors! While it is correct that all 22 of the letters in the Hebrew alphabet are regularly consonants, and so the three different Hebrew letters (*yud, hei & waw*) used in the Tetragrammaton are consonants **in normal use, nevertheless in the Tetragrammaton they are not used as consonants, but as vowels** - there are a few Hebrew letters which have this characteristic of being used mainly to denote consonants, but on occasion (and actually, rather widely and often, in the right circumstances) as vowels, so it is not an aberrant usage of these letters, but quite a common one, predating the Masoretic scholars, the apostles, the Messiah, the prophets - by many centuries. This is so widely recognized that there is, as mentioned above, a special technical term for this double role of the letters: *matres lectionis*, or "mothers of learning" or "mothers of reading".

Is there any solid evidence for this assertion, that "YHWH" stands for four Hebrew vowel-sounds and no consonants at all? Certainly, and I will quote a couple of witnesses briefly from Gerard Gertoux, already mentioned in this document. While the translation from French may be a little sticky here and there, and I have made the odd modest correction for the sake of English readers, it is many orders better than any French I might try to produce:

The present Masoretic vowels are not the genuine vowels because they appeared only after 500 CE. Before this epoch, the Jews used a "mothers of reading" system (some consonants were used as vowels) to pronounce most of the proper names [my emphasis]. The writings from Qumran have shown that before the second century CE even usual words were vocalized owing to these special letters (mothers of reading, that is to say Y for the vowels I and E, W for O and U, and H for an A at the end of words), proving that the "mothers of reading" system was widely used. Judah Halevi wrote in his book The Kuzari (1140CE), that the letters of the Tetragram are used as vowels for any other words (furthermore Judah Halevi in The Kuzari IV:3 related that Y is used for I, W for O, and H for A). A long time before, in the first century, Flavius Josephus, a Jewish writer, had written that the Tetragram is written with four vowels (and not four consonants).

Flavius Josephus (37-100), who knew the priesthood of this time very well, clarified that when Romans attacked the Temple, the Jews called upon the fear-inspiring name of [G-d] (The Jewish War V:438), but he wrote of his refusal to give it his reader (The Jewish Antiquities II:275). However he gave some information of primary importance to rediscover the pronunciation he wanted to conceal. One can read indeed in the work The Jewish War the following remark: "The high priest had his head dressed with a tiara of fine linen embroidered with a purple border, and surrounded by another crown in gold which supported into relief the holy letters; these ones are four vowels." [My bolds] (The Jewish War V:235) This description is excellent;

moreover, it completes the one found in Exodus 28:36-39. However, as each one knows, there are no vowels in Hebrew, but only consonants. [My comment: this is French sarcasm at its most acidic!] Regrettably, instead of explaining this visible abnormality, certain commentators (influenced by the form Yahweh) misled the readers of Josephus by indicating that this reading was IAUE. Now it is evident that the “sacred letters” [denoting the Tetragram] were written in paleo-Hebrew, and not in Greek. Furthermore, in Hebrew these consonants Y, W, H are exactly used as vowels; they are moreover called *matres lectionis* “mothers of reading”. Qumran’s writings showed that in the first century Y as vowel served only to indicate sounds I and E, W served only for sounds Ö and U, and a H final served for the sound A. Furthermore, the H was used as vowel only at the end of words, and never inside of it (but between the two vowels the H is heard as a slight E). So, to read the name YHWH as four vowels, it is to read IHÖA that is IEÖA. [My note: Gertoux doesn't here show why he sidelines the alternative vocalization leUA.]

Well, I see I was side-tracked into discussing the pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton, in spite of my good intentions to limit myself to just using either the four Hebrew letters or the four English equivalents and to leave the reader to puzzle over the way to say it - a good question is always a good starting-point for real learning. But at this point it has become important, to make it clear that the NWT translators in my opinion have gone to a great deal of trouble to justify replacing the Greek term with a Tetragrammaton-based word, only to choose to use that one word which to my mind is about as far away in meaning, spelling and vocalization from the base as you can get while still doffing a hat to it. (Did I mention that in Hebrew, *hovah* means *disaster* or *calamity*?)

It should be perfectly clear, if you have been following the discussion so far, that there is at heart no difference between the rationale of the translators of the NWT and that of so many other more traditional English translations regarding actually putting the Tetragrammaton forward on virtually every page, where it belongs by right. If anything, the burden is greater on the NWT translators for correctly pointing out a most important problem with the regular translations, and then supplying a halfway solution which actually suffers from exactly the same deficiencies as it is supposed to correct; an approach which may be expected to deceive many of their readers after they accept it because it's not too unfamiliar. Scholarship has moved on since the founding and naming of the Jehovah's Witnesses movement, and one would hope that they would turn their backs on brand recognition in favour of a more accurate appellation.

(For the occasional reader who would really like to get a most insightful chronological summary, visit <http://digilander.libero.it/domingo7/Gertoux.htm> or Google for “PARADOX OF THE ANONYMOUS NAME ” coupled with “Gertoux”. Since 1991 Gertoux, a specialist on the Tetragrammaton, has been president of the Association Biblique de Recherche d’Anciens Manuscrits.)

To tidy up the question of where this all originated: for a long time I didn't know who was responsible for the quote which triggered this study. Eventually the trail led to Lynn Lundquist, an American politician and sometime Republican Speaker of the House in the State of Oregon. This caused me some surprise as American politicians do not often spring to mind as the most likely sources of long intricate text-critical studies on variant Scripture translations; but Lundquist does seem to be something of a polymath. However that may be, you can follow up his various works by Googling on “Lynn Lundquist”. In doing so you will probably come across the following link: <http://jehovah.to/exe/greek/tetragram.htm> which is well worth visiting by anyone wanting a far more detailed analysis of the whole issue than I have given here. A recent response from Heinz Schmitz to Lundquist's study, which I came across too late to integrate extensively into this paper, it has a wealth of references and highlights numerous interesting points, one of which is the degree to which the early *Christians* were involved in making so many changes, including removing the Tetragrammaton, in the copies *they* made of the LXX for the sake of their “Old Testament studies”, so much so that Origen remarked that Christians needed to try to persuade Jews to give or lend them copies of the LXX that *hadn't* been tampered with!

Schmitz's Jehovah's Witness affiliation comes through in this paper, but his breadth of background and his even-handedness shine through, while the responses from Lundquist are not very helpful, in my opinion at any rate. Perhaps I must reiterate here that I am holding no brief for the JW's or indeed any Christian or para-Christian denomination or sect, I am strictly interested in learning and obeying what YHWH has to teach me through His Torah, be it expressed in the text of the Scriptures, in the life-example of His Son Yahusha His Anointed One, or through the inner promptings of His Spirit of Set-apartness.

In this life-approach I see the Christian groups as having much to offer, far too much - most of it tending to deflect one's focus away from the primary injunction of two of the three great monotheistic religions: *Hear, o Isra'el, YHWH your Mighty One is one! And you shall love YHWH your Mighty One with all your heart, and with all your being, and with all your might.* Happily I will fellowship with and learn from anyone who will lower himself to learn alongside me at a very basic level, but I find that my requests for teaching, guidance and fellowship are usually repudiated by people who cannot understand how I got from where they are (and I was) to where I am now. I try to maintain the

attitude commanded in the AC:

Heb 12:14 Pursue peace with [or, amid] all, and pursue apartness without which no one shall see the Master.

As so often, the Greek loses something by comparison with Hebrew - instead of the rather indeterminate *irene* (*peace-irrespective*) of the Greek, one looks here for the vigorous, robust *shalom* of Hebrew, i.e. *peace-with-integrity, peace-with-15-dimensions*. The salvation that so much of Christianity takes as being the first and last word of the gospel, is in fact only the entrance fee, paid on our behalf, to authorize us to participate in the race that (probably) Paul talks of in that same 12th chapter of Hebrews:

Heb 12:1 We too, then, having so great a cloud of witnesses all around us, let us lay aside every weight and the sin which so easily entangles us, and let us run with endurance the race set before us,

Heb 12:2 looking to the Princely Leader and Perfecter of our belief, יְהוָה, who for the joy that was set before Him endured the stake, having despised the shame, and sat down at the right hand of the throne of Elohim.

So I invite Christians who are prepared to think to join me in the race set before us, the race of living out Torah, of living in Torah, of having Torah living in us. If some Christians are unwilling to start running, if they want to just lounge around in the mustering area, why, a certain natural apartness will develop as I stumble weakly and unimpressively along the course. The fact is that just to thoroughly implement the concept “*YHWH your Mighty One*” in one's heart, throughout one's being, and with even a bit of one's might, just to take up station on the starting line, is a greater challenge than many Christians seem prepared to face.

Without the imputed righteousness of the perfect Lamb of Elohim slain for my sake and yours on an execution-stake outside Jerusalem nearly 2000 years ago, without the presence of the Ruach of Set-apartness writing this principle on the fleshy tables of the heart, there would be no point in even moving up to the start-line.

Without debating the question of whether using pagan names to identify our Mighty One and our Saviour is sin or not... undoubtedly this practice is one of those “weights” that we need to lay aside if we want to run a good race, because the ambiguity they impose on their users leads inevitably to bad doctrine and thus to bad behaviour, bad running.

A large assertion to end with - but a good one for introducing a later series of studies which, if my heavenly Father, my Mighty One, YHWH, grants me the needed resources, I plan to tackle.

Say among all the nations: YHWH reigns! Basil Fernie

Copyright © Basil Fernie 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009