

End Note No. 3: The Divine Name

In Exodus 3:14-15 the Almighty clearly connects his name to the verb “to be”: “I make be what I make be” (אֶהְיֶה אֲשֶׁר אֶהְיֶה). “I make be has sent me unto you” (אֶהְיֶה שְׁלַחְנִי אֵלֵיכֶם). “Yăh^weh (he makes be)... has sent me unto you.” (יְהוָה...שְׁלַחְנִי אֵלֵיכֶם). The parallel statements demonstrate that *yăh^weh* is based on *’ah^weh*. The connection to the root היה and its alternate^a form הוה is most evident. Which conjugation of הוה does the divine name יהוה represent? All the conjugations end with הוּ. In the 3rd mas. singular only the Hiphil conjugation begins יְהִי which is in agreement with the separate short form of the name: יְהִי. Thus it is evident that the combination יְהוּה = הוּ + יְהִי. The consonant ה is lightly sounded and the accent on the end of the name reduces the long vowel in the separated short form to a patah.

Even if we suppose that Yăh^weh is in some way incorrect, there is no harm in calling him this precisely because this name has an honorable meaning which may be easily proven because it is the exact form of the 3rd person masculine singular of the Hiphil conjugation. If the Jews deemed other substitutions to have pious meaning, “Master,” (אֲדֹנָי) “The Name” (הַשֵּׁם) or “The Eternal” then there is no harm done in calling him “He makes become,” (יְהוּה) because his is the Creator. So in a worst case scenario, like I am totally wrong, and the Almighty informs me of this, it will turn out that saying Yăh^weh for the name is simply as good as any other meaningful substitution.

The divine name only differs from אֶהְיֶה in that he said “I make be” but we say “he makes be.” That is a one letter difference, א vs. י. *I* vs. *He*.

The only other popular forms “Jehovah” or “Yehovah” or “Yehowah”, etc. have no meaning in Hebrew. If these forms turn out to be incorrect, then there is no fall back defense that they are acceptable substitutions.

a Several verb roots share two forms the middle yod switching for a waw. For example the root for the verb live occurs in the form חִיָּה and חוּה. This explains how the name *Hawwah*, spelled with waw, is related to the verb live, spelled with yod. The change from י to ו appears in the common use of the participle form of the verb to be: הוּה.

b In the translation Yăh^weh is spelled without the hateph vowel. Though some explanation is needed about vocalizing the ה, it is less likely that the name will be mispronounced by someone who does not understand the use of the phonetic symbol. The key is to aspirate the letter, i.e. “eh” can sound only like “e” or it can sound “eh” with a puff of air on the h. In spoken language it is common that all sounds do not come across precisely as words are written.

There is, in fact, no verb conjugation of the verb ‘to be’ with a long qamets in the last syllable of the imperfect. The /o/ suggests a participle, but one would never conjugate a participle with a yod.

Since Yăh^awēh (יְהוָה) clearly does mean “He makes be,” then reading Gen. 2:4b, “In the day of He-măkes-be Almĭghty’s making earth and heavens...”^a can be no more incorrect than reading “In the day of Măster Almĭghty’s making earth and heavens...” It could be no more incorrect that putting “HaShem” or “The Eternal.” But, since the other substitutions are guaranteed not to remember the name, breaking the commandment, saying Yăh^awēh (יְהוָה) is the only way to have a chance at getting it right.

The first part of the divine name is apparent in the often used phrase *Hallelu Yah*.^b The short form of the name is *Yah*. Besides the Masoretic vowel pointing, the oral tradition of this commonly used short form may be regarded as a second witness. A third witness (see below) is the meaningful hiph’il verb conjugation.

Many Hebrew names end with *-yahu*, i.e. Ēli-yahu. Many of the same names also end with *-yah*. Other names begin with *Yeho-*. These are called theophoric names. Scholars are uncertain why the prefix forms change vowels to *Yeho-*, as question marks in the HALOT LEXICON show, but I suppose that piety was the reason. No one wanted a name beginning exactly like the divine name. A situation will arise where someone will call another person a bad name and thereby end up coming too close to cursing the name. Likewise, the full name was not used at the end of theophoric names.

We know for certain that the divine name was not *yehovah (or yehowah) as pointed in the Masoretic Text: יְהוָה or יְהוֹה as if that is what the Masoretes intended. If we suppose that יְהוָה represented the real vowels, then we would expect the Masoretes to prefix *to, and, as, in* to the name: לִיְהוָה or וְיְהוָה or בְּיְהוָה or בִּיְהוָה. This expectation is shown by the rule preventing double shewa. The prepositions and conjunction are

a This is equivalent to “In the day of the Creator Almighty’s making of earth and heavens...”

b See Exodus 15:2 where יהי appears as a separate name. Also *Halelu Yah* appears as two words: הַלְלֵי־יְהוָה. The Qamats (ֵ), instead of Paṯḥaḥ (ַ), appears *in pause* and because the accent falls on יהי. The Mappiq, which is the dot in ה, indicates that the ה is regarded as a consonant since occurring at the end of a word, ה is regarded as a vowel. This shows that יהי represents the initial two letters of the name: יְהוָה. The ending of the name is הַ, which is a vowel pronounced /eh/ i.e. /ey/ as in the word *they*. The Paṯḥaḥ (ַ) appears in the first part of the name because the accent falls on the end of the name: יהי (wēh). The accent also accounts for the /ay/ i.e. /e/ sound of the Segol (ֶ). Since the second letter of the name is actually a consonant, it takes a *hiataf pataḥ* (ֶ) in the hiph’il verb from which it is derived. This requires the letter to sound like an aspiration, i.e. it is not totally silent: yah^awēh. The /h^a/ may be pronounced by simply slowing the pronunciation of the name and blowing some air with the /h^a/.

ordinarily added to words as: לְ or וְ or כִּ or בִּ. If the word to which these prepositions are attached has a shewa in its first vowel, e.g. לְיִ, then the rule says this becomes: לִי־. If the word begins with a guttural letter having a hatef vowel, e.g. לְאֵי, then the rule says the non shewa part of the hatef vowel is used, e.g. לְאֵי. The rule is illustrated in the case of the name Yehoshua: יְהוֹשֻׁעַ. When a conjunction or a prepositional prefix is attached to the name Yehoshua, then it appears according to the rule as: וַיְהוֹשֻׁעַ or לְיְהוֹשֻׁעַ or בְּיְהוֹשֻׁעַ. See Exodus 24:13; Zech. 3:3; Deut. 31:7; Joshua 10:17; Zech. 3:6.

If the name was Yehovah, then the prefixing rule is not followed by the Masoretes. In other words, they break the rules. Because we do not find the forms that would be expected if this were the case: לְיְהוָה or וַיְהוָה or בְּיְהוָה or בְּיְהוָה. Rather we find: לְיְהוָה or וַיְהוָה or בְּיְהוָה or בְּיְהוָה. Why is this? This is because it is what we expect to find when the scribes have instructed the readers to say Adonai: אֲדֹנָי. This is because the rule says that the hataf patah changes to a patah, e.g. לְאֲדֹנָי or בְּאֲדֹנָי or וַאֲדֹנָי. See for example Gen. 18:30, 32; Psa. 73:28; Isa. 49:14.

The reason the Masoretes put יְהוָה instead of יְהוֹה was to prevent the reader from starting the name out saying Yah-. Also the holam is often left out as noted previously: יְהוָה. It is plainly evident that the divine name was not vowel pointed according to the standard phonetic rules, if it be supposed that the vowels were the actual correct vowels. In fact, if we suppose that the vowels are correct, then the rules to justify them are completely and utterly eclectic. The eclectic rules that would have to be supposed would be unique to the divine name. There would be no way to test or check on the work of the Masoretes. There would be no second witness. Therefore, from a scholarly point of view it is sheer arrogance to make the claim that “we know the name is Yehovah.” What is more, it is completely inconsistent with the evidence. Some times we see the form יְהוָה in the texts which is the Qere code for saying Elohim. If those vowels were real, then the reader would have to say Yehovih (or Yehowih). But they are not the real vowels. They are substitutions to indicate the saying of a substitution for the name.

It is often claimed that the vowels cannot be for Adōnai or Elohim because they are not exactly the vowels for those two words, but Jews have never been in the habit of reading exactly what the text says according to regular rules. They read it with special rules, and these special rules do not

require every vowel of Adōnai to be exactly represented in the text. Only one letter at the end is necessary to signal whether Adōnai (יְהוָה) or Elohim (אֱלֹהִים) should be substituted.

So what is the best explanation as to how the name was said? The divine name is based on the Hebrew verb “to be” of which there are two forms הוּהוּ, הִיָּה. The name is based on the הוּהוּ form, which in the imperfect 3ms Hiphil stem is: יְהוּהוּ. The normal Hiphil conjugation is pronounced *ya hə WeH*, where /ə/ is the a in about and /e/ is the e in they. In the divine name the middle vowel becomes almost silent, and it is sounded *yăh^hWeH*. It means “he makes be,” “he makes hapeen,” or “he creates.” The middle vowel is waw (not vav) because when it appears as a vowel it is pronounced /oo/, i.e. the u in Yahu is /oo/. When we put this into the verb pattern, it comes out *ya hə ooeh*, but when oo is followed by another vowel it hardens into a w and not a v. Try saying /wh/ words in English oo-at (what), oo-ere (where), and you will see how the vowel tries to change to w. But if you are German you will say ‘v’ for ‘w.’ A German will spell the word for “why” as “warum” but will say “varoom.” But if the German puts the u at the start of a word like *Uhrzeit* (time of day), i.e. ooh r zeit, it sounds almost w. This shows by demonstration that the English w is the natural consonant form of the u vowel. Consider a Hebrew name like עֲשָׂו. This is not Ḥsav. It is Ḥsau, i.e. Ḥsaw, because the waw is showing as a consonant in the Hebrew. The LXX translators knew this and so put Ησαυ. Likewise Δαυιδ for king David.

In Ex. 3:14, the Almighty says “I make be what I make be” (אֲהִיֶּה אֲשֶׁר אֲהִיֶּה), which points at יְהוּהוּ as the canonical^a form. One thing that we can be sure of, and that is anyone who says *Yah^hweh* can be assured that they are saying a Hebrew name that means “He makes happen,” and this is much closer to correct than substituting Adōnai or HaShem which mean ‘Lord’ and ‘the Name’ respectively. Therefore to call him *Yăhwēh* honors him as creator. The name means “He makes happen,” “He makes be.”

Without a doubt certain Jewish sects in the second Temple period believed the saying of the name should be banned. They were powerful enough to get their corrupt tradition inserted into the Greek translation of Lev. 24:16, “One naming the name of the Lord by death he shall be killed.” But the Hebrew says, “One blaspheming the name of Yăhwēh a dying he shall die.” Also they were powerful enough to restrict the saying of the name in the Temple to the high Priest. This tradition is based on falsehood, and violates Exodus 3:14, “This is my name for ever, and this is my memorial from generation to generation.” The traditional ban profanes the name by contradicting the divine intent. It is also inconceivable that Scripture would have the divine name thousands of times before a reader and for

a This is the actual conjugation from the verb table. The connection was recognized by W.F. Albright. The HALOT Lexicon recognizes ‘yahweh’ as correct in vol. 1, page 395, pub. 2001 by BRILL and states that ‘Jehovah’ (or Yehovah) is a known mistake of mixing the reading vowels for Adōnai with the consonants.

there to be such a harsh penalty for one who simply reads it aloud. We must also remember that the same tradition claims that a non-Jew who keeps *Ṣabbaḥ* is worthy of death. The only pertinent question for us is the extent of enforcement of this unlawful tradition in the first century. Despite the official position of some leaders, it is highly unlikely that they ever succeeded in punishing anyone with death. The greatest penalty seems to be the threat of the Qumran sect to ban members who said the name, and the reason this could be done was that their community was a social collective. It is likely that the divine name was said among those who knew the ban was unlawful were the freedom to do without so was possible without traditionalists casting an evil eye at anyone saying the name.

Whatever the degree of repression of the divine name, with which we who disagree with it are at times forced to endure, the Scriptures, including the Evangelists, always allow for, and look forward to the day when the holy name can be liberated from this illegal tradition. The original Hebrew Scripture never went along with inserting the wrong vowel points for the name. Also the original Evangelists, written in Greek, always allowed for using the divine name via *nomina sacra* markings for divine names. The divine name was indicated by ΚC in the texts and not **ΚΥΡΙΟΣ**. By putting ΚC the Evangelists were indicating that it is o.k. to read the divine name *Yāhweh* (or not to say the name if circumstances prevented it). By using coded text the writings of *Mēssiah* could be protected from the repression without actually endorsing the ban.

A similar marking for *Yēshua* is IC instead of **ΙΗΣΟΥΣ**. If the marking was not there, then we would have to suppose that the Greek *ee-ay-soos* was *Mēssiah*'s proper name. Also, ban supporters, who want to interpret ΚC to mean the *name* should only be understood but also suppressed are faced with the dilemma about what IC means. Are we to understand *Yēshua*, but then suppress it and say **ΙΗΣΟΥΣ** (*ee-ay-soos*)? By no means, but the coded text is meant to support the saying of his name. ΚC does not mean it means *Yāhweh* and then we are to read aloud Lord. Rather it means the name of the Lord is to be read. Likewise IC does not mean we are to say Jesus or *Ee-ay-soos* and ignore his Hebrew name. It is there to indicate we should say *Yēshua* or *Yēhoshua*.

Further, those who want to interpret the Greek texts as supporting the ban are begging the question. For they assume the text is the way it is to support the ban. Rather, the texts are the way they are to protect people from being hurt by the ban while allowing us to substitute the true names using the codes when it is safe to do so. If a person assumes the ban is valid because it is tradition then one interpretation results. But we know that the ban is invalid and based error, so the other interpretation must be true.

A person is free to read this translation with the name or with a substitution if his or her circumstances require it. By no means do I support the doctrine that saying the name is a magic wand imparting salvation. Neither is circumcision, nor baptism, nor believe once always saved doctrine.

These are all false doctrines, but the only true teaching is that Yāhweh is compassionate and merciful, forgiving our sins, yet by no means will he acquit the guilty. He loves those who love him and keep his commandments. Whoever confirms his loyalty to him will have everlasting life.

End Note No. 4: Gen. 1:2

NOUGHT AND NOTHING; END OF RUIN RECONSTRUCTION THEORY. Many versions translate *tohu* 'formless' or 'without form.' Some 'unformed' (JPS, CJB, ISV). The problem is that these translations do not work in other texts even though they might seem to make functional sense in Gen. 1:2. What makes sense in all the texts is 'nought' or 'nothingness.' *Vohu* is seldom used, and appears to be a near synonym of *tohu* chosen for its sound alike quality. The KJV 'without form and void' is functionally close, except that a void is an empty space. More probably water was in the empty space, so it would be better to describe the earth as nothing rather than the space to be occupied by the earth as empty. There happen to be two English words that meet the requirements, and as a bonus they sound alike: nought and nothing. Also nought and nothing work in the other texts. See below.

Some translations try to render the words "waste and wild" or "desolate and empty" as if the earth existed, but was simply unshaped, or a chaos, or had suffered a destruction. On the contrary, there is no reason to suppose anything except water existed at the beginning (cf. 2 Pet. 3:5) as 'void' (KJV) would suggest, albeit an empty space in the water. More likely an empty space is not being described, but an earth that is a *nothing* at that time, like the nations are nothing in the Almighty's sight.

The *tohu wavohu* (תהו ובהו) statement is analogous to saying one's house was *nought and nothing*, but that there were piles of lumber which a carpenter was inspecting, like the water over which the Spirit stood. As well as 2 Peter 3:5, the *waste and wild* of some^a translations is contradicted by the fact that creation was very good and sin had not entered creation.

Neither can such a translation be unambiguously sustained as supposed by mistranslation in some other passages, but Jer. 4:23, "I had looked at the land, and behold *nought* and *nothing*, and to the heavens, and no light of them." Isa. 34:11, "And he will have stretched over it a line of *nought* and stones of *nothing*." Isa. 29:21, "Then they make inclined unto *nought* the righteous." Isa. 59:4, "Trusting upon *nought*;" Isa. 49:4, "I have toiled for *nought*." "*He is stretching the north out over nought, hanging the earth over nothing.*" See *The Bibliotheca Sacra*, Volume 56, 1899, TOHU: A HISTORICAL AND EXEGETICAL STUDY OF ITS MEANING IN GENESIS I.2, pg. 165, C.B. WARRING.

Tohu and *vohu* have all the appearance of being synonyms that sound alike. The latter is only used three times in conjunction with *tohu*, already cited above. Additional uses of *tohu* alone occur: "He finds him in a land of

^a AMP, ASV, Darby, NLV, TLV, YLT, Rotherham.