



# *Sacred Name* **Sources**

**Sacred Names & Titles of Elohim  
Restored~Abomination Removed.**

*edited by k.m.young~*

**for Yahwist Disciples**



TARA'S LITTLE LEATHERETTE  
LIBRARY : **Resurrection Books**  
*for M&M's Mission-Star Net Ministry*  
**[www.immortality4free.name](http://www.immortality4free.name)**



*-editing Copyrighted (c) 2006-*

**reprints**

*gender friendly version*

*Behold the*  
**Eternal Star**  
*Who Guides Us*  
*Thru the Labyrinth,*  
*Beyond the Great Abyss,*  
*Past the Fiery Lake,*  
**Unto Paradise!**

What some trusted Experts  
(*in their various Historical Time Zones*)  
have to say about the  
Sacred Names & Titles of Elohim,  
(*for Yahwist Disciples*):

**Revised Standard Version Preface**

*Rotherham's Original Preface from the **Original Rotherham Emphasized Bible***

**Restoration of Original Rotherham's Emphasized** Sacred Name Bible: 1976-Preface Partial

**American Standard Version** (1901), by Thomas Nelson & Sons, pg. 4 of the "Preface."

**YHVH or YHWH?** (*summarized*) by Jacob Meyers

**Biblical Hebrew**~R.K. Harrison~1976: pub by David McKay Co.-NY-10017

*end, short quotes from:*

**American People's Encyclopedia.**

**Gesenius' Hebrew-English Lexicon**, (pgs 337-8)

**MacWhorter and Gesenius.**

**MacWhorter's "Memorial Name"** (1857)

**MacWhorter.**

**The Revised Standard Version**  
*is a traditionally biased (against Names) revision*  
*of the*  
**American Standard Version /1901**  
*which is an unbiased (against Name) though*  
*dated Revision of the traditionally biased*  
*(likewise, against Name)*  
**King James Version of 1611.**

**RSV Preface-Partial:** *(quote:)*

The Revised Standard Version of the Bible is an authorized revision of the American Standard Version (1901), which was a revision of the King James V.(1611).

The first English version of the Scriptures made by direct translation from the original Hebrew and Greek, and the first to be printed, was the work of **William Tyndale**. He met bitter opposition. He was accused [*by Romanists-ed.*] **of willfully perverting the meaning of the Scriptures**, and his New Testaments were ordered to be burned as “untrue translations.” He was finally betrayed into the hands of his [*Romanist-ed.*] enemies, and in October 1536, was publicly executed and **burned at the stake** [*by those same rascal Romanists-ed.*].

Yet Tyndales's work became the foundation of subsequent English versions, notably those of Coverdale/1535; Thomas Matthew (*John Rogers?*)-1537; the Great Bible-1539; the Geneva Bible-1560; and the Bishops' Bible-1568. In 1582 a translation of the New Testament, made from the Latin vulgate by Roman Catholic scholars, was published at Rheims.

The translators who made the King James Version, took into account all of these preceding versions, and comparison, shows that it owes something to each of them. It kept felicitous phrases and apt expressions, from whatever source, which had stood the test of public usage. It owed most, especially in the New Testament, to Tyndale.

The King James Version had to compete with the Geneva Bible in popular use; but in the end it prevailed, and for more than two and a half centuries, no other authorized translation of the Bible into English was made. The King James Version became the "Authorized Version of the English speaking peoples."

The King James Version has with good reason been termed "the noblest monument of English prose." Its revisers in 1881 (*E.R.V.*) expressed admiration for "its simplicity, its

dignity, it's power, it's happy turns of expression... the music of it's cadences, and the felicities of it's rhythm." It entered, as no other book has, into the making of the personal character and the public institutions of the English speaking peoples. We owe to it an incalculable debt.

Yet the KJV has grave defects [*i.e. like opportunistic insertions of some strategically placed pagan concepts and profanation of the Savior's true name, etc.-ed.*]. By the middle of the 19th century, the development of Biblical studies and the discovery of many manuscripts more ancient than those upon which the KJV was based, made it manifest that these defects are so many and so serious as to call for revision of the English translation. The task was undertaken, by authority of the Church of England, in 1870. The English Revised Version of the Bible was published in 1881-1885; and the American Standard Version, it's variant embodying the preferences of the American scholars associated in the work, was published in 1901.

Because of unhappy experience with unauthorized publications in the two decades between 1881-1901, which tampered with the text of the English Revised Version in the

supposed interest of the American public, the American Standard Version (ASV) was copyrighted, to protect the text from unauthorized changes. In 1928 this copyright was acquired by the International Council of Religious Education, and thus passed into the ownership of the (American Churches-Canadian) which were associated in this Council through their boards of education and publication.

The council [*did this & that, etc...*]. In the end the decision was reached that there is need for a thorough revision of the version of 1901 which will stay as close to the Tyndale-KJV as it can in the light of our present knowledge of the Hebrew and Greek texts and their meaning on the one hand, and our present understanding of English, on the other...

The publication of the RSV... was authorized by vote of the National Council of Churches [*Romanized Trinitarians: in spite of Tyndale's anti-Trinitarian witness--ed.*]....

The problem of establishing the correct Hebrew and Aramaic text of the O.T. is very different from the corresponding problem in the N.T. For the N.T, we have a large number of Greek manuscripts, preserving many variant

forms of the text. Some of them were made only two or three centuries later than the original composition of the books. For the O.T., only late manuscripts survive, all (except Dead Sea texts of Isaiah and Habakkuk/some fragments of other books) based on a standardized form of the text, established many centuries after the books were written. [*don't forget: Septuagint-ed.*].

The present revision is based on the consonantal Hebrew and Aramaic text as fixed early in the Christian era and revised by Jewish scholars (the Masoretes) of the sixth to ninth centuries. The vowel signs, which were added by the **Masoretes**, are accepted also in the main, but where a more probable and convincing reading can be obtained by assuming different vowels, this has been done. No notes are given in such cases [*herein*], **because the vowel points are less ancient and reliable than the consonants.**

Departures from the consonantal text of the best manuscripts have been made only where it seems clear that errors in copying had been made before the text was standardized. Most of the corrections adopted are based on the ancient versions (translations into Greek, Aramaic, Syriac [*Murdock's*], & Latin), which



were made before the time of the Masoretic revision and therefore reflect earlier forms of the text. In every such instance a foot-note specifies the version or versions from which the correction has been derived, and also gives a translation of the Masoretic Text.

Sometimes it is evident the text has suffered in transmission, but none of the versions provides a satisfactory restoration. Here we can only follow the best judgement of competent scholars as to the most probable reconstruction of the original text. Such corrections are indicated by the abbreviation **Cn**, and a translation of the Masoretic text is added.

The discovery of the meaning of the text, once the best readings have been established, is aided by many new resources for understanding the original languages [*of extant texts-ed.*]. Much progress has been made in the historical and comparative study of these languages. A vast quantity of writings in related Semitic languages, some of them only recently discovered, has greatly enlarged our knowledge of the vocabulary and grammar of Biblical Hebrew and Aramaic. Sometimes the present translation will be found to render a Hebrew

word in a sense quite different from that of the traditional interpretation. It has not been felt necessary in such cases to attach a footnote, because no change in the text is involved and it may be assumed that the new rendering was not adopted without convincing evidence. The analysis of religious texts from the ancient Near East has made clearer the significance of ideas and practices recorded in the O.T. Many difficulties and obscurities remain. Where the choice between two meanings is particularly difficult or doubtful, we have given an alternative rendering in a footnote. If in the judgment of the Committee the meaning of a passage is quite uncertain or obscure, either because of corruption in the text or because of the inadequacy of our present knowledge of the language, that fact is indicated by a note. [...*not all agree, minority views not noted, herein-ed.*].

**A major departure from the practice of the ASV is the rendering of the Divine Name [ יהוה ], the “Tetragrammaton.” The ASV used the term “Jehovah”; the KJV had employed this [*Jehovah*] in four places, but everywhere else, except in 3 cases where it was employed as part of a**

**proper name, used the English word LORD (or in certain cases, GOD) printed in capitals.** The present revision **returns** to the procedure of the KJV, which follows the precedent of the ancient Greek and Latin translators and the long established practice [*of corruption of the sacred Names-ed.*] in the reading of the Hebrew scriptures in the synagogue (the Jews traditionally using **Adonai**, since Babylonian Captivity). While it is almost if not quite certain that the Name was originally pronounced “**Yahweh**,” this pronunciation was not indicated when the Masoretes added vowel signs to the consonantal Hebrew text. To the four consonants “YHWH” of the name, which had come to be regarded as too sacred to be pronounced [*in spite of Exodus 3:15-ed.*], the Masoretes attached vowel signs indicating that in it’s place should be read the Hebrew word “**Adonai**” meaning “Lord” (or “*Elohim*” [*plural-ed.*] meaning “God” [*singular-ed.*]). The ancient Greek translators substituted the word “Kyrios” (Lord) for the Name. The Vulgate likewise used the Latin word “Dominus.” **The form “Jehovah” is of late medieval origin; it is a combination of the consonants of the Divine Name and the vowels attached to**

**it by the Masoretes but belonging to an entirely different word.** The sound of **Y** is represented by **J** and the sound of **W** by **V**, as in Latin [*thus 'Romanizing' the sacred name, into the profane LORD-ed.*]. For two reasons ..Committee has returned to the more familiar usage of the KJV: #1. the word "Jehovah" does not accurately represent any form of the Name ever used in Hebrew; and #2. **the use of any proper name for the one and only God**, as though there were other gods from whom He had to be distinguished [*sophistry-ed.*], was discontinued in Judaism before the Christian era and **is entirely inappropriate for the universal faith of the Christian Church** [*as they are Romanized and need an excuse to ultimately deny the sacred "memorial" name Yabweh, so to usurp His position and authority, supplanting the living Yabweh, with their false deity "The LORD God"-ed.*].

The KJV of the N.T. was based upon a Greek text that was marred by mistakes, containing the accumulated errors of fourteen centuries of manuscript copying. It was essentially the Greek text of the N.T. as edited by Beza-1589, who closely followed that published by Erasmus/1516-1535, which was based

upon a few medieval manuscripts. The earliest and best of the eight manuscripts which Erasmus consulted was from the tenth century, and he made the least use of it because it differed most from the commonly received text; Beza had access to two manuscripts of great value, dating from the fifth and sixth centuries, but he made very little use of them because they differed from the text published by Erasmus.

...We have resisted the temptation to use phrases that are merely current usage, and have sought to put the message of the Bible in simple, enduring words that are worthy to stand in the great Tyndale-King James tradition. *[etc.etc.etc.-one more page of type-ed.]*.

*-end, Nelson's-finis-*

**ed.:** **Likewise**, by the authority of the First Authority of Life and Truth who is the Living Yahweh, are true Nazarenes recruited to persevere in further purification of Holy Writ, in spite of misguided or guileful **insertions** of alien/pagan concepts (*against which Mr. Tyndale spoke out, no doubt..., which outspokenness cost him his Life at least*). For though the Romanized Trinitarians are given power to censor their versions of Holy Scripture, and to attempt to

paganize the Biblical Faith of their converts, they are **not** given authority to so persevere in their impunity, *unchallenged*. Ancient pagan Trinitarianism may not be an alien concept to Romanizers, but is quite alien to Biblical Hebrew scholarship and honest Nazarene faith. Such paganized “abominable” alien concepts which may have been imposed upon Nazarene mentalities, must be challenged and removed, lest our ultimate goal in this Faith, even our Eternal companionship with the true Nazarene, be impinged. According to the tradition of the venerable scholar whom Nelson’s Preface supposedly esteems, Mr. Tyndale was **not** a Trinitarian, and his **non**-Trinitarian viewpoints got him into **grave** difficulties with the Trinitarian Advocates of his time, whom Mr. Tyndale was compelled by the holy Spirit, to refute even at the expense of his Life, though not at the expense of his testimony which yet refutes every single last one of these Romanizers, even unto this very day. -StarNet/M&Ms-

*Rotherham's Original Preface from*  
***Original* Rotherham**  
**Emphasized Bible**

*reprinted by Zondervan, Grand Rapids;*  
*"Section #2/pg. 25;*

“The form ‘**Yahweh**’ is here adopted as practically the best. The only competing form would be ‘Yehweh,’ differing, it will be observed, only in a single vowel: ‘e’ for ‘a’ in the first syllable. But even this difference vanishes on examination. It is true that “Yehweh” is intended to suggest the derivation of the noun from the **simple** (Kal) conjugation of the verb; and that some scholars take “**Yahweh**” as indicating a formation from the **causative** (Hiphil) conjugation; but, since Other Scholars (presumably because of the aspirate **h**) regard “**Yahweh**” itself as consistent with a Kal formation, thereby leaving us free to accept the spelling “**Yahweh**” without prejudging the question of the precise line of derivation

from the admitted root **hayah** (haiah), we may very well accept the spelling now widely preferred by scholars, and write the name “**Yahweh**.”

By way of explanation so that laymen can understand, the Kal conjugation of the verb is the most basic, active form. The Hiphil is the causative active form of the verb, (*causing something to be done -or to be created*).

If we were to conjugate the Hebrew verb of existence **hyh** (haiah) and place it into it's Hiphil conjugation , imperfect (present and future tense), we would find the verb to stand as follows: **יְהִי** . Notice the **patach** or ‘short a’, and the **segol** or ‘short e’ at the end. It would therefore be transliterated into English as follows: **YaHWeH**. Since this is a noun, the first vowel could be lengthened to indicate that it is not a verb. Since we already have evidence from the Scriptures, that the abbreviated form of the Name ‘**יה**’ is pronounced ‘YAH,’ we would



have to allow the complete form to harmonize with the abbreviated form and so we have **YAHWEH.**”

~finis~

## The Name Suppressed

“It is willingly admitted that the suppression[*of the Tetragrammaton in Holy Writ-ed.*] has not been absolute; at least so far as Hebrew and English are concerned. The Name, in it’s four essential letters (characters), was reverently transcribed by the Hebrew copyist, and therefore was necessarily placed before the eye of the Hebrew reader. The latter however, was instructed **not** to pronounce it, but to utter instead a less sacred name -- **Adonay** or **Elohim** [*these would be titles, not “names”-ed.*]. In this way the Name was not suffered to reach the ear of the listener. To that degree it was suppressed. The Septuagint, or ancient Greek version (*of Old Test.*) made the concealment complete by regularly

substituting **Kurios** [*early texts of the original Septuagint do not indicate this suppression of the sacred name of Yahweh-JM*]; as the Vulgate in like manner, employed **Dominus**; both Kurios and Dominus having at the same time their own proper service to render as correctly answering to the Hebrew Adonay, confessedly meaning “Lord.” [*actually, “master” -ed.*]. The English versions do nearly the same thing, in **rendering the Name as LORD**, and occasionally God; these terms also having their own rightful office... representing the Hebrew titles Adonay and Elohim, and El. So that the Tetragrammaton is nearly hidden in our public English versions. Not quite. To those who can note the difference between “LORD” and “Lord” and between “GOD” and “God” and can remember that the former (printed with small capitals) do, while the latter do NOT stand for the Name; to such, an intimation of the difference is conveyed. But although the

Reader, who looks carefully at his book, can see the distinction, yet the mere Hearer remains completely in the dark respecting it, inasmuch as there is no difference whatever in sound between (*them*). It hence follows that in nearly all the (7000 occurrences) of the Name throughout the OT, is absolutely withheld from all who simply hear the Bible read. “Nearly all” as there are about half a dozen instances in the AV, and a few more in the RV, in which this concealment does not take place. In other words there are these very few places in which the Tetragrammaton appears as “Jehovah”; and although it may be asked, “What are they, among so many?” still their presence has an argumentative value. If it was wrong to unveil the Tetragrammaton at all, then why do it in these instances? If, on the other hand, it was right to let it be seen in these cases, then why not in all? With the exceptions explained, however, it remains true to say, that in our public

versions, the one especial Name of (*El*) is suppressed, wholly concealed from the listening ear, almost as completely hidden from the hastening or uncritical eye.”

## **The Immediate Consequences of the Suppression:**

(ii) “Is it too much to assume that the Name has about it something very grand or gracious, or at least something very mysterious? Whichever conclusion is received, the question arises whether there is not something essentially presumptuous, however little intended, in substituting for (*the Name*) one of the commonest of titles... It is therefore the most natural presumption that the suppression of the Name has entailed on the reader, and especially upon the hearer, irreparable loss.”

“A plausible explanation was written before the publication of the American Revised Version\* .... in which the name Jehovah has been inserted throughout the

OT. However, the reader should bear in mind that the KJV has the printed form LORD *[for substitution of the original Hebrew Tetragrammaton]*.

~Rotherham Emphasized~finis~

**\*ed.'s Note:** The above dated explanation was written **before?/find it** the publication of the American Revised Version of the Bible-1881, in which the dated and erroneous Name “Jehovah” has been inserted throughout the ASV Old Testament. However the reader should bear in mind that the KJV or so called ‘Authorized Version’ used by many readers, has the printed form “LORD” (*in capitals*) which is merely a substitution of the sacred name of Eloah (יהוה = **Yahweh**), which sacred Tetragrammon was originally inscribed in the original Hebrew/ed.

**This is not Rotherham's Original; but is the 1976 version of the:**

# Restoration of Original Rotherham's *Emphasized*

Sacred Name Bible: 1976--Preface Partial  
concerning Sacred Names & Titles of the Hebrew  
Deity, Yahweh & Son.

The RESTORATION of the Original Sacred Name Bible is designed to restore to the Scriptures the Sacred Name of the Most High and His Son, from the Sacred Original, on the basis of the (Original) Rotherham Version. **Revised by Missionary Dispensary Bible Research***[who vary from Rotherham's original opinion & scholarship-ed-see above]* - - **1976.**

The Sixth letter of the Hebrew alphabet, which is the third letter of the Name (the Tetragrammaton), is VAV; "V" in English, (*even*) YHVH.

Tetragrammaton= יהוה =YAHVAH

Here presented below are three photo-graphs from the **Universal Pronouncing Dictionary of Biography and Mythology**, by **Joseph Thomas, M.D., LL.D.**; **New Third Edition** thoroughly revised and brought

**up to 1901. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co. London England: 36 Southhampton St., Covent Garden.**

These photographs are all from page 15  
of the Introduction of this book.

First, you will notice in the Ancient Hebrew Alphabet that the 6th letter is Vav or Vauv ~ V, not W. Next, in Greek, V, **when used as a Vowel**, Upsilon, (it) **is pronounced as oo-u** [*need we say more?-ed*]. But, 3rd, when this same letter is used as a consonant in Greek, it is pronounced like our (English) V.

This is exactly the way the 6th letter is used in Hebrew (?). **Vav** (or vauv), when used as a consonant is **V, when used as a vowel in Hebrew, it is oo (u) or o.**

# “Ancient Hebrew Alphabet”

Power:      Name:      Hebrew Script

- |     |  |   |
|-----|--|---|
| 1.  | a= a'lef   | a |
| 2.  | v/b=beth/bath  | b |
| 3.  | g= gimel/gee'mel   | g |
| 4.  | d/dh= da'leth  | d |
| 5.  | h= he/ha   | h |
| 6.  | v= vav/vauv  | w |
| 7.  | z= za'yin  | z |
| 8.  | H= heth/hath   | ? |
| 9.  | t= tet/tat   | ? |
| 10. | y= yodh  | y |
| 6.  | Y-y= (upsilon) is nearly like the French u (or u/oo)   |   |
| 25. | Y-v- (consonant) when before a vowel or the iiquids l,m,n,r, is like our v: eg. avep`uw is pronounced... |   |

a-א b-ב c-שׁ d-ד e-הּ f-פּ g-ג h-ח i-י  
j-י׃ k-כ l-ל m-מ n-נ o-וּ p-פּ q-ק r-ר  
s-ס t-ת u-ע v-שׁ w-וּ x-צ y-י׃ z-ז:

<22 letters in the Hebrew alphabet.



**Note:** The short form of Yah's Name is in the blessed Hebrew universal praise **Halleluyah** (**Hallelujah**) (or **Halleluiah**), meaning "Praise ye **Yah!**"

The full form of Yah's Name is found in Isaiah 42:8, as He said, "I am Yahvah, that is My Name. Jeremiah 16:21, Ezekiel 39:7, Psalms 83:18.

**Note:** Whenever the title "*the LORD*" (in capitals) occurs in the Scriptures, it has been substituted for the original Name of Yahvah. See Preface for further details.

The Sacred Name originated from the Hebrew verbs **Hayah** and **Havah**, meaning **to Exist**; the Existing Ever-living One. Hence, Yahvah the Most High.

**Shua-** This title/term means Save or Saviour, Deliverer, Powerful...; The Son said, I have come in my Father's Name (John 5:43); hence Yahvah**shua** the Saviour--Salvation Name (Acts 4:10 & 12). **Contracted form is Yahshua.**

### **List:**

Acts 4:10-12 -- John 3:16 -- Philippians 2:9-10 --  
Ephesians 1:21 -- Colossians 3:17 -- Psalms 118:26 -  
- Matthew 21:9 -- Mark 11:9 -- Luke 19:38 -- John

12:13 -- Matthew 6:9 -- Luke 11:2 -- John 17:6,11,12,26 -- Acts 20:32 -- Matthew 25:34 -- Jeremiah 33:2-3 -- Exodus 34:5-6 -- Hebrews 1:4-5.

Quotes compared from OT-NT; Matthew 4:4 with Deuteronomy 8:3 --- Matthew 4:7 with Deuteronomy 6:16 -- Matthew 4:9 w/Deut. 6:13.

## **Yahshua revealed his name to Saul in the Hebrew Language:**

“I heard a voice speaking unto me, and saying in the Hebrew tongue, “Saul, saul, why persecutest thou Me...?” I said, “who art thou?” He said, “I am Yahvahshua, whom thou art persecuting.”  
Acts 26:14-15/22:2, 7-/8/ 9:4-5.

**Note:** the Savior could **not** have said “**Jesus**” as this name/form does **not** appear in Hebrew.

## **The Name Suppressed**

*(from Rotherham’s Emphasized Old Test.):*

“It is willingly admitted that the suppression has not been absolute; at least so far as Hebrew and English are concerned. The Name, in it’s four essential letters (characters), was reverently transcribed by the Hebrew copyist, and therefore was necessarily placed before the eye of the Hebrew reader. The latter however, was

instructed NOT to pronounce it, but to utter instead a less sacred name -**Adonay** or Elohim. In this way the Name was not suffered to reach the ear of the listener. To that degree it was suppressed. The Septuagint, or ancient Greek version (of OT) made the concealment complete by regularly substituting **Kurios** *[original texts of the earliest Septuagint do not indicate this suppression of the sacred name of Yahweh-ŷM]*; as the Vulgate, in like manner, employed **Dominus**; both Kurios and Dominus having at the same time their own proper service to render as correctly answering to the Hebrew Adonay, confessedly meaning “Lord.” *[actually“master-ed]*. The English versions do nearly the same thing, in rendering the Name as **LORD**, and occasionally God; these terms also having their own rightful office... representing the Hebrew titles Adonay and Elohim, and El. So that the Tetragrammaton is nearly hidden in our public English versions. Not quite. To those who can note the difference between “LORD” and “Lord” and between “GOD” and “God” and can remember that the former (printed with small capitals) do, while the latter do NOT stand for the Name; to such, an intimation of the difference is conveyed. But although the Reader, who looks

carefully at his book, can see the distinction, yet the mere Hearer remains completely in the dark respecting it, inasmuch as there is no difference whatever in sound between (*them*). It hence follows that in nearly all the (7000 occurrences) of the Name throughout the OT, is absolutely withheld from all who simply hear the Bible read. "Nearly all" as there are about half a dozen instances in the AV, and a few more in the RV, in which this concealment does not take place. In other words there are these very few places in which the Tetragrammaton appears as "Jehovah"; and although it may be asked, "What are they, among so many?" still their presence has an argumentative value. If it was wrong to unveil the Tetragrammaton at all, then why do it in these instances? If, on the other hand, it was right to let it be seen in these cases, then why not in all? With the exceptions explained, however, it remains true to say, that in our public versions, the one especial Name of (E) is suppressed, wholly concealed from the listening ear, almost as completely hidden from the hastening or uncritical eye."

## **The Immediate Consequences of the**

## Suppression:

**(ii)** “Is it too much to assume that the Name has about it something very grand or gracious, or at least something very mysterious? Whichever conclusion is received, the question arises whether there is not something essentially pre-sumptuous, however little intended, in substituting for (*the Name*) one of the commonest of titles... It is therefore the most natural pre-sumption that the suppression of the Name has entailed on the reader, and especially upon the hearer, irreparable loss.”

“A plausible explanation was written before the publication of the American Revised Version .... in which the name Jehovah has been inserted throughout the OT. However, the reader should bear in mind that the KJV has the printed form LORD [*for substitution of the original Hebrew Tetragrammaton-ed.*].

**Note:** The foregoing explanation [*some of which I have left out-ed*] was written before the publication of the American Revised Version of the Bible, in which the Name, “Jehovah” has been inserted throughout

**the OT. However, the reader should bear in mind that the KJV or Authorized Version, used by most readers, has the printed form “LORD” (in capitals) and is the substitution of YHVH or Yahvah, as inscribed in the original Hebrew.**

*The second reference is from the*  
**American Standard Version (1901),**  
by Thomas Nelson & Sons, pg. 4 of “Preface.”

1. “The change first proposed in the Appendix, that which substitutes “Jehovah” for “LORD” **AND** “GOD” (printed in small capitals), is one which will be unwelcome to many, because of the frequency and familiarity of the terms displaced. But the American Revisers, after a careful consideration, were brought to the unanimous conviction that a Jewish superstition, which regarded the Divine name as too sacred to be uttered, ought no longer to dominate in the English or any other version of the OT, as it fortunately does not in the numerous versions made by modern missionaries. This memorial Name, explained in Ex.3:14-15, and emphasized as such over and over in the original text of the OT, designates God as the personal God, as the covenant God, the God of revelation, the Deliverer, the Friend of his people; not merely the abstractly “Eternal One” of many French translations, but the ever living Helper of those who are in trouble. This personal name, with it’s wealth of sacred associations, is now restored to the place in the

sacred text to which it has an unquestionable claim.”

The quotes from the ASV and the Newberry Bible both use “Jehovah” for the Name. Since a number of different forms have been used in English, and in other languages, for the Name, an important Bible question is, “What is His Name and what is His Son’s Name, if thou cans’t tell?” (Proverbs 30:4) KJV. To this question there are four different answers from four different versions of Isaiah 42:8; (1/2/3/4)

## **The Creator’s Name as Defined in the Holy Scriptures:**

The Newberry Bible/(1959) {page 6} of the Introduction, makes mention of the Name (it states, title) occurs about 7000 times, that it (i.e. Name) is rendered “Lord,” 6800 times; “God,” 800 times. In other words, the Name in the full Hebrew form יהוה, and the short form, יה, occurs about six or seven thousand times in the OT alone. And since the Creator declared ...that this is His Name, and not just the short form, but this יהוה. Examination of ( )/etc. including the Restoration of Orig Sacred Name



Version/other versions as well, especially the Hebrew Text, and the Hebrew Dictionary in Strong's Concordance..., all confirm this fact.

The Name (in Hebrew) is composed of the tenth, fifth & sixth letters of the Hebrew alphabet; yod-י, hay-ה, vav-ו, hay-ה.

Reading from right to left, the equivalent of these letters in English are YHVVH, with the vowel “a” between Y & H (Yah) and between V & H, making the correct Name, YAHVAH. These four Hebrew characters, hwhy, can be found alphabetically in the divisions of Psalm 119 which contain the Hebrew alphabet, especially in the ASV/1901 which contains the correct Hebrew/English alphabet. See also other authoritative Hebrew and English alphabets (*grammars*). These four Hebrew characters יהוה, which compose the Name in the Hebrew Old Testament, in English, are YHVVH (YaHVaH).

Though Strong's and Young's Bible Concordances differ on the spelling of the Name, Young's puts it “Yahweh,” Strong's puts it “Yehovah,” yet both agree that the Name originated from the verbs **hayah** (haiah) and **havah**, meaning to Exist, the Existing, Ever-

Living Eternal One. See the words **Be** and **Become**, in Young's Concordance, also in Strong's Concordance Hebrew-English dictionary, numbers #3068, 1933,1961. Though the Scofield Bible footnote on Genesis 2:4 uses Yahwe, it also states that the Name is formed from "**havah**."

According to Gesenius' Hebrew-English Lexicon, pg. 219-22, the Hebrew characters and vowel points used, one can see the Name is derived from הוּוֹה-**havah** and from הָיָה-**hayah**, meaning **to exist**, the existing one. (in causative tense, according to DB).

Under the Name 'Jehovah,' (Volume 11/pg.599), the American Peoples Encyclopedia (1952), is this quote: "Many critics contend for Hebrew Yahveh, Some for Yahvah, and some for Yahaveh ('Jehovah'). It is generally derived from **havah**, an old form of **haiah**, meaning "He is." The import of the name is explained in the book of Exodus: "And El said unto Moses, I am that I am..." (Ex.3:14), thereby predicating self-existence or existence in a sense in which it can be applied to no created being."

Where the word Hallelu**Yah** occurs in the

original, Rotherham correctly renders this “Praise ye Yah,” not “Jah”(pg606,par.4, Special Notes on the Psalms. Rotherham and Goodspeed use Yah while some versions render Jah. In Psalm 68:4, Rotherham brings out the correct short form Yah, thus giving the correct spelling *of the* first part or *short form of the* Name.

Many more references could be given as pointed out in Young’s and Strong’s Concordances, American People’s Encyclopedia; and in Gesenius’ Hebrew-English Lexicon, pages 337/338, (that) the Name is derived from **havah** (ha**VAH**). Combining Yah with **vah** gives the correct spelling of the Name, YAHVAH (Yahvah), meaning to exist. The Existing, Ever-Living Eternal One.

A statement by Alexander MacWhorter of the Yale University in his book Memorial Name, pub. in 1857, harmonizes with this, as he said that the Name is derived from the Hebrew verb “**havah**,” the OLD FORM of “**hayah**” (haiah), meaning to exist... . Much more evidence could be given (here) but this is sufficient to prove that the correct spelling and pronunciation of the Name is Yahvah, just as it is spelled and as it sounds, Yah-vah.

*-finis-*

# American Standard Version

1901, by Thomas Nelson and Sons

pg. 4 of the “Preface.”

1. “The change first proposed in the Appendix, that which substitutes “Jehovah” for “LORD” AND “GOD” (printed in small capitals), is one which will be **unwelcome to many, because of the frequency and familiarity of the terms displaced.**

But the American Revisers, after a careful consideration, were brought to the **unanimous conviction** that a Jewish **superstition**, which regarded the Divine name as too sacred to be uttered, **ought no longer to dominate in the English or any other version of the O.T.**, as it fortunately does not in the numerous versions made by modern missionaries.

This **memorial Name**, explained in Ex. 3:14-15, and emphasized as such over and over in the original text of the O.T, designates God as the personal God, as the covenant God, the God of revelation, the Deliverer, the Friend of his people; not merely the abstractly “Eternal One” of many French translations, but the ever living Helper of those who are in trouble.

**This personal name, with it's wealth of sacred associations, is now restored to the place in the sacred text to which it has an unquestionable claim."**

*~American Standard Version/finis~*

# YHVH or YHWH?

by Jacob Meyers

*convenient condensed version;*

send for Original version-*free*.

“(Meyers’s) research into dictionaries and encyclopedias verified (*the name YHWH*) was best transliterated into English from Hebrew, as **Yahweh**.

...why we use **Yahweh**, and that if one is totally objective, there is no evidence to the contrary, at this time.

...this unique word has been chosen by our Heavenly Father to be His personal name. It appears approx-imately 7000 times in the Hebrew Scriptures. In the English translations the term “the LORD” has been favored but this (*form*) is entirely erroneous.

Isaiah 42:8; “I am **Yahweh**, that is My Name, and My Glory will I not give to another, neither My praise to graven images.”

In the inspired Hebrew Scriptures, the four letters of the Name appear as יהוה in the text. One cannot escape this fact when one reads the Hebrew text...;

It is therefore imperative that we TRANSLITERATE (means: “to write or spell -words-- in the characters of another alphabet, that represent the same *phonetic* sounds) the Name into English and every other language spoken by men so that all may know the personal and (*original*) name of the one true “Mighty One.” (*Creator Deity-El*)...;

(Therefore the word means to carry across from one language to another, the **sounds** of words, so that the same word will be recognized in both languages when spoken.)

The KJV translators attempted to do this when they retained a **phonetic transliteration** of the names of the Prophets; Moses, Isaiah, Jeremiah, etc.

(Incidentally, the names of the prophets and other Bible characters are usually an attempted transliteration of how their names sounded in the Hebrew. The Bible is a Hebrew book, and it's integral composition is Hebrew. We cannot circumvent this fact. Even though it has been translated into the English language, it's Hebrew imprint is unmistakable.)

1 Corinthians\*; 4-7, & Jeremiah 10:10; (*look it up*);

Although some authors will make the statement that no letters of the Hebrew alphabet are vowels, any Hebrew grammar ... will inform you that such a statement is not entirely correct. All of the Hebrew letters are indeed consonants and have a con-sonantal value, but some of them function additionally as vowels and are so employed.

...recent scholarship has proven Josephus to be accurate in many areas, the Sacred Name being one of them. Scholars had found fault with Josephus because he made the statement that the Sacred Name was **four vowels**. “A mitre also of fine linen encompassed his head (*the high priest*), which was tied by a blue riband, about which there was another golden crown, in which was graven the sacred name (*of the Almighty*): it consists of four vowels.” This is a description of the headgear worn as the official ceremonial garb by the high priest of Israel. Since (*Josephus*) was familiar with the (*old*) Hebrew language as his native tongue, who are we to argue that it did not consist of vowels?

Any Hebrew grammar will verify that Hebrew does in fact have vowel letters, (*i.e.*) letters of the Hebrew alphabet bearing vowel sounds



functioning as vowels (*though written as consonants*). Hebrew does have a system of vowels written under the consonants: little marks that indicate which vowel is to be read; but those marks were added to the text during the days when the Masoretic text was being composed **from** the ancient texts.

This occurred around the **7th** century (600-900 C.E.) of our common era. The reason **why** the vowel points were introduced, was so that the ability to (*correctly*) read the Hebrew texts (*of OT*) would not be lost among the Jews of the dispersion (*diaspora*).

Let us check several Hebrew grammars, to learn what they say on the subject:

**Weingreen** (Oxford University Press-1959), “However, long before the introduction of vowel signs, it was felt that the main vowel sounds should be indicated in writing, and so the three letters (וּ הּ יֵ) were used to represent long vowels...”(pgs. 7/8).

Here is a recognized scholar who has agreed with Josephus (as do all of the **Hebrew** grammarians...).

Each one of the letters mentioned is used in the Heavenly Father's Name...; verification *of* this fact: **A Beginner's Handbook to Biblical Hebrew**: Marks and Rogers, Abingdon Press/1958, pg.7; **How the Hebrew Language Grew**: Horowitz, KTAV Pub., 1960, pp. 333-334.

Both of these sources also include the א (aleph) as a vowel letter, while some other sources include e (ayin).

...we shall return to the texts to determine what value they would have in the English language: The י (yothe) is the smallest letter in the Hebrew alphabet and has the vowel sound of a long **i** (pronounced like a long **e**, as in the word **machine**). The ה (hay) has the vowel sound of a long **a**. The ו (waw) has the vowel sound of a long **u**. The ה (hay) standing at the end of a masculine name, has the vowel sound of short **e**. The long a sound is a **feminine** ending at the end of a name (*grammatical*). Now if we put these letters together we have the English letters : **i - a - u - e**. Pronounce them slowly and then rapidly..., (*and*) you will discover you are saying **Yahweh**.

The second way we can definitely prove that the most accurate transliteration of the Sacred Name (from Hebrew into English) is **Yahweh**, is to transliterate the letters just as though they were consonants. Here we find a conflict of opinion among some writers, that has led to the two variations, YHVH and **YHWH**. The Masoretic Hebrew manuscripts (Hebrew text of OT that has been handed down to us...) are vowel pointed for the **Sephardic** pronunciation system (the Sephardic Hebrew is the form of Heb that was spoken in the Mediterranean area and is thought by scholars to be the most pure and ancient spoken Hebrew). Sephardic was still the language of the Scriptures during the time of the formulation of the Masoretic text and therefore the scrolls are vowel pointed for this pronunciation.

(The **Ashkenazic** form of Hebrew is less ancient; it is Hebrew, read and spoken with Germanic sounds to the letters, without recognizing the softening of some of the letters such as is directed in the Sephardic. It was popularized by European Jews). Since the scrolls that were handed down to us are pointed for the Sephardic version, we shall use this (*Sephardic*) type of transliteration into the English.

Again we shall look at the four letters of the Heavenly Father's Name. They are transliterated as follows: The י (yothe) is transliterated as **Y**; the ה (hay) as **H**; the ו (waw) as **W**; the ה (hay) as **H**; -(sources used are both Weingreen, and the Marks and Rogers Beginner's Handbook mentioned above). In order to pronounce these letters as consonants, Marks & Rogers give the following examples: The י (yothe) is pronounced as the **y** (*as*) in "yes." The ה (hay) is pronounced as the **h** (*as*) in "hat." The ו (waw) is pronounced as **w** (*as*) in "way." They also state that the proper pronunciation of this letter (ו) is **wow**. So now we have the second witness that the proper way of transliterating the four letters of the Tetragrammaton, would be **YHWH**. In the final analysis, both of these methods agree since they (*both*) indicate that it would be pronounced **Yahweh** and not YHVH. The Hebrew letter that **is** pronounced **V**, is b. This letter does not appear (*is actually not appearing in the written*) Name of the Heavenly Father... ("*b is 'bh' ...pronounced like a 'v'...*" - *RKHarrison, Biblical Hebrew, page 12/ed.*);

Since there are vowels added to the four letters of the Heavenly Father's Name in the Hebrew texts, let us examine them for just a moment. In the Hebrew texts the Sacred Name appears as יהוה. Notice the vowel points: One letter, (the Waw-w) has two points! It has a dot above it (a **cholom**), which means that it is already employed once as a vowel and cannot be used again as a consonant. The last vowel point is a **qames**, and since it precedes the final letter, it would take the place of the letter and become a pure long "a" according to the Hebrew rules of grammar. Therefore it would have to be transliterated into the English as Ye-ho-a, (*and*) complete transliteration into the English would be Yehoah. (*Now* it should be obvious to even the layman, why scholars have stated that the pronunciation has been lost or that it could not be pronounced.) **Jehovah** is IMPOSSIBLE as a transliteration, which you can see for yourself. It is indeed a **hybrid** word...; All scholars accept the fact that it was so "pointed" in the scrolls, to assure that no one who read it would read the pronunciation demanded by the letters, "**Yahweh**," but that they would (*rather instead*) read the name which was prompted by the vowel

points, “Adonai.” The Talmud says, “It is **written** by yothe--hay (**Yahweh**), but it was **pronounced** da, aleph--daleth (Adonai).”

The Talmud was written by Babylonian Jews who lived during and after the Messiah's time, therefore they were merely **following the traditional view of the rabbis' which demanded that no one pronounce the Sacred Name**. Such a doctrine is erroneous and was condemned by Yahshua the Messiah, John 17:6. The Scriptures tell us many times (*often*) to “call upon” His Name (Joel 2:32; Acts 2:21; Romans 10:13). Therefore we must reject the vowel points **attached** to the Sacred Name (*which refer to Adonai*) as **uninspired** and the product of theological **error**, and with it we (*then must*) discard the word **Jehovah**. Let us also recall the solemn warning found in Deut.4:2; Proverbs 30:6; Rev. 22:18. The vowel points of the Masoretic Hebrew text did serve a good purpose in preserving the original pronunciation of the Hebrew words, down through the centuries, but when the scribes overstepped their authority and added the deceptive vowel signs to the Sacred Name so that no one would use the Name... they became guilty of tampering

with the inspired Word of **Yahweh**. They have **admitted** their guilt and it is up to us, the true worshipers of our time, to correct the error immediately rather than promulgating it and becoming party to it ourselves.

Let us examine yet another witness, another method of arriving at the form we use (**YAHWEH**). One of the best explanations of the Sacred Name is to be found in the **Rotherham Emphasized Bible (reprinted by Zondervan, Grand Rapids/date?)**. Dr. J.B. Rotherham has written slightly over 7 pages in his introduction ...one section deals specifically with this question:

Section #2/pg. 25; reads as follows: (quote) “The form “**Yahweh**” is here adopted as practically the best. The only competing form would be “**Yehweh**,” differing, it will be observed, only in a single vowel- “**e**” for “**a**” in the first syllable. But even this difference vanishes on examination. It is true that “**Yehweh**” is intended to suggest the derivation of the noun from the simple (Kal) conjugation of the verb, and that some scholars take “**Yahweh**” as indicating a formation from the causative (Hiphil) conjugation; but, since other scholars (presumably because of the aspirate h)

regard “**Yahweh**” itself as consistent with a Kal formation, thereby leaving us free to accept the spelling “**Yahweh**” without prejudging the question of the precise line of derivation from the admitted root **hayah**, we may very well accept the spelling now widely preferred by scholars, and write the name “**Yahweh**.”

By way of explanation so that laymen can understand, the Kal conjugation of the verb is the most basic, active form. The Hiphil is the causative active form of the verb, (causing something to be done) (*accomplished-created*).

If we were to conjugate the Hebrew verb of existence *hyh* and place it into it's Hiphil conjugation, imperfect (present and future tense), we would find the verb to stand as follows: **יְהוֹה**. Notice the patach or short a, and the segol or short e at the end. It would therefore be transliterated into English as follows: **YaHWeH**. Since this is a noun, the first vowel could be lengthened to indicate that it is not a verb. Since we already have evidence from the Scriptures, that the abbreviated form of the Name *hy* is pronounced **YAH**,



we would have to allow the complete form to harmonize with the abbreviated form, and so we have **YAHWEH**.” (end quote)

Let us once more reiterate that the Sacred Name could not be transliterated as YHVH..., unless you accept the V as standing for the Latin U. The W is merely a double U or long U. This was precisely the intention of the one who began this innovation. It has only been since the 1600's that this misunderstanding has existed, since it was **after** that time that the V became a consonant(remember-above: “b is ‘bh’ ...pronounced like a ‘v’...” - RKHarrison, *Biblical Hebrew*, page 12)

Let us obtain the testimony of yet another witness, and that is the ancient **Moabite Stone**. You can find a description of this prized archeological discovery (*treasure*) in most encyclopedias. This stone was written

by King Mesha of Moab (2 Kings 1:1/3), to celebrate his victory over Israel. It contains the name **Yahweh** written in the ancient Hebrew letters, and if one is to be consistent in reading the remainder of the text, he/she would have to read **Yahweh** for the four letters of the Heavenly Father's Name. If you can obtain the use of a picture of the Moabite Stone, examine it closely (*and*) you will see that the ancient Hebrew alphabet then in use, did not have the added vowel points, and yet the people were able to read the Name of the Heavenly Father, **and pronounce it**.

In summary (*summation*) we would say the following: We spell and pronounce the Name of the Heavenly Father as **YAHWEH**, since it is the best possible form that could be employed to transliterate the four letters of His Name into English, from the Hebrew

language in which He spoke His Name from Sinai (Ex.19-20). YHVH is incorrect since it does not accurately transfer the sounds of the original letters into English, from the Hebrew. Can we know that **YAHWEH** is correct beyond a shadow of a doubt? We have proven the form **YAHWEH** in several ways above, and up to this point, no evidence has been unearthed that would disprove it.

Scholars are in agreement with this form today. As one of my Hebrew professors stated, "We use **Yahweh** because it is the best representation of the original letters of the Name transliterated into English. We are 99.44-100% positive of this form, although our minds are not closed should new evidence be introduced by scholarship." I (*Jacob Meyer*) would concur completely with this statement because the evidence supports

it.

Let us then be sincere and objective in our Bible study and in obeying the wishes of our Heavenly Father. He has set forth His Name in His Word. Who are we to alter it in any way, be it by translation or incorrect transliteration? His Name is His Mark...

*-finis-*

Jacob Meyer; Assembly of Yahweh:  
Box 6, Bethel PA. 19507

*Jacob Meyers: YHWH or YHVH?/etc. (ask for free, rather thorough literature: his scholarship vindicates the pronunciation Yahweh).*

**Biblical Hebrew~1976**

**David McKay Co.-NY-10017**

The author R.K. Harrison says (*quote - page 11*): “The Hebrew alphabet comprises **22** letters, all of which are consonants...” (*end*).

*(The 22 letters may be consonants, of course, but the*

vowel sounds “between” the consonants remain undisputed, as Harrison interestingly determines below-kmy)..;

(quote-page 14): “The Semites had a liberal sprinkling of vowel sounds in their words, and seem to have been almost unable to pronounce two or three consonants together. Thus a word like “rhythm” would probably have been broken up into three syllables by placing a very short vowel sound between the ‘**r**’ and the ‘**h**’, regarding the ‘**y**’ as an ‘**i**’ in sound, and placing a further vowel between the last two letters of the word.”

(end quote).

Harrison continues (quote-pgs. 12-13):

“ ‘ is the letter ‘**y**’ (yodh);

𐤅 is the letter for ‘**h**’ (he), (or hay);

𐤆 represents the letter ‘**w**’ (waw/wow);

𐤂 is ‘**bh**’ (beth), and is pronounced like a ‘**v**’”;

R.K.Harrison also says, (quote-pg. 12): “Hebrew is one of the north-west Semitic group of languages which also includes Phoenician, Punic, Moabitic and Aramaic. It has considerable affinity with Arabic as well. ...Aramaic increased in influence

particularly after the Exile, and towards the start of the Christian era it supplanted Hebrew as the spoken language of the Israelites.” (end quote).

**Also** (quote from page **16-17**): “We have seen the above letters (*see original book*) were consonantal in force. In ancient times the Hebrew words were written without vowels in what is called “unpointed” script, so that each word consisted of a group of consonants whose vowel sounds were supplied from memory by the reader. The Hebrews knew, from oral teaching and practice, which vowels were associated with the different words, and it was only after many centuries that a mechanical system of vowel ‘points’ was devised, enabling the reader to pronounce any word without prior knowledge of it’s sounds...;” (*end quote*).

**Also** (quote-page 20): “Up to the first few centuries of the Christian era, the Old Testament was written in unpointed consonantal Hebrew, with the reader supplying the vowel sounds from memory. As Classical (*i.e.* Biblical) Hebrew fell into disuse for conversational

purposes, it became necessary to devise some system of vocalising the text so as to enable it to be read correctly without any necessary previous acquaintance on the part of the reader with the sound of the words. This difficulty had been partly met in the unpointed text, by the use of certain consonants to indicate the principal long vowels, the particular consonants being **he**, **yodh** and **waw...**;" (*end quote*).

**Also** (quote-page 21): "About the Seventh Century AD., a vocalic system was introduced by the Massoretes, a group of people interested in preserving and vocalising the traditional Hebrew text, and who derived their name from the Hebrew word for "tradition." The system consisted of vowel points or signs which were written in & around the consonants so as not to interfere with their traditional sacredness." (*end quote*).

R.K.Harrison further says, (quote-page 12): "**Hebrew** is one of the north-west Semitic group of languages which also includes **Phoenician**, **Punic**, **Moabitic** and **Aramaic**. It has

considerable affinity with Arabic as well. From a linguistic standpoint, Hebrew was probably at it's best in the period which saw the composition of the historical books such as Samuel and Kings, and the pre-Exilic prophets. Aramaic increased in influence particularly **after** the Exile, and towards the start of the Christian era it (*Aramaic*) supplanted Hebrew as the spoken language of the Israelites.” (end quote).

~Harrison/finis~



## **Quotations in Full from Other (above) Sources:**

**American People's Encyclopedia** states:  
“(the tetragrammaton) is generally derived from HAVAH, an Old form of HAIHA, meaning ‘He is’”; (*Harrison is vindicated, here - kmy*).

**Gesenius' Hebrew-English Lexicon**, “(in) the Hebrew characters and vowel points used, one can see the NAME is derived from (hwh) הוּהָ, havah (old form); and from (h v h) הוּהָ, hayah (new form), meaning to Exist, the Existing One.” (pages 337-8)

**MacWhorter and Gesenius** seem to agree that “the Name is derived from the Hebrew **verb** HAVAH, the **Old Form** of HAYAH (haiah), meaning to Exist, ...the Existing One.”

**MacWhorter's “Memorial Name”** (1857): (says) “the Name is derived from the Hebrew **verb** “HAVAH,” the **Old Form** of “HAYAH”: means to Exist, Existing One.”

**MacWhorter**; “The Hebrew characters and

vowel points used, one can see the Name is derived from ‘הוה’ (hwh)-havah; and from ‘הי’ (hyh)-hayah, meaning to Exist, the Existing One” (*Gesenius quote*). These sources agree that the Name originated from the verb havah (*old form*) and the verb hayah (*haiah-new form*), meaning to Exist, the Existing, Ever-Living Eternal One.

**Rotherham ‘76 preface:** In Psalm 68:4; “Rotherham brings out the short form Yah, thus giving the correct spelling of the first part or short form of the Name. Combining Yah with vah gives the correct spelling of the Name (hv-hy/הוה-הי) Yahvah, meaning to exist: the Existing, Ever-Living Eternal One.”

**Editor's Note:** holy Writ and all of it's "tracts" therefrom, remain open to further purification by inspiration of the Spirit of Truth, in spite of traditional views and translation efforts, even that **uncensored** "simple, **enduring** words" may further assist Nazarenes in our Quest for Truth and Enlightenment.

There are no more "worthy, simple and **enduring** words" in holy Writ, than the true and uncensored "saving" sacred names of our Heavenly Father **Yahweh** & His Son, **Yahshua**.

Thus it remains absolutely essential, even for Life's sake, to persevere in this literary purification, to fully restore the Sacred Names to **any** and all Bibles wherein the Abomination is removed, and to the mentalities of Nazarenes, even in the face of tradition's resistance, especially as there is no more **worthy** effort than to rid all translations of holy Writ, of any error which persistently & willfully **censors** ***Saving Truth***.

And by the authority of the First Authority of Life and Truth, the Living Yahweh, are true Nazarenes recruited to persevere in this further purification of holy Writ, in spite of tradition.

Thus in these Last Days, the restoration of the sacred names controversy persists in the face of traditional erroneous views, yet is wholly resolved by John the Beloved, in Rev. 14:1;

*"And I saw, and behold, the Lamb standing on the mount Zion, and with him a hundred and forty and four thousand, **having his name, and the name of his Father, written on their foreheads.**"*

If these "simple, enduring, worthy" names are good enough for these 144,000, then they must be good enough for all Nazarenes!kmy~StarNet~M&M'