

The Truth About Inspired Titles In The Light of The Sacred Names

Authors:

Elder Dale George

Rabbi Silvio Soto

Revised 2015

INTRODUCTION

The following treatise is being written with the deepest concern over religious zeal – which once cemented – is almost impossible to change or correct, even when it is manifestly obvious that the same is built on absolute falsehoods. The reader should at all times bear in mind that our intentions are not to judge anyone or to promote any more divisions within an already fragile and fragmented movement. This treatise should not be considered an attack against the Sacred Name Doctrine, which the authors themselves continue to personally promote and defend. On the contrary, this treatise represents an honest attempt to handle truth with intellectual integrity, hoping that when all is said and done, the cause of the Sacred-Name would prove to have been further vindicated by our humble endeavor.

Religious zeal is an unpredictable phenomenon and it is always easier to attack the messenger than to challenge the message (especially when the quality of the evidence presented is overwhelming and irrefutable). As this is often the most common reaction encountered, it would not be surprising to us if we were to lose respect and popularity in the eyes of many. Religious resentment runs deep and most people (including some leaders) are unwilling to publicly admit error and, as a result, this attitude represents a formidable barrier which truth must somehow overcome. However, while painfully aware of these possible adverse reactions to the conclusions presented in this essay and given that the authors have been fully cognizant of these facts for some years, we find it difficult – in fact impossible – to continue to turn our eyes away in order to keep protecting the PRIDE AND PRESTIGE OF THE STATUS QUO! As ministers of the Most High, we are commanded and indeed expected to be willing to sacrifice ourselves, even when doing so means the possible loss of human admiration and support. Given the history of human behavior (and Sacred-Name believers are no exception), the reader should not be surprised to learn that we are somewhat apprehensive in sharing this information. This is due to our acute conscious recognition that even the Sacred-Name Movement has some religious beliefs deeply cemented in its traditions, which when challenged, leaves the challenger condemned and look upon with disfavor, regardless of the evidence presented.

And while the possibility of personal rejection is a genuine concern, we cannot but feel compelled, by the love we have for the Movement and its future, to proceed with the distribution of this material.

Many will in time come to appreciate our work. Others will view it differently. Some will even take the offensive and attempt to undermine our efforts. Yet, we do not fear a *genuine* scrutiny of the facts we present nor a serious test of what we claim. We ask, however, that scholarly honesty be followed and that the reader do not resort to *merely* disagreeing with the information contained in this booklet. A *refutation* involves demonstrating: (1) actual fault with the evidence presented, (2) errors of logic in the structure of the arguments made, and (3) defects with the conclusions drawn. To just reject the information based on zeal and emotional reactions, does not constitute a valid defense of truth.

The authors have concluded that the best possible format to use for sharing this information is that of an outline. This has been done in order to facilitate cross referencing and scrutiny of all major arguments, evidences, facts, and conclusions presented. While there are many fine English translations of the Bible, the New American Standard Bible 1995 (NASB) has been used for the sole purpose of facilitating and encouraging linguistic verification with a Strong's Concordance or other similar sources – while employing a user friendly English version.

Once again, we will like to reiterate that it is our hope that the information presented by this publication will be seriously and prayerfully considered by the reader. Our intention is not to tear down, but rather to rebuild. Even when sometimes it is necessary to remove weakened parts of a structure in order to preserve the rest of the building, the goal is still to restore, fortify, and strengthen the existing frame. In like manner, our aspiration is to achieve similar results and let Yahweh Almighty receive all the glory.

This 2015 revision has not alter any substantial claims from the 2005 original brief publication or its 2007 expanded revision. The opportunity has been taken to edit spelling and correct grammatical errors. Both the 2005 short essay and the 2007 revised expansion employed the King James Version, instead of the NASB used in this present 2015 revision. Careful attention has been given to the Hebrew layout, reflecting our growth in this area. We have expanded some arguments and introduced others which reflect the encounters we have experienced in the past 10 years since our first publication.

The original 2005 publication and the 2007 expanded revision employed the name forms Yahweh and Yahshua. However, we are *painfully* aware of the variants that are championed by different sacred-name organizations (instead of Yahweh, some argue for Yahveh, Yahwah, Yahuweh, Yahuwah, Yahu`eh and other similar forms; and instead Yahshua they favor: Yahushua, Yahoshua, Yehoshua, Yeshua, etc). Then there is the argument of whether these names – seeing they are sacred and divine – should be rendered into any alphabet other than Hebrew. Hence, in an effort to avoid our intended message from being prematurely rejected on account of having selected a specific English form, we have chosen to represent the names of the Father and the Son with Hebrew characters. We are confident that this will not be distracting, as the readers we are aiming will read this thesis should be learned in recognizing the sacred names when printed in Hebrew characters.

Finally, this publication is copy written and any partial production or distribution is completely prohibited. You are encouraged and permission is granted to *freely* reproduce, distribute, email, and/

or upload to a website this publication as a whole, unaltered and in its complete form. This is being done in order to prevent our information from being posted or quoted in a manner that contravenes or contradicts the message intended.

The challenge before us all ... can our truth stand the test!

OUTLINE OF PART I

- I. History of rejected words by the Sacred-Name Movement
 1. Discovery that the original Sacred Names had been hidden
 - A. The Father and the Son have personal names
 - B. Yahweh and Yahshua are the names
 - C. The name of Yahweh must be used
 - D. Scholars, Christianity, and misguided zeal have obscured the names
 2. Facts about the "common" names
 - A. Scripture forbids use of false names
 - B. Worship of Baal has been a great stumbling block
 - C. Some scholars support use of correct names
 3. Two principles developed to forbid the use of certain words
 - A. Pagan Connection
 - B. Perverted Substitution
 4. Teaching regarding salvation
 - A. Christianity is to be deprecated and vilified
 - B. Use of the Names urged
 - C. Salvation declared to depend on the Names
- II. Crucial flaws of the two principles (point three above)
 1. Inconsistency of application
 2. Poor linguistic research
3. Failure to observe that Scripture doesn't follow these principles
- III. Refutation of the "principles" as applied
 1. Baal
 - A. baal used as a common noun in the Scriptures
 - B. baal applied to Yahweh in the Scriptures
2. Adon

A. adon often applied to Yahweh in the Scriptures

B. adon is used in Feast related passages

C. adon applied to Yahweh by Hosea

D. adon is used in numerous Messianic prophecies

E. adon is used by NT writers

3. El and elohim

A. used in reference to Yahweh in the Scriptures

IV. Conclusions from the Scriptural use of titles

1. Using these words as common nouns is acceptable
2. Using these same words as proper nouns is idolatrous worship
3. Whatever men may have done to a word, Yahweh may still use it
4. These titles must be granted to Yahweh and Yahshua

PART I

THE ISSUE REGARDING HEBREW TITLES

I. History of rejected words by the Sacred-Name Movement:

In order for us to better understand the arguments promoted by many in the Sacred-Name Movement, it is necessary to review its historical and philosophical development and to carefully analyze the various stages of this process. Once this exercise is completed, we will then possess an overview that will enable us to move forward with the rest of this treatise. Over all, most Sacred-Name organizations agree with the following historical sketch as to the movement's theological development:

1. The early Sacred-Name pioneers initially discovered certain facts, which although readily known to scholars, were not relayed to the masses who were kept ignorant about their existence and of the theological significance of the same.

These were:

A. That the Creator has a personal Name (Is.42:8, Ps.83:16-18, Jn.17:6).

B. That the majority of scholars (Jewish, Catholic, Pro-testants, and Secular) were essentially in agreement that Yahweh (or a form close to this) is the personal Name of the Creator and that the Savior's name is Yahshua (or a form close to this).

C. That the Bible teaches the Name of Yahweh is a moral issue (Ex.23:13, Lev.19:12, Mal.1:6-8).

D. That scholars, the traditions of Christianity, and Bible Translations have caused the Name of Yahweh to become obscured in our English-speaking society.

One can readily sympathize with the holy horror that must have coiled the souls of the early Sacred-Name believers as these facts were unearthed. The realization that for so long an essential biblical doctrine as the Creator's personal Name was kept away from the masses must have been initially overwhelming. Considering these factors, one can easily understand that once the mind of these early Sacred-Name believers was enlightened, it became impossible for those committed to truth to remain where they were.

2. Other crucial observations were made as further Biblical research was conducted:

A. That the Bible forbids any and all associations with the names of false deities (Ex. 23:13, Josh.23:7, Ps.16:4).

B. That Israel's continuous punishments were chiefly the result of her numerous involvements with pagan worship, especially that of Baal (Num.25:1-3, Judg.2:8-13, Jer.11:9-13, 23:25-27).

C. Israel's idolatry led to a divine injunction against the very name of Baal (Hos.2:16-17).

D. That some works of *selected* scholars could be alluded to in support of the above.

3. As a result of these factors, two primary lines of reasoning were developed by which some began to argue against the usage of certain words that ultimately will be forbidden and discontinued. By dissecting the various arguments, we propose that the same can be expressed as *principles* in the following manner:

A. Principle No. 1: *Pagan Connection*

Any word demonstrated to have been connected or associated with pagan religious practices or to have been the actual name of a false deity, must be forbidden and its usage discontinued.

B. Principle No. 2: *Perverved Substitution*

Any word used by a people or culture to substitute for Yahweh's Name – causing his Name to become obscured, forgotten, or disregarded – must be forbidden and its usage discontinued.

By employing the arguments based on these *principles*, in time several words would be singled out as unsuitable for true worshipers. Eventually, the discontinuation of these *selected* words will be proposed by some of the early Sacred-Name pioneers:

(1) Adonay: Rejected for violating principles 1 and 2.

(2) Baal: Rejected for violating principles 1 and 2.

(3) Amen: Rejected for violating principles 1.

(4) Lord: Rejected for violating principles 1 and 2.

At one time, it was disallowed by arguing a *linguistic pagan connection*, but as the *necessary etymological* evidence for this is not conclusive, this charge has been *modified* by many Sacred Name organizations. Currently, most teach that the *pagan connection* of the English word *Lord* consists of the fact that it represents the *proper name* of what is termed as the "idolatrous Trinitarian deity" worshiped by Christianity, the *Lord God*.¹ Furthermore, it is also argued that *Lord* is essentially the English equivalent of the Hebrew *Baal*, and that in like manner, it is unsuitable for true worshipers as it has become a *perverted substitution* in the English language for the Name of Yahweh.

(5) God: Rejected for violating principles 1 and 2.

As to its *pagan connection*, it was argued that the English language derived the name *God* from the Babylonian deity of *fortune* recorded in Is. 65:11. Many still teach this,² even though etymologists do not support this contention. Others, perhaps realizing the lack of linguistic support for this argument, are satisfied with arguing that *God* is also part of the proper name of the Christian pagan deity the *Lord God*, and as such, it must be condemned. In addition, it's argued that the term *God* has become a *perverted substitution* in the English language for the Name of Yahweh, making it unacceptable.

4. Finally, these issues were proclaimed to have an essential bearing on an individual's salvation:

A. Coined phrases were adapted and introduced which help to enhance the persuasiveness of the foregoing arguments. "*Baal worship*" and "*Lord worship*" became interchangeable terms. Christianity became "*Pagan Christendom*," "*Mystery Babylon*" or "*Churchianity*." These phrases helped create the current attitudes characteristic of many in the movement.

B. A crusade exclusively emphasizing the original names of Yahweh and Yahshua was launched. An urgent call for the immediate restoration of the Sacred Name was demanded. All titles or words of adoration, however meaningful and well-intended, were declared to be unimportant, so that the Sacred Name became the only focus of attention. Choice passages of Scripture where the Name was exclusively used were alluded to as *proof text* (Prov.18:10, Ps.105:1-3, Is.42:8, Prov.30:4).

C. Selected passages of Scripture where the Sacred Name was isolated and directly applied to man's salvation were also extensively cited (Joel 2:32, Acts 4:12, 15:14-18, 1 Jn.2:12, etc.). This, along with the de-signation of Christianity as "*Mystery Babylon*," led to all Christian believers being pronounced hopelessly lost if they did not abandon their religious affiliations (Rev.18:1-4).

II. Crucial flaws regarding the two Sacred-Name principles:

The *pagan connection* and the *perverted substitution* principles represent one of the issues to be dealt with in this treatise. If a genuine fault can be found with these *principles* (and it's so demonstrated), it would logically follow that any biblical interpretation based on either or both of them would likewise be suspect. Therefore, as *truth seekers* we are obligated to put these *principles* to a real test. Before beginning to test their validity in a responsible manner, several initial observations are necessary:

1. Inconsistency of application:

The first observation we can make is that the various Sacred-Name organizations have failed to CONSISTENTLY apply the very *principles* that form the foundation of their entire doctrinal position against certain words and titles. It is this inconsistency which makes others view our linguistic statements and teachings as unreliable. We have some organizations that reject only a hand-full of words (anywhere from 6 to 20 in total). Then you have other organizations whose list of forbidden words actually numbers in the hundreds.³ In every organization, leaders employing the two Sacred-Name *principles* pick and choose from the vast pool of *corrupted* words the ones that they will reject and the ones they will *learn* to live with. The whole process is based on the personal preference of the leaders making the selections.

The truth of the matter is that it is literally IMPOSSIBLE to fully practice the two *principles* promoted by many in the Sacred-Name Movement against certain words and titles. Were we to identify and eliminate EVERY word with an alleged *pagan connection*, we would not be left with much of a language, nor would we be able TO COMMUNICATE!

We can't even solve this problem by suggesting that every believer ought to learn to speak Hebrew, as the very language in which much of the Bible was written has been corrupted and perverted by paganism, idolatry, and humanism (more on this later)! If we are honest and consistent with linguistics facts, WE WILL BE FORCED TO RECOGNIZE THAT AT PRESENT THERE ISN'T A PURE LANGUAGE IN THE WORLD THAT MEETS THE STANDARDS OF THE SACRED NAME MOVEMENT, NOT EVEN HEBREW!

This being the case, we find that there is no real consensus as to how to consistently apply these two *principles*, making the process by which some organizations argue against certain words an arbitrary and subjective exercise at best.

2. Poor Linguistic Research:

Sacred-Name linguistic arguments *against certain words* are usually developed and designed to appeal to the individual's conscience and reasoning ability. Admittedly, at first glance they are quite impressive and challenging. What is not immediately noted is that most of these consist primarily of half-truths and are often based on unsubstantiated concepts. We are forced to make this statement because only PARTIAL linguistic facts are ever alluded to by Sacred-Name advocates. The traditional Sacred-Name arguments fail to comply with the burden of proof whenever they are fully explored and tested. Although the manner by which these various

linguistic claims were developed was indeed clever, we will soon demonstrate that the same are in error. When a careful and complete investigation is undertaken, the fallacies of these arguments at once become apparent.

3. Uninspired approach to Scripture:

Perhaps the most amazing irony in this ordeal is the fact that Yahweh and the inspired writers of the Bible do NOT follow these two *principles*. Even when Inspiration is zealously contending against idolatry and paganism, the Bible writers do NOT exhibit the disdain against certain words that many Sacred-Name believers are known to reject! In fact, we will demonstrate that Yahweh and the inspired writers of the Bible actually conduct themselves in a manner that MUST be recognized is contrary to the *principles* espoused by many in the movement.

III. Refutation of the two Sacred-Name linguistic principles:

The *principles* we have thus far alluded to are intended to be based on LINGUISTIC facts. They are presented as "evidence" by advocates of the Sacred-Name Movement who uphold the two *principles* under discussion. They are NOT intended to be the *subjective* opinions of some. We are on record as proclaiming that these *principles* are based on hard facts which no one acquainted with truth can deny or dare to challenge! All this being the case, it follows that a LINGUISTIC REVIEW should be all that is needed in order to *test* the validity of these two *principles* and the arguments that led to their formulation.

However, when we apply an ACID TEST to the "unquestionable" and supposedly "factual" evidence cited on behalf of these *principles*, we quickly find out that what many in the Sacred-Name Movement have been stating for several decades regarding certain words – which to date has gone basically unchallenged – is actually false! Consider the following:

1. The truth about BAAL:

The classical Sacred-Name argument against the word *baal* is based on two premises, the first of which is *factual* and the second an *assumption*. As to the *factual*, there is no denying that an idol existed in the days of Ancient Israel by the name of *Baal*.⁴ Because of this, it was then *assumed* that the word *baal* could NEVER had been used by inspiration in a direct reference to Yahweh. This *assumption* is understandable, especially when one makes the observation that scholarly works that define or describe the word *baal* do not give any examples of it being used in reference to Yahweh. Therefore, someone reading these works could easily developed the impression that no matter how much we *search* the Bible, we would *never* find a passage of scripture where the word *baal* is attributed by inspiration to Yahweh. Hence, it would then be natural to argue as a *linguistic* fact that Yahweh and *baal* can never be mixed without incurring in the sin of idolatry.

This being the case, to TEST this line of reasoning, all one has to do is conduct a *word-study review* of the Hebrew Scriptures with the intention of verifying if it's true that the Bible under inspiration avoids applying the word *baal* to Yahweh.

When proper linguistic research is undertaken to determine how inspiration dealt with the Israelites within their culture and language, we find that *Baal* was indeed the name (i.e. a PROPER NOUN) of a false deity whose worship did anger Yahweh. But, it is ALSO a fact that *baal* (as a COMMON NOUN) is applied to Yahweh in the Hebrew Scripture!

A. The very first instance in dialogue that *baal* is utilized in the Hebrew Scriptures, is by Yahweh *himself*:

(1) Genesis 20:3

But God came to Abimelech in a dream by night and said to him, "Behold, thou art but a dead man, for the woman which thou hast taken; for she is a *man's wife* (baal)."

One of the rules governing biblical interpretation is what scholars refer to as the "Law of First Mention." From a linguistic point of view, this means that the first mention or usage of a word in the Bible usually determines its "primary" meaning. Therefore, all Hebrew lexicons and scholars render the PRIMARY meaning of the *common noun* BAAL as "owner or possessor," with an extended logical SECONDARY meaning being "*husband or married*" (i.e. one who *owns* or *possesses* a wife).⁵ These meanings represent the actual linguistic definition of this HEBREW WORD in its *common noun* usage! As we are about to see, the way the Old Testament employs the word *baal* clearly validates these definitions.

B. While many Sacred-Name advocates would like to believe that *baal* was applied in the Bible *only* to men and to a false Canaanite deity, the Hebrew Scriptures actually disproves this notion. When a full scale investigation is launched, the Hebrew scrolls reveal that inspiration acknowledged the fact that *baal* was both a *common noun* and a *proper noun*. As a result, the *common noun baal* IS APPLIED to Yahweh in the following passages:

(1) Nahum 1:2

El is jealous, and Yahweh revengeth; Yahweh revengeth, and is *furious* (lit.: Yahweh and is the baal of fury); Yahweh will take vengeance on his adversaries, and he reserveth wrath for his enemies.

It is not always easy to spot the uses of the word *baal* in the Hebrew Scriptures when reading an *English Bible*. Naturally, Israel would not have experienced this problem since they read the Scripture in their own Hebrew language. We, on the other hand, are quite a different story. Because we depend on an English translation of the Bible, we have failed to realize when the word *baal* is not transliterated phonetically into English as we would expect. Yet, the reason for this is understandable. Linguistically, a scholar should ONLY TRANSLITERATE proper nouns, while common nouns are always TRANSLATED (except in cases where the receiving language does not have any words that are equivalent or close enough to the idea being conveyed)!

The word *baal* (as is the case for hundreds of other terms) is BOTH a COMMON NOUN and a PROPER NOUN in Hebrew! For this reason, *baal* as a *Hebrew common noun* is usually rendered by English Versions as "husband" or "married" (see the other examples cited in this section) or it is left untranslated (as in the above verse where the Hebrew literally reads "Yahweh and *is the baal of fury*")!

Admittedly, rendering this verse as "Yahweh ... is the *husband or possessor of fury*" would have been somewhat unnatural. Thus, the King James Version opted to render the TWO Hebrew words as ONE English word: "furious." We find that this rendering has been maintained by most of the popular English translations we have consulted – with the exception of "The Rotherham Bible" which translates the phrase as "an avenger, is Yahweh, and a lord of wrath." And, while some may argue that it is not essential to translate *baal* into English in this verse, the LINGUISTIC FACT STILL REMAINS that the prophet Nahum under inspiration DID APPLY to Yahweh the term *baal*, an act not easily explained by Sacred-Name believers who reject the word *baal*! Furthermore, if chronologists are right, the book of Nahum was written AFTER the prophetic admonition against *Baal* recorded by Hosea 2:16-17!

If this was the only instance, perhaps one could argue "foul play." However, we are about to see that there are many more verses which show us that inspiration didn't hesitate to apply *baal* as a *common noun* in connection with Yahweh.

(2) Is. 62:4

Thou shalt no more be termed Forsaken; neither shall thy land any more be termed Desolate: but thou shalt be called Hephzibah and thy land *Beulah* (married): for Yahweh delighteth in thee, and thy land *shall be married* (te-ba-el).

The significance of this verse lies in the fact that it is a prophesy of the future! The time will come (during the millennium) when the land of Israel (under Yahshua's supreme rule) WILL BE CALLED by those speaking in the Hebrew language: BAAL LAND! The land, once again, will be *married (baal)* to Yahweh

(3) Jer. 3:14

Turn, O backsliding children, saith Yahweh; *for I am married unto you* (lit. *ba-al-ti ba-chem — I am married in you*): and I will take you one of a city, and two of a family, and I will bring you to Zion.

(4) Jer. 31:31-32

Behold, the days come, saith Yahweh, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although *I was a husband* (ba-al-tee) unto them, saith Yahweh.

Anyone familiar with the Old Testament is acquainted with Yahweh's numerous charges against Israel for playing the harlot by not being faithful to Him. One of the most glorious themes of the Old Testament is how Yahweh continuously refers to himself as Israel's *husband*. He, therefore, offers Israel divine protection, love, caring, and blessings (as any husband would). What is NOT perceived by English readers is that in MANY of these instances, the Hebrew Scriptures employs the *common noun baal* in order to describe this HOLY relationship that existed between Yahweh and Israel!

It is also important to observe that the inspired writer who penned these two verses where the word *baal* is applied to Yahweh in a most emphatic manner, is the very prophet whom inspiration moved to write:

How long shall this be in the heart of the prophets that prophesy lies? yea, they are prophets of the deceit of their own heart; Which think to cause My People to forget My name by their dreams which they tell every man to his neighbor, as their fathers have forgotten My name for BAAL. (Jer.23:26-27)

The impact of this linguistic uncovering is the realization that Jeremiah did NOT know NOR did he ever practice the rejection of words that many in the Sacred-Name Movement have attributed to him!! Jeremiah's concern about *baal's* "pagan connection" (principle #1) was not such as to prevent him from employing the word in a POSITIVE sense to Yahweh. Neither did the fact that *baal* had been used by Israel as a "perverted substitution" of Yahweh's Name (principle #2) prevent the prophet from applying the word to Yahweh when addressing the very Israelites who were practicing idolatry. As far as Jeremiah was concerned (and inspiration for that matter), Yahweh is the ONE and TRUE BAAL (husband) of Israel.

These textual observations of how Jeremiah employs the Hebrew word *baal* can only be explained if we accept the fact that Jeremiah intended to condemn the *proper noun Baal* and NOT the *common noun* usage of it. It should be obvious that Jeremiah and inspiration were not engaging in self-contradiction. Jeremiah did NOT reject the idolatry of *Baal* linguistically, but he did so theologically! It was the CONCEPT of a false deity by the name (*proper noun*) of *Baal* that Jeremiah spoke against and condemned. He did NOT intend to condemn the mere articulation of the word when it was used as a *common noun*.

(5) Is. 1:3

The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass *his master's* (ba-al-av) crib: but Israel doth not know, my people doth not consider.

(6) Is. 54:5

For thy Maker is *thine husband* (ba-al-ech-ah); Yahweh of Host is his name; and thy Redeemer the Holy One of Israel; the God of the whole earth shall he be called.

Was Isaiah not aware of the controversy surrounding the word *baal* in his days? Did he not know that there was a false deity by that name or that Israel had perverted Yahweh's name by substituting it for that of *baal*? Certainly Isaiah was very much aware of these linguistic facts, but as he intended a *common noun application*, it did not prevent him from using the word *baal* to Yahweh!

C. Most Sacred-Name believers argue that the New Testament was originally written in Hebrew ⁶ and then translated into Greek. We then maintain that Yahweh's Name must have been retained by the original inspired writers of the New Testament. To prove this, we allude to the Old Testament Scriptures where the Name of Yahweh appears and which are quoted in the New Testament. Our rationale has been that if the Old Testament passage contains the name of Yahweh, then certainly the New Testament writers would have retained the same when they quoted the passage under inspiration, as they would have done so verbatim.

Similarly, Paul must have retained the word *baal* in the following quotation:

(1) Is. 54:1

Sing, O barren, thou that didst not bear; break forth into singing, and cry aloud, thou that didst not travail with child: for more are the children of the desolate than the children of the *married* (be-ul-ah) wife, saith Yahweh.

(2) Gal. 4:27

For it is written, Rejoice, thou barren that bearest not; break forth and cry aloud, thou that travailest not: for the desolate hath many more children than she which hath a *husband* (be-ul-ah).

It is most significant to observe that ALL of these inspired and sanctioned uses of the word *baal* took place DESPITE the prevalent pagan worship of the time and of Israel's historical idolatry involving a deity by this very name!! Therefore, although *baal* as a PROPER NOUN had already become a word with a notorious *pagan connection* and a history of injury to Yahweh's personal Name by *perverted substitution*, these facts did not prevent inspiration from publicly applying the term as a COMMON NOUN directly to Yahweh, while at the same time condemning the use of the PROPER NOUN *Baal*!

Naturally, Israel hearing and reading the Law and the Prophets in their own native Hebrew language was able to discern the intention of inspiration and therefore understood when *baal* was being used as a *common noun title* or was being condemned as a *proper noun name*. Scholars and English translators of the Bible also understand this, which is why as a *proper noun Baal* is ALWAYS transliterated for us while as a *common noun* it is ONLY translated. This is NOT a mere opinion, but a linguistic fact! There is nothing inherently wrong or sinful about the word *baal* standing by itself. The taboo that many Sacred-Name believers attribute to it is simply NOT biblical.

2. The truth about ADONAY:

Given the history of the Sacred-Name's rejection of words, perhaps this section of the treatise will be even more difficult to deal with than the previous one on *baal*. However, if there is error in the camp, we are bound by divine duty to expose it and get rid of it. As people of Yahweh committed to truth, we cannot risk being found guilty of willful inaccuracies. Since no one has the right to create his own truth, if the facts do not concur with the claim, then that claim must be rejected. With this motivation in mind, consider the following *irrefutable* linguistic facts.

A. ADON is used in reference to Yahweh on numerous occasions:

(1) Neh. 10:29

They clave to their brethren, their nobles, and entered into a curse, and into an oath, to walk in God's law, which was given by Moses the servant of God, and to observe and do all the commandments of Yahweh *our Lord* (ad-on-ai-nu), and his judgment and his statutes.

(2) Ps. 8:1

O Yahweh *our Lord* (ad-on-ai-nu), how excellent is thy name in all the earth! who hast set thy glory above the heavens.

(3) Ps. 97:5

The hills melted like wax at the presence of Yahweh, at the presence of *the Lord* (ha-adon) of the whole earth.

(4) Ps. 114:7

Tremble, thou earth, at the presence of the *Lord* (adon), at the presence of the Elohim of Jacob.

(5) Is. 1:24

Therefore saith the *Lord* (adon), Yahweh of Host, the mighty One of Israel, "Ah, I will ease me of mine adversaries, and avenge me of mine enemies."

(6) Eze.38:14

Therefore, son of man, prophesy and say unto Gog, "Thus saith the *Lord* (adonay) Yahweh; 'In the that day when my people of Israel dwelleth safely, shalt thou not know it?'"

(7) Zech. 4:14, 6:5

Then said he, These are the two anointed ones, that stand by the *Lord* (adon) of the whole earth.

And the angel answered and said unto me, These are the four spirits of the heavens, which go forth from standing before the *Lord* (adon) of all the earth.

Observe how in Zechariah an angel is the one that refers to Yahweh by the title ADON!

(8) Gen. 15:2,8

And Abram said, *Lord* (adonay) Yahweh, what wilt thou give me, seeing I go childless, and the steward of my house is this E-li-e-zer of Da-mas'cus? And he said, *Lord* (adonay) Yahweh, whereby shall I know that I shall inherit it?

The prevailing general belief among many scholars is that Israel borrowed the word *adon*.⁷ This contention led many in the Sacred-Name Movement to charge that it was rebellious Israel who adapted the "heathen" word *adonay* as a *pervverted substitution* of the Divine Name.

Now, it must be admitted that even to this date, Jews in general do not pronounce the name of Yahweh but rather vocalize *adonay* or *ha'shem* (Heb. for "the Name") as an obvious *substitution*. This practice should and must be condemned, as it stands in clear violation of what the Scriptures command us to do!

The problem, however, is that so much emphasis has been placed on what traditional Jews have done, that the impression could be created that the word *adonay* does not actually appear in the Bible! Therefore, it is understandable to see the disturbed reaction of some Sacred-Name believers when it is demonstrated that on numerous occasions (about 400 times)⁸ *adonay* is used in connection with Yahweh (and more especially, in connection with prophecies involving the Sovereign Yahshua Messiah)!

The early Sacred-Name pioneers were so adamant in their sentiments against this word, that when the late Elder A.B. Traina's revision of the King James Bible was published, contrary to the King James Version, it adopted no one *uniform* English word to translate the various appearances of the word *adonay*. Instead, by rendering *adonay* wherever it appeared in the Old Testament as "King," "Savior," and in some instances with the expression "Yah-Yahweh," it had the effect of eliminating

the word from those passages of Scripture! In doing so, it became easy for the readers of the Traina's Version to erroneously assume *adonay* was simply not part of the Hebrew text. In essence, the Traina's Version bestowed upon itself an authority given to no one: It proceeded to CHANGE Scripture and to REMOVE from the Bible those words that were considered *offensive*.

Despite the genuine and sincere motives for these changes, in reality no justification could ever be given for what can only be characterized as sacrilege. Not only was the inspired word of Yahweh altered, but in so doing it helped to perpetuate a fallacy that would see Yahweh and Yahshua destitute of some of the most significant titles inspiration ascribes to them. After all, the whole Bible — titles and all — is inspired, not just the name of Yahweh.

In light of the fact that we in the Sacred-Name Movement take a hard-party line approach against those scholars who have removed the Name of Yahweh from the Bible, by what rationale can we now justify incurring in the same deplorable act? We have charge others for being the "Lying pens of the scribes" who have "falsified the word of Yahweh!" Yet, we act as if it is acceptable to inspiration if WE remove words from Scripture, but NOT if ANYONE ELSE does so.

We have NOT been granted any special privileges that we should dare to take it upon ourselves to alter and change the actual Hebrew words which inspiration employed! The only way we could ever justify doing so would be if we were to *definitely prove* that the Hebrew scrolls contain textual corruption. And, although modern liberal scholars (with their obvious humanistic prejudices) have stated and taught that the Hebrew scrolls are full of historical and textual inaccuracies (and tampering), these claims are based on theories and *pre-suppositions* designed to deny the inspiration of Scripture. Therefore, it is understandable when linguist and scholars continuously claim that Israel *borrowed* or *adopted* much of their religious beliefs, terminology, and practices from other ancient cultures, as these scholars ALWAYS give the benefit of the doubt to the Egyptian, Babylonian, and Canaanite cultures and languages than to Israel or the Hebrew language!! What else could we then expect them to say? ⁹

As we continue with this review, we will demonstrate that the title *adonay* (in its *common noun* usage) is not only an ACCEPTABLE term to inspiration, it is in fact a term that Scripture EXPECTED Israel to use!! We will also see that the theological concept conveyed by the manner inspiration used the word *adonay* is as VITAL to our salvation as the Name of Yahshua!

B. The title *adonay* plays a role in Yahweh's Feast Days:

(1) Ex. 23:17

Three times in the year all thy males shall appear before *the Lord* (ha-adon) Yahweh.

(2) Neh. 8:10

Then he said unto them, Go your way, eat the fat, and drink the sweet, and send portions unto them for whom nothing is prepared: for this day is holy unto *our Lord* (ad-on-ai-nu): neither be ye sorry; for the joy of Yahweh is your strength.

Certainly it can be said that among most practicing Bible believers, the Sacred-Name Movement enjoys a more profound understanding on the subject of Yahweh's Holy Days. In this area, we rightly conceive ourselves to be the defenders of the Faith. Yet, as we can see from the preceding verses, there is a crucial linguistic observation which has been overlooked in our traditional analysis of Yahweh's Feast Days. We have failed to see the inspired connection that exist between the Hebrew title *adon* and Yahweh's appointed Festivals.

Inspiration explicitly commands that all men are to appear before "*ha-adon* Yahweh" three times a year (during the Festivals of Unleavened Bread, Pentecost and Tabernacles). These *prophetic* Festivals are linguistically associated NOT merely to the name of Yahweh, but to the Hebrew title AS WELL: hence, *ha-adon* Yahweh! This means that these Festivals are intended to remind us of the fact that Yahweh is the ONLY true *adon* – a *common noun* meaning Sovereign Ruler – of mankind and earth!

This explains why in Nehemiah 10:29 (cited earlier), the children of Israel – who are returning from captivity and PAGANISM – are led into pledging a vow of loyalty to Yahweh, "the *adon* of the earth!" We see that in the first Feast of Tabernacles that Nehemiah celebrated with Israel (8:10), the association between Tabernacles and *adon* is preserved for us by inspiration. It also serves to accentuate the fact that the men of Yahweh in antiquity understood the relevance of preserving Yahweh's holy titles. This is NO mere coincidence! During these Festivals, Yahweh was not interested in Israel appearing before him while merely recognizing that his Name is Yahweh. He commanded that his people appeared before him recognizing him as *adon* Yahweh! His divine desire was for Israel to show that they were aware of both the Creator's Name and his SOVEREIGNTY over their lives!

Therefore, the THEOLOGICAL CONCEPT conveyed by the Hebrew title *adon* is essential to inspiration and faithful Israel certainly understood this to be true. When inspiration consistently associates a title to Yahweh's Name, we cannot argue that Yahweh's Name is all we need! This is not to imply that Yahweh's Name and his titles are equal, for clearly they are NOT. On the other hand, we must guard ourselves never to take a more puritan approach than Yahweh himself requires. Titles are used for divine purposes and no amount of deviation by men or Satan will ever change this fact! We are not at liberty to rewrite the Bible. Neither men nor devils are invested with the power or the authority to rob the Almighty of his language.

C. Hosea himself applied the term *adon* to Yahweh:

(1) Hos. 12:14 & 13:1

Ephraim provoked him to anger most bitterly: therefore shall he leave his blood upon him, and his reproach shall *his Lord* (ad-on-av) return unto him.

When Ephraim spake trembling, he exalted himself in Israel; but when he offended in *Baal*, he died.

One of the most frequently quoted verses of Scripture by Sacred-Name believers is Hosea 2:16-17, where Yahweh angered at Israel's idolatry, proclaims that the time will come when they will no longer call him *Baali* but will instead call Him *Ishi*. Some have interpreted *Baali* in this context as being *generic* and as referring to ALL pagan NAMES which have been attributed to Yahweh or have been used to substitute for his Name. The natural extension of this line of reasoning has been that titles and names such as LORD, GOD, and ADONAY (to name a few) are included in this prophecy and form part of what has been designated and condemned as "Baal worship."

As prominent as this line of argument has been in the history of the Sacred-Name Movement, unfortunately it serves to illustrate how inadequate and incomplete our linguistic research has often been.

That inspiration did not intend *Baali* in Hosea 2:16-17 to be understood in a *generic* sense can be demonstrated by Hosea's use of *adon*, cited above. No rational linguistic explanation can be given for the prophet's use of *adon* if the *principles* advocated by many in the Movement is what Hosea meant to convey and practice. Had Hosea intended to have his condemnation of *Baali* interpreted to include *adonay*, then we ought to expect that he would never have applied the term *adon* to Yahweh, as he obviously did! Hosea's unqualified use of the word *adon* in a direct reference to Yahweh must clearly indicate that the prophet did not intend his con-demnation of *Baali* to be interpreted generically (as done by most Sacred-Name advocates today)!

Furthermore, it should be noted that Hosea is prophesying about a *future event* (a fact often overlooked by many who attempt to apply this passage to the issue of the Sacred Name) when the "bow, sword, and battle" will cease against the land and Yahweh will once again be *married* to Israel! ¹⁰

But, even if we were to grant a generic interpretation of Hosea's use of *Baali* (unlikely as it is) and agree that the prophet meant a more broader application, it still will follow he did NOT intend to condemn the use of the *common noun adon*! Observe the contrast of Hosea's POSITIVE use of *adon* in 12:14 (in reference to Yahweh) with his NEGATIVE use of *Baal* in 13:1! According to Hosea, it is *adon* that will punish Ephraim for worshiping *Baal*! This linguistic reference helps to emphasize the fact that the two Hebrew words (*adon & baal*) cannot mean the same to inspiration (as often advocated by Sacred-Name believers). For if they meant the same, how can we explain why Yahweh – the *adon* of Israel according to Hosea – will chastise Ephraim for going after *Baal* (a word that many argue means the same as *adon*)? This is why the English translators have done the right thing in Hosea 12:14 and 13:1, where they chose to translate *adon* into English while they trans-literate *baal*.

Another crucial observation that needs to be made in this passage is this: If the Name of Yahweh encompasses everything to inspiration (as some often argue), then why in Hosea 2:16-17 do we have Yahweh eliminating one Hebrew title while feeling compelled to find another title (with the same basic meaning and concept) by which his people are to refer to him? Bear in mind, it is Yahweh who desires and commands to be addressed by a new title, *ishi* (*my man-as if intending "my husband"*). In light of all the corruption involving titles and the all sufficiency of his divine Name, why the need to select yet another title? Why does not Yahweh settle for his Name only? Obviously, titles are far more meaningful to Yahweh than we have realized!!

One more point: whatever interpretation we apply to Hosea 2:16-17, we must take into account that Isaiah 62:4 (cited earlier) has clearly prophesied that Israel will be known in the Hebrew language as "*baal* /married land" during the millennium.

Therefore, Hosea's condemnation must be interpreted that Yahweh will no longer ALLOW HIMSELF to be called "my Baal" (*Baali*), and NOT that the *common noun baal* - in of itself - will be eliminated. The authors welcome any other suggestions as to how to better harmonize Hosea 2:16-17 with Isaiah 62:4.

D. *Adon* is used in numerous Messianic prophecies:

(1) Ps. 110:1

Yahweh said unto *my Lord* (a-do-nee), Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool.

Few brethren realize that this Scripture in the book of Psalms is the Old Testament passage most frequently quoted by the New Testament writers (Mt.22:41-45, Mk.12:35-37, Lk.20:41-44, Acts 2:34-36 and it is also alluded to by Paul in 1 Cor.15:25 and by Hebrews 10:13). Its Messianic character has been recognized by all scholars, as it is obvious that Yahshua is the one referred to in this text as *adonee*! This title is in fact prophetic of the Savior, representing the role that Yahshua is to enjoy in the believer's life. As we are about to demonstrate, we are commanded to recognize and invoke the Son of Yahweh by his titles, just as we are instructed to acknowledge his Name. There is no acceptable excuse we can give to the Father in order to justify the manner how many in the Sacred-Name Movement belittle and often ignore the significance of divine titles.

(2) Is. 25:6-8

And in this mountain shall Yahweh of hosts make unto all people a feast of fat things, a feast of wines on the lees, of fat things full of marrow, of wines on the lees well refined. And he will destroy in this mountain the face of the covering cast over all people, and the veil that is spread over all nations. He will swallow up death in victory; and the *Lord* (adonay) Yahweh will wipe away tears from off all faces; and the rebuke of his people shall he take away from off all the earth: for Yahweh hath spoken it.

Given the language of this passage, this prophesy is to be fulfilled by Yahshua during his future reign of one thousand years on earth. Therefore, the "*adonay* Yahweh" referred to in verse eight is Yahweh acting through his Son, Yahshua! The title in this instance is essential in order to

differentiate the Son from the Father!

(3) Is. 40:10-11

Behold, the *Lord* (adonay) Yahweh will come with strong hand, and his arm shall rule for him: behold, his reward is with him, and his work before him. He shall feed his flock like a shepherd: he shall gather the lambs with his arm, and carry them in his bosom, and shall gently lead those that are with young.

(4) Is. 61:1

The Spirit of the *Lord* (adonay) Yahweh is upon me; because Yahweh hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound.

(5) Mal.3:1

Behold, I will send My messenger, and he shall prepare the way before Me: and the *Lord* (adon), whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold, He shall come, saith Yahweh of Hosts.

The more one looks into the importance of these Hebrew titles, the greater their significance appears to be. There is a unique and obvious association that exist between the title *adonay* and the very person of Yahshua. The many passages of Scripture which attest to this fact cannot be dismissed as mere coincidence or incidental. Inspiration is absolute in its resolve to assure that Yahshua's divinely appointed titles be recognized by all. The *adonai*ship of Yahshua is a critical teaching of biblical prophesy. There is an appointed time that the Father has determined when the SOVEREIGNTY of his Son will be established and fulfilled! This fact becomes more abundantly clear in the New Testament.

E. *Adonay* is used of Yahshua in the New Testament:

As noted earlier, it is the belief of most Sacred-Name organizations that the New Testament was originally written in Hebrew and not in Greek. Therefore, it is argued that the Greek manuscripts that are available to scholars today are translations of an original Hebrew. This being the case, it is often possible to reverse the process and partially reconstruct what the original Hebrew wording would have looked like. This process is especially simple when it comes to merely converting coined words (i.e. *theos* into Yahweh or Elohim, *christos* into Messiah or Anointed, etc.).

By following established linguistic rules of interpretation, one can easily verify through a lexicons (or other similar source) that the Greek word *kuriou* is essentially the equivalent of the Hebrew word *adonay*. For example, the New Strong's Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible defines these two words as:

2962 **kuriou**, from **kuros** (*supremacy*); supreme in authority, i.e. (as noun) *controller*; by impl. *Mr.* (as a respectful title):—God, Lord, master, Sir.

113 **adon**; from an unused root (mean to *rule*); *sovereign*, i.e. *controller* (human or divine):—lord, master, owner.

By keeping this linguistic fact in mind, carefully observe the impact and significance that the following passages of Scripture apply to titles which inspiration has permanently attached and associated to the Savior's personal Name.

(1) Jn. 13:13-14

Ye call me Master and *Lord* (*kuriou/adonay*): and ye say well; for so I am. Now if I, your *Lord* (*kuriou -adonay*) and Master have washed your feet you also should wash one another's feet.

Perhaps the most amazing thing about this verse is the argument by some that *adonay* had already become an injurious word which the Jews were using to "substitute" for Yahweh's Name during the lifetime of the Savior. Yet, if this is true, Yahshua does not rebuke those who recognize him by calling him *adonay*. On the contrary, he ENCOURAGES those who do so to continue, by acknowledging that HE IS in fact *adonay*! Why didn't the Savior emphasize the importance of his personal Name instead? Why was not the Savior's reaction something like, "You call me Master and *adonay*, but you are wrong. I am to be known only as Yahshua?" If divine titles are not essential, then why does the Savior vindicate the use of the same, even when these are words that as *proper nouns* are guilty of a pagan connection?

Observe also that this passage of Scripture is the text that all Bible students and scholars quote in order to teach the institution of the *feet washing* ceremony! This new commandment (which was not taught in the Law of Moses) gets ADDED by virtue of the fact that Yahshua as *adonay* is Sovereign and he is endowed with the necessary authority to amend the Law, even the Passover ceremony!!

Isn't it ironical that if Yahshua were to visit a Synagogue today and while there proclaim he is *adonay*, he would immediately be denied and rejected! However, it is even more sad to realize that because of our misconceptions, if Yahshua were to do the same in most Sacred-Name assemblies, his proclamation would take everyone by surprise and would likely cause him to be denied and rejected!

We are quick to condemn Christians for not being willing to *recognize* the Savior's true Name. How then should our Heavenly Father deal with us who likewise refuse to *recognize* the Savior's true titles? This is the gravity of our error. Not only have we denied the Savior the very titles that inspiration has appointed unto him, we have also developed a doctrinal application that is so inconsistent and contrary to Scripture, that it cannot be labeled anything short of heresy!

(2) Jn. 20:20, 28

And when he had so said, he shewed unto them his hands and his side. Then were the disciples glad, when they saw the *Lord* (kurious -adonay). And Thomas answered and said unto Him. My *Lord* (kurious -adonay) and my God.

(3) Acts 2:34-36

For David is not ascended into heaven: but he saith himself. Yahweh said unto my *Lord* (adon), Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thy foes thy footstool. Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that Yahweh hath made that same Yahshua, whom ye have impaled, BOTH *LORD* (kurious - adonay) and MESSIAH.

The power and divine authority invested in the titles *messiah* and *adonay* are best illustrated in these passages of the New Testament. It clearly shows that it was NOT sufficient for the Israelites listening to Peter's sermon on the day of Pentecost to accept the Name of Yahshua. It was also required that they recognize that this man Yahshua — who they had executed — had been declared to be both "*ADONAY* and MESSIAH." ¹¹

(4) Acts 11:17

For as much then as God give them the like gift as *he* did unto us, who believe on the *Lord* (kurious -adonay) Yahshua Messiah; what was I that I could withstand God.

(5) Acts 28:30-31

And Paul dwell two whole years in his own hired house, and received all that came in unto him, Preaching the Kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concern the *Lord* (kurious -adonay) Yahshua Messiah, with all confidence, no man forbidding him.

Therefore, our salvation involves more than just accepting and invoking the divinely given Name of the Savior. We are compelled to accept and recognize that his divinely appointed titles are also essential for our salvation! Which one of us is going to DARE to challenge the Father for bestowing on his Son a title that by standards of many is unacceptable? Who are we to refuse to obey Yahweh's clear directives on this matter, and yet, proclaim ourselves children of the Most High?

(6) Rom. 10:9

That if thou confess with thy mouth the *Lord* (kurious -adonay) Yahshua, and shalt believe in thine heart that Yahweh hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved.

Peter was not the only one who understood the importance of attributing the title *adonay* to Yahshua. Paul too recognized its significance and the divine mandate that we are to invoke the Son of Yahweh by his titles in order to be saved! In fact, the Greek text of Roman 10:9 has been mistranslated by the KJV. Scholars and modern Bible translations point out that the literal Greek text of Romans 10:9 is best rendered as:

"... if you confess with your mouth Yahshua

as Lord (i.e, AS *adonay*)!"

Or as:

"... if you confess with your mouth Yahshua is Lord (i.e., IS *adonay*)!"

In order to be saved, Paul here argues that one must confess (i.e. publicly proclaim) that Yahshua – the only begotten Son of Yahweh – is *adonay*! Herein lies a Pandora's box that challenges the very foundations of those Sacred-Name believers who contend against the word *adonay*.

(7) 1 Cor.12:2-3

Ye know that ye were Gentiles, carried away unto these dumb idols, even as ye were led. Wherefore I give you to understand, that no man speaking by the Spirit of Yahweh calleth Yahshua accursed: and that no man can say that Yahshua is the *Lord* (kurious -adonay), but by the Holy Spirit.

An interesting observation about the Apostle's statement in this passage is the fact that he acknowledges the pagan history of the Corinthian members. If there were ever a time when concern for a confused body of believers with a strong pagan background would influence Paul's selection of words, it certainly would be the writing of this Epistle. However, if the Sacred-Name Movement is right about their rejection of the word *adonay*, it is obvious Paul never got the message! While at the same time condemning the *former* pagan practices of the Corinthians, Paul is not deterred from applying to Yahshua a title with a well KNOWN PAGAN CONNECTION both in Hebrew and Greek!! Furthermore, not only does verse three emphatically states that "no one speaking by the Spirit of Yahweh calls Yahshua accursed," it also teaches THAT THOSE TRULY LED BY THE SPIRIT OF Yahweh WILL IN FACT BE LED TO PROCLAIM HIM AS ADONAY Yahshua!! In light of this fact, we are most assured that claiming that Yahshua is *adonay* could NEVER constitute sin!! BUT REFUSING TO DO SO IS SIN!!

(8) 2 Cor. 4:5

For we PREACH not ourselves, but Messiah Yahshua the *Lord* (kurious -adonay); and ourselves as servants for Yahshua's sake.

Again, just like in Rom.10:9, Greek scholars do not follow the KJV, but maintain that the Greek text is best rendered as:

For we do not preach ourselves, but Yahshua Messiah as Lord (i.e., AS *adonay*)

Or as:

For we do not preach ourselves, but Yahshua Messiah is Lord (i.e., IS *adonay*)

Therefore, the message that the apostle Paul claims to have been PREACHING to the gentiles was the recognition of Messiah Yahshua as *adonay*!

No matter how we turn this one around, the evidence forces us to recognize the linguistic fact that salvation is NOT found in the mere Name of Yahshua, but in the full expression of *adonay* Yahshua *messiah*. Historical and linguistic research has even concluded that the *original* baptismal formula found throughout the book of Acts follows this same proclamation!¹²

While it is true that the Father has bestowed upon his Son a unique special Name, it is no less true that Yahweh has also chosen to appoint some very unique honorary titles upon his beloved Son! Ask yourself: Given the language of these verses, if a Jew were to have accepted the Name of Yahshua, but refused to recognize him as Messiah or as *adonay*, would he have been saved? Would Paul have stretched out his hand of fellowship to that Jew? Obviously NOT! Yet, given OUR standards, many in the Sacred-Name Movement today would not only extend a hand of fellowship, but would go to great length to rejoice, failing to realize that the refusal of Yahshua's divinely appointed titles is in itself an act of rebellion against inspiration!

(9) 1Cor. 1:3

Grace be unto you, and peace, from Yahweh our Father, and from the *Lord* (kurious -adonay) Yahshua Messiah.

Paul's consistency is compelling as it is also conclusive. Over and over again we see how he greets the Brethren (NOT just in the Name of Yahshua) but in the Name of ADONAY Yahshua MESSIAH (see Rom.1:7, 2 Cor.1:2, Gal.1:3, Eph.1:2, Phil.1:2, Col.1:2-3, 1 Th.1:1, 2 Th.1:2, 1 Tim.1:2, 2 Tim.1:2).

Despite all these irrefutable linguistic facts, there are those who still want to hold on to the errors of the past. In the same manner that Sunday-keepers have been arguing that "names are not that important," we have been arguing that "titles are not that important!" To a Sunday-keeper, it is absurd to make the "divine names" of Yahweh and Yahshua a salvation issue. On the other hand, to us it is equally absurd to make "divine titles" a salvation issue. However, to inspiration - ahh! - that's a whole different story!! For unless we willfully wish to claim blindness, it is obvious from the many passages of Scripture already quoted that DIVINE NAMES and INSPIRED TITLES do MATTER TO Yahweh!! The question we should ask ourselves is, "WHO ARE WE TO SAY DIFFERENTLY?"

For those who wish to argue that titles (even divine ones) are not specific and unique enough to warrant such treatment, consider Paul's statements which follows.

(10) 1 Cor. 8:5-6

For though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or in earth, as there be gods many, and *lords* (kurious - adonim) many,

But to us there is but ONE God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and ONE *Lord* (kurious - adonay) Yahshua Messiah, by whom are all things, and we by him.

(11) Eph. 4:4-5

There is one body, and one spirit, even as you are called in one hope of your calling; ONE *Lord* (kurious - adonay), one faith, one baptism, ONE God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.

Let us analyze the overwhelming ramifications of these two passages of Scripture. Here Paul willingly acknowledges and recognizes that there are in fact MANY *mighty ones* and MANY *sovereign rulers*! He does NOT deny this to be true. BUT, as far as inspiration is concerned, there is but ONE (and only ONE) true *mighty-one*, Yahweh! And, ONE (yes, only ONE) *adonay* – Yahshua the Messiah!! Note that Paul was not content with merely stating there is but ONE Yahweh and ONE Yahshua! Inspiration wants to assure we go further than just recognizing the SACRED Names of the Creator and His Son. It also makes sure that WE RECOGNIZE THE SACRED TITLES of Yahweh and Yahshua!!! Do we need a verse clearer than this?

(12) Phil. 2:10-11

That at the Name of Yahshua every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; And that every tongue should confess that Yahshua Messiah is *Lord* (kurious - adonay), to the glory of Yahweh the Father.

Yes, you read that right! The time WILL COME when ALL will bow their knees and every tongue SHALL CONFESS (i.e. publicly proclaim) – NOT that the Name of the Son is Yahshua – BUT that Yahshua is *adonay*!!! This is a passage of Scripture that every Sacred-Name believer quotes frequently. We have always loved it because verse 9 reads: "Wherefore Yahweh also has highly exalted Him, and given Him A NAME which is above every name." And yet, this passage not only exalts the Name of Yahshua, it also exalts his title *adonay*!! It has been there all this time, we simply have been too biased in our reasoning to see it!!!

To further accent the divine importance of Yahshua's titles, observe what Yahshua at his second coming will be displaying ACROSS his CHEST and along his THIGH (just to make sure that everyone will notice):

(13) Rev.19:16

And he (Yahshua) hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, King of kings and *Lord* (kurious-adon) of lords (kurious - adonim).

Imagine the holy OBSESSION the Father feels toward the titles He has given to his beloved Son! Observe that in this passage the Savior does NOT wear his NAME on this insignia! All he wears are his TITLES! Do you get the impact of this?

Here we have the Savior returning to earth for the first time in approximately TWO thousand years. During his absence, men and Satan have so corrupted the precious Name of the Son of Yahweh that today only an insignificant number of people actually know and use the true Name Yahshua. If it were left to OUR manner of thinking, the most important thing would be to immediately restore the Savior's holy Name at his second coming, right? Yet, inspiration is more concerned with displaying Yahshua's titles than with displaying his Name!!! Now, isn't this contrary to OUR rationale? Obviously, Yahweh is not too impressed by our methods which are "designed to protect and promote" his cause ... OUR WAY. It is ironical to observe that the average Sacred-Name believer today — were he to be given the honor of designing this decorative ribbon to be worn by Yahshua at his appearance — would have made the same bearing only the name: Yahshua!!

These are inspired linguistic facts against which the modern Sacred-Name Movement has no possible defense. We must ask ourselves: With all the details involved in the long awaited return of Yahshua and the establishment of his kingdom on earth, why is the Father so adamant about displaying to the whole world *titles* that we in the Sacred-Name Movement have either termed to be pagan, evil, unacceptable, or at the very least, unimportant?

To add insult to injury, we have developed such animosity against the word *adonay*, that the English word *Sovereign* has become more HOLY to us THAN THE ORIGINAL HEBREW WORD THAT INSPIRATION USES. Again, we ask: When the kingdom of Yahweh is finally established on earth and the "pure" language is restored, WHO WILL BE CALLING Yahshua BY THE ENGLISH WORD SOVEREIGN? What other possible Hebrew word could we be using then than *adonay*? By Yahweh's decree, which word will appear engraved in Yahshua's vest at his Second coming: *Sovereign* or *adonay*?

This is not to imply that the English word *Sovereign* cannot be used, for even the authors of this treatise use it as a translation of *adonay*. However, to employ *Sovereign*, while rejecting in our *hearts* the Hebrew *adonay*, is a slap in the face of inspiration — as we show by this act our willingness to nullify the word of Yahweh in favor of our man made traditions! It should be clear and understood that it is illogical to reject the Hebrew word *adonay* and at same time promote its concept through a translation. If it were true that inspiration did not want us to use the Hebrew *adonay*, how can we defend using the *technicality* of an English translation as means of avoiding the biblical command? The consistent thing would be to completely eliminate the concept (a thing we are not willing to do either), as an English translation still implicitly recognizes and acknowledges the existence of the Hebrew word it renders!

(14) Rev. 17:14

These shall make war with the Lamb, and the Lamb shall overcome them: for he is *Lord* (kurious-adon) of lords (kurious-adonim), and King of kings: and they that are with Him are called, and chosen, and faithful.

Naturally, we all realize that Yahshua's name means Yahweh-saves. However, it is not Yahshua the Savior that conquers the enemy at his Second Coming. Rather, it is Yahshua *adonay* – the King of kings – that defeats all opposing forces. These titles are essential to the true idea intended by Rev.17:14 above. They help put into perspective the honor and glory of the authority that Yahweh has bestowed upon Yahshua, His beloved Son.

As in the case of *baal*, all of these inspired uses of the *common noun adonay* took place despite the fact that some argue that the *proper noun Adonay* had already become the name of a false deity and that at the time of Yahshua and the Apostles, the Jews were already causing the Name of Yahweh to become obscured by their constant substitution of *adonay* for the Holy Name (a practice they have continued to this date!). Again, we are forced to acknowledge that the two *principles* advocated by many in the Sacred-Name Movement today are contrary to the practice sanctioned by inspiration and recorded by Scripture. In 1 Cor. 1:2 Paul literally states regarding Yahshua and the Sacred-Name believers of his days:

"... that in every place call upon the name of Yahshua Messiah our *Lord* (kurious -adonay), BOTH THEIRS and OURS."

Is Yahshua your *adonay*? Like it or not, HE'D BETTER BE!

3. The truth regarding EL:

A. *El* was the name of a pagan deity in Abraham's days. Consider some of the facts that Unger's Bible Dictionary (pg. 293-4) states regarding the word *El*.

In Canaanite paganism as reflected in the Phoenician historian Philo of Byblos, c. 100 A.D., and particularly in the epic religious literature unearthed at Ras Shamra, ancient Ugarit in North Syria, 1929-1937, *El* was the head of the Canaanite pantheon.

Unger's Bible Dictionary continues by stating:

Like Homer's Zeus, *El* was the father of men and gods. The utter moral abandon of *El*, as well as that of his son, *Baal*, and his three sister-wives, who were patroness of sex and war, point to the degrading effects of Canaanite religion and offer adequate moral explanation for the inflexibly stern attitude of the Old Testament toward the religion of the Canaanites themselves ... *El* rapidly declined, however, and was largely supplanted by the worship of *Baal*, which was equally demoralizing.

What is amazing about this reference is the fact that Unger's Bible Dictionary is one of the Sacred-Name Movement's most often quoted books. The linguistic arguments which many in the Movement have advanced against the titles *baal* and *adonay* have relied heavily on the scholarship of this and other similar reference material. The irony is that the Bible dictionary that was employed by some in the Sacred-Name Movement (in order to prove that *adonay* and *baal* were words guilty of a "pagan connection") also proves that *el* and *elohim* ARE LIKEWISE ASSOCIATED WITH PAGANISM AND FALSE WORSHIP! ¹³

However, although the full impact of this fact has only of late been realized by some Sacred-Name organizations, it is rather amusing to observe that our pioneers "chose" to conveniently ignore the above reference. So, while on one hand *baal* and *adonay* were condemned and labeled unacceptable because of their "pagan connection," *el* and *elohim* were retained despite having the same "pagan connection"! Which naturally begs the question, "Where is the consistency?"

Within the last 15 years or so, the realization that *el* and *elohim* were associated with paganism has finally begun to cause havoc, as it has become one of the principal reasons why some Sacred-Name Assemblies known to the authors of this treatise have split or are on the verge of doing so. Sadly, the very misconceptions (the two Sacred-Name *principles*) that for some time helped us to grow and develop into a recognized movement, are reflected in the reasons why many Assemblies today have become fragmented, to the point where shameful and senseless rivalry has caused even Elders and leaders to permanently disassociate and dis-fellowship one another! Yet, this sad state of affairs should NOT surprise us in the least, since the same is the product of decades of accumulated faulty reasoning.

The only way out of this dilemma is to go back to the beginning and start casting our foundation anew. EITHER WE ACCEPT THE IRREFUTABLE FACT THAT OUR TWO BASIC PRINCIPLES ARE CONTRARY TO SCRIPTURE or WE WILL BE FORCED — in order to be consistent with the *principles* we argue and defend — TO CONDEMN, ELIMINATE, and ERADICATE any and ALL words (both Hebrew and English) that can be demonstrated to have a pagan connection!! All things considered, there is no room for middle ground.

As we have already done with *baal* and *adonay*, let us now analyze how inspiration employs the Hebrew words *el* and *elohim*, despite the well documented pagan connection associated with these.

B. Abraham applied the word to Yahweh:

(1) Gen. 14:18-20, 22

And Mel-chize-dek king of Sa'lem brought forth bread and wine: and he was the priest of the *Most High God* (le el elyon). And he blessed him, and said, Blessed be Abram of the *Most High God* (el elyon), possessor of heaven and earth: And blessed be the *Most High God* (el elyon), which hath delivered thine enemies into thy hand. And he gave him tithes of all.

And Abram said to the king of Sodom, I have lifted up mine hand unto Yahweh, the *Most High God* (el elyon), the possessor of heaven and earth.

The fascination that scholars have displayed over the quest to find out who Mel-chize-dek was is legendary. His identity has been the subject of many doctoral theses, publications and books. Yet, the one thing that Scripture makes clear is the high regard that inspiration gave to this king, as the Savior's priesthood is named after him! Obviously, whoever Mel-chize-dek was, HE WAS NOT CONSIDERED A PAGAN WORSHIPER by inspiration! Nonetheless, he refers to Yahweh by the very name that other nations OF HIS TIME WERE USING TO WORSHIP A FALSE DEITY!! We can't even argue that Mel-chize-dek was simply ignorant, for Abraham himself takes a cue from this king and refers to Yahweh by the same supposedly pagan name and appellants (verse 22)!!!

C. Even Yahweh applies the word *el* to himself:

(1) Gen. 17:1

And when Abram was ninety years old and nine, Yahweh appeared to Abram, and said unto him, "I am Almighty *God* (*el shaddai*); walk before Me, and be thou perfect."

(2) Gen. 35:7,11

And he (Jacob) built there an altar, and called the place El-Beth-El: because there God (*elohim*) appeared unto him, when he fled from the face of his brother.

And *God* (*elohim*) said unto him, "I am *God* Almighty (*el shaddai*): be fruitful and multiply; a nation and a company of nations shall be of thee, and kings shall come out of thy loins."

Just like we observed with the words *baal* and *adonay*, Yahweh freely refers to himself by the *common noun* titles *el* and *elohim*, unconcerned by the fact that in Abraham's days the *proper noun* *El* was the name of a pagan deity that was even worshiped by the people of Ur, the very place where Abraham was born and grew up (consider Joshua 24:2)!! Yahweh is not alarmed by the supposed possibility that Abraham may get the wrong impression or become confused as to who is the true "Mighty One." Those who now wish to contend against the use of the word *elohim* must face up to these linguistic facts. If inspiration can make use of a term — although corrupted by some — WHO ARE WE TO CHALLENGE Yahweh?!

(3) Ex. 20:2-3

I am Yahweh *thy God* (*el-o-heh-cha*), which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. Thou shall have no *gods* (*elohim*) before Me."

Paganism does not stop Yahweh. Devils and rebellious men may corrupt every word in the Bible, this will not prevent Yahweh FROM RETAINING HIS OWN LANGUAGE, NAME and TITLES! In fact, a coin has already been discovered by archeologist where the short poetic form YHW (*Yahu*) appears engraved in what is claimed to be a tribute to a "Thunder god" (perhaps the predecessor of Zeus?)! ¹⁴ Would any of us argue based on this fact that the Name of Yahweh has been corrupted and that due to this "pagan connection" it is no longer acceptable? OF COURSE NOT! Then why the "hang-over"? The same rationale applies to ALL other words which inspiration has employed!!

(4) Ps. 84:11

For Yahweh *God* (*elohim*) is a *sun* and shield: Yahweh will give grace and glory: No good thing will He withhold from them that walk uprightly.

(5) Mal. 4:2

But unto you that fear My Name shall the *Sun* of Righteousness arise with healing in his wings; and ye shall go forth, and grow up as calves of the stall.

Here is another fine example that paganism will NOT deter Yahweh from applying to himself those titles and literary designations that are rightfully his!

All scholars are in agreement that one of the very first objects of pagan worship was the *Sun*. In fact, it seems that in every ancient culture and civilization, the *Sun* was the favorite symbol or personification of the deity being worshiped. This was specially true of many of Israel's neighboring nations. *Sun* worship is attributed to Nimrod and the first Babylon he created, as every novice Sacred-Name believer already knows.

Yet, Yahweh employs both the word and the object worshiped by pagan nations in reference to himself!! Again, it did not concern Yahweh that at the time, *Sun* worship was a prevalent pagan

practice! Neither does Yahweh appear concerned that his actions may lead (or rather mis-lead) some poor Israelite into believing that Yahweh and the *Sun* were one.

(6) Dt. 10:17

For Yahweh *your God* (el-o-heh-chem) is *God* (elohe) *of gods* (ha-elohim), and *Lord* (ve-adon-ai) *of lords* (ha-adon-im), a (lit. *the*) great *God* (ha-el), a mighty, and a terrible, which regardeth not persons, nor taketh reward.

Here Moses, who wrote the often quoted admonition against mentioning the names of false deities (Ex.23:13,¹⁵ Dt.12:3,18:20), applies the alleged "pagan" words *elohim*, *el* and *adonay* directly to Yahweh! Are we to believe that Moses did not understand what he wrote? Or, could it be THAT WE ARE THE ONES WHO HAVE NOT PROPERLY UNDERSTOOD MOSES? Obviously, we are the ones who have erred, even if driven by good intentions.

The obvious reason why Moses was able to apply ALL these Hebrew words directly to Yahweh is because he meant to convey the THEOLOGICAL CONCEPTS represented by the meanings of these words when employed as mere *common nouns*! Naturally, Moses was NOT attributing to Yahweh the *pagan concepts* or worship associated with these very words when rebellious men used them as the names (*proper nouns*) of their false deities!! Needless to say, the Israelites who heard Moses and the future generations who later read his *Book of the Law* understood the difference.

(7) Ps. 136:1-3

O give thanks unto Yahweh; for He is good: For his mercy endureth for ever.

O give thanks *unto the God* (le-elo-hay) *of gods* (ha-elohim): For his mercy endureth for ever.

O give thanks to *the Lord* (le-ado-nai) *of lords* (ha-adonim): For his mercy endureth for ever.

Beloved reader, could you with a clear conscience make these same public proclamations? Could you invite all those around you to give thanks unto Yahweh, the *EL* of *elohim* and the *ADONAY* of *adonim*? Could you do so while rejoicing in your heart with the realization that Yahweh is indeed the *elohim* and *adonay* par excellence? Could you with total freedom of expression invoke the Name of Yahweh along with the titles *elohim* and *adonay*? If you can't or if you are hesitant to do so, THE PROBLEM WOULD BE WITH YOU AND NOT WITH THE WORD OF Yahweh!

(8) Is.26:13

O Yahweh *our God* (elo-hai-noo), *other lords* (adonim) beside Thee *had dominion* (ba-al-ah-noo) over us: but by Thee only will we make mention of Thy Name.

(9) Is.46:9

Remember the former things of old; I am *God* (el), there is none else; I am *God* (elohim), and there is none like me.

In Isaiah 26:13, the prophet employs all three supposedly "unclean pagan words." There is not even the least trace of concern by Isaiah that doing this may "send" the wrong message to Israel, a people already plagued with a rebellious history of idolatry and paganism, which Isaiah himself had been battling against.

Our second example is a direct quotation, where Isaiah records Yahweh as directly stating that He is *el* and *elohim*! Instead of saying, "I am Yahweh ..." as in previous occasions, in Isaiah 46:9 Yahweh declares, "I am *elohim*." And, why shouldn't Yahweh make such a statement? After all, Yahweh is the ONLY TRUE *elohim*, par excellence, in the whole universe!!

Perhaps, no other passage of Scripture can better illustrate the way Yahweh feels about his title *elohim* than Ezekiel 28:1-10, where Yahweh sentences the "prince of Tyre" to death for believing in his heart and claiming he was ... *elohim*!

(1) The word of Yahweh came again unto me, saying,

(2) Son of man, say unto the prince of Tyrus, Thus saith the Adonay Yahweh; Because thine heart is lifted up, and thou hast said, I am a God (Heb. EL), I sit in the seat of God (Heb. Elohim), in the midst of the seas; yet thou art a man, and not God (EL), though thou set thine heart as the heart of God (Elohim):

(3) Behold, thou art wiser than Daniel; there is no secret that they can hide from thee:

(4) With thy wisdom and with thine understanding thou hast gotten thee riches, and hast gotten gold and silver into thy treasures:

(5) By thy great wisdom and by thy traffic hast thou increased thy riches, and thine heart is lifted up because of thy riches:

(6) Therefore thus saith the *Lord* Yahweh; Because thou hast set thine heart as the heart of God (Elohim);

(8) Behold, therefore I will bring strangers upon thee, the terrible of the nations: and they shall draw their swords against the beauty of thy wisdom, and they shall defile thy brightness.

(9) They shall bring thee down to the pit, and thou shalt die the deaths of them that are slain in the midst of the seas.

(10) Wilt thou yet say before him that slayeth thee, I am God (Elohim)? but thou shalt be a man, and no God (EL), in the hand of him that slayeth thee.

(11) Thou shalt die the deaths of the un-circumcised by the hand of strangers: for I have spoken it, saith the *Lord* Yahweh.

Observe that the prince of Tyre did NOT claim to be Yahweh (a proper noun), but rather, *elohim* (a common noun). In His judgment against this audacious individual, Yahweh emphasized that the prince was but a man, as if meaning to say, "How dare you usurp one of my titles!"

All things considered (just as we have seen in our previous linguistic analysis of *baal* and *adonay*), *el* and *elohim* are acceptable *common nouns* that inspiration uses over and over again and applies as titles to Yahweh with the utmost reverence.

This observation holds true for countless of other Hebrew words that in like manner have been corrupted. To illustrate, we read in 2Kings 17:31:

"And the Avites made Nibhaz and Tartak, and the Sepharvites burnt their children in fire to *Adrammelech* and *Anammelech*, the gods of Sepharvaim."

According to Hebrew authorities (Strong's #152), *Adrammelech* is a compound proper noun which means "excellent king." Although 2 King 17:31 makes it abundantly clear that *Adrammelech* is the name of a false deity, these same words are applied as titles of majesty directly unto Yahweh in the following verses: 1 Samuel 12:12, Psalms 8:1 and Isaiah 42:21

Psalms 8:1

“O Yahweh our Sovereign, how *excellent* (Heb. *a-deer*) is your name in all the earth! Who hast set your glory above the heavens.

Isaiah 42:21

“Yahweh is well pleased for his righteousness' sake; he will magnify the law, *and make it honorable* (Heb. *ve-y'a-deer*).

1 Samuel 12:12

“And when you saw that Nahash the king of the children of Ammon came against you, you said unto me, Nay; but a king shall reign over us: when Yahweh your God was *your king* (Heb. *meh-lech-ech-em*).”

Psalms 24:8

“Who is this *King* (Heb. *melech*) of glory? Yahweh strong and mighty, Yahweh mighty in battle.”

If we apply the biblically inspired rationale which we have discovered in our careful analysis of the numerous passages of Scripture cited through out this treatise, one is COMPELLED to REVISE the Sacred-Name *principles* as follows:

Fact #1:

Had an Israelite employed the words *baal*, *adonay* or *elohim* meaning nothing more than “*husband*, *sovereign*, or *mighty-one*,” he will NOT had been guilty of sin if he applied these words to Yahweh or to other men, as he would have been employing them as mere *common nouns*.

Fact #2:

On the other hand, had the same Israelite employed the words *baal*, *adonay* or *elohim* as *proper nouns* intending a dignified and reverent reference to a false deity or had he attempted to substitute the name of Yahweh while attributing to Him the characteristics or worship meant to a false deity, then that Israelite would have been guilty of sin and idolatry.

Fact #3:

Irrespective of all the perversion men and devils may perpetuate against the righteous character of Yahweh, this will never prevent the Almighty from retaining and applying to himself those words and titles that in the judgment of divinity rightfully belong to Yahweh and Yahshua. This is especially important to remember when we are dealing with the linguistic realization that *elohim* and *adonay*, were not merely sanctioned by inspiration, but were also required and mandated to Israel!

Given the irrefutable nature of the linguistic evidence we have thus far previewed, there is ONLY one possible conclusion:

The sin of idolatry does not lie on the mere use or articulation of the words *adonay* or *elohim*, but on the INTENTION of the individual who employs the same! What makes a word *clean* or *unclean* is NOT the existence of the word itself, but the THEOLOGICAL CONCEPT intended by the individual speaking. The Bible CONDEMNS the CONCEPT of IDOLATRY, but it does NOT do so solely on a LINGUISTIC BASIS!

For example, in Judges 13:2-4 and 19-24 we have the account of how a righteous Hebrew couple were miraculously blessed with a son whom they named *Samson*. Looking into the name of *Samson*, however, one discovers that it means *sunlight*.¹⁶ One may ask, “At a time when *sun* worship was such a predominant form of false religion among most of the pagans in *Samson*’s days, why would his righteous parents gave him a name that meant *sunlight*?” The answer is obvious: They did not *intend* to honor the *sun* as an idol! Rather, given that the Angel of Yahweh had manifested himself to them in a *brilliant* manner, naming their son *sunlight* was their way of associating the prophetic event to the child! Idolatry was the farthest thing on their mind. On the other hand, had *Samson*’s parents been pagan worshipers of Zeus (whose name means *sky*),¹⁷ then idolatry would have been the motivating factor and the name would have stand condemned. Once again, the difference lies with the individual’s intentions!

The error of some of the early Sacred-Name leaders was their failure to see the distinction between a Hebrew word used as a mere *common noun* and the same word used as a *proper noun*! As a result, they interpreted the Bible's admonition against "invoking the names (*proper nouns*)" of false deities as an all inclusive *linguistic mandate* instead of a *theological mandate*. The consequences of this error, however well intended, has caused many in the Sacred-Name Movement to develop fanatical and extreme positions which have only serve to hinder its otherwise noble calling. In the process, we have developed a doctrinal practice where we belittle, deny, or refuse to acknowledge the importance inspiration gives to the divinely appointed titles of Yahweh and Yahshua. In short, we have stripped the Father and the Son of the glory and honor, that the titles *elohim* and *adonay* are intended to convey! This is nothing short of heresy!!

We must reconsider our positions anew. We should never forget that while it was NOT a sin for Israel to refer to Yahweh and Yahshua by their divinely Hebrew appointed titles, IT WAS CERTAINLY A SIN TO REFUSE TO ADDRESS THEM BY THEIR TITLES! Inspiration did NOT grant Israel the personal choice of determining if they were going to acknowledge these divine titles. It was NOT a matter of liberty, but one of moral obligation, as it was their solemn duty to accept, promote, and proclaim the divine titles which inspiration had revealed had been appointed to both Yahweh and Yahshua! Anything short of this could only constitute willful rebellion and sin!! The Bible leaves no room to doubt this was most certainly the case.

By now we hope the reader is convinced of the importance that certain Hebrew titles have for our Heavenly Father and his Son. There are not that many objections that can be presented against the evidence and conclusions of this treatise. However, there are always those "die-hard" traditionalists who, like a drowning man holding on tightly to a dead floating log, attempt the impossible in order to avoid the inevitable, water fall, awaiting immediately ahead of them.

In our discussions with many in the Sacred-Name Movement, we have encountered those who, on one hand, find themselves forced to grant that we have presented our case well, but at the same time, they insist that all we have done is prove that "*Hebrew words and Hebrew titles*" are acceptable (that is, they are "clean" words). As a result some have been willing to adopt a new extreme: That these titles cannot be translated into English but must be retained and used in their original Hebrew forms. "After all," they argue emphatically, "Hebrew is the *original pure* language and English isn't!" They, therefore, admit that a believer may be taught to use the Hebrew words *elohim* and perhaps even *adonay*, but in light of the fact that these titles are inspired, they ought to be TRANSLITERATED into English just like the Name of Yahweh. Again, we shall appeal to Scripture in order to settle this issue on the second part of this treatise.

OUTLINE OF PART II

- I. Non-Hebrew 'Pagan' languages
 - 1 The origin of languages
 - A. Yahweh originated the other languages at Babel
 - B. We use a pagan language and do not learn Hebrew
 - C. Yahweh has used and still uses all languages
 - 2 If the concept of 'pagan languages' is taken to it's logical conclusion
 - A. Yahweh's name should not be rendered into other alphabets
 - B. Hebrew should be only Paleo-Hebrew
 - 3 Although Aramaic is not Hebrew
 - A. It is used for scripture
 - B. It was used by Yahshua
- II Divine titles in common languages

- 1 Titles can be translated
 - A. Daniel translated titles into Aramaic
 - (1) Elohim into Elah
 - (2) Adon into Mare
 - B. Paul translated titles into Aramaic and Greek
 - (1) Elohim into Theos
 - (2) Adon into Mare in 'Maranatha'
- 2 The translations 'lord and god'
 - A. No pagan connection can be proven
 - B. The Hebrew roots of *Gad*
 - C. Hebrew titles were 'paganized' but still used
 - D. Using *God* and *Lord* is not a mandate
- 3 Challenging Christianity on 'god' and 'lord'
 - A. We appear inconsistent to our members and to prospects
 - B. We should continue to defend the names as given to us
 - (1) God and lord are mere titles and
 - (2) God and lord must not be substituted for the names
 - C. This argument detracts from other important errors

III Call to action

- 1 A fanatical attitude is mis-placed zeal
- 2 We need to display the dedication to truth we demand from others
- 3 True disciples know that only the TRUTH can set us free
- 4 Time for change?
 - A. Must not tolerate sin in our camp
 - B. Face the truth - do not fear!
 - C. Consider the consequences of ignoring the truth
 - (1) Compromise of evangelistic efforts
 - (2) Judgment of Adon Yahshua

PART II

THE ISSUE INVOLVING ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS OF THE HEBREW TITLES

I. Non-Hebrew languages:

1. The concept of a pagan language:

One pivotal argument often advanced is the contention that non-Hebrew languages are actually *pagan*. From

this premise, various theological applications have been espoused and developed by the Movement. In fact, perhaps the main — if not the sole — motivation behind the Movement's promotion of the idea that the New Testament was originally written in Hebrew (and not in Greek) is the argument that Greek is a *pagan* language. It is this very concept that has some now willing to promote that Hebrew titles ought to be transliterated instead of translated. We now give ourselves to the task of addressing this issue.

A. The origin of languages:

When good intended believers begin to make their traditional emphasis on Hebrew being the "original pure tongue of the Garden of Eden" and all other languages being *pagan*, they often end up adopting extremes that are quite contrary to Scripture. We feel, for this reason, compelled to mention the following facts which seem always to be overlooked:

(1) Before anyone begins to emphasize how Hebrew is the original heavenly language that was spoken in Eden, we ought never to forget who is the *originator* of most other languages.

Gen.11:6-9

And Yahweh said, "Behold, the people is one, and they have all *one language*; and this they begin to do: and now nothing will be restrained from them, which they have imagined to do. Go to, *let us* go down, and there *confound their language*, that they may not understand one another's speech." So Yahweh scattered them abroad from thence upon the face of all the earth: and they left off to build the city. Therefore is the name of it called Babel; because *Yahweh did there confound the language of all the earth*: and from thence did Yahweh scatter them abroad upon the face of all the earth.

While it is true that the other languages which came after Hebrew were not originally spoken in the Garden of Eden, it is no less true that the same divine person that introduced Hebrew to Adam also introduced the other languages to the descendants of Adam. For this reason, no real theological advantage can be gained by labeling these languages as *pagan*. Some realizing this, have argued that the other languages introduced by Yahweh in Genesis 11 were "initially clean and pure" and that it was sinful rebellious men who later "corrupted" these languages to the point of making it necessary today to label them as *pagan*. The problem with this admirable attempt is the fact that Israel has also corrupted the original Hebrew language considerably, but no one wants to label it as *pagan* (more on this later). Here again, we are not willing to be consistent with our principles or arguments. If we were consistent, we would have to conclude that ALL languages in the world today — including Hebrew — are *pagan*, which would bring us back to our initial inquiry, "Where is the theological advantage gained?"

If we considered this subject logically, we cannot but conclude that languages, alphabets, and phonetic sounds are neutral things. Languages are neither moral or immoral anymore than a knife in of itself can have any moral qualities (that is, a knife used to commit murder does not by its mere existence become a sinful thing, but the individual who committed the act is guilty of sin). Only Free Moral Agents have moral qualities and are therefore accountable. Languages, on the other hand, depend on the user's *intention* and *concept* as exercised within the context of culture to make them a moral issue. A word, phrase, dialect, or language can only be *pagan* if the user intends to convey a *pagan* idea or concept! And, even then, it would only be immoral because of the manner the user intended to use it and NOT due to its very existence! Therefore, another individual could employ the same words, phrases, dialect, or language and not suffer any divine condemnation for his actions because his *INTENTIONS* are more noble! This is why we have seen that an Israelite prophet could employ and assign to Yahweh words, which in a different context (as *proper nouns*) were unacceptable, but as titles (*common nouns*) recognizing Yahweh's glory and honor they were praise worthy!

Hence, the expression "*pagan* words" when used linguistically should properly be understood as referring to the user's *INTENTION* and *CONCEPT* and NOT merely to his *PHONETIC ARTICULATION*! There is no such things as a sinful sound. What the individual is trying to convey by vocalizing the sound (the concept intended) is what may constitute sin!

(2) For all the talk we do about how that language or this word is *pagan* or *corrupted*, at times, we give the impression to have forgotten that WE OURSELVES SPEAK A NON-HEBREW

LANGUAGE!

By our rationale, English ought also to be considered a *pagan* language (and is in fact so considered by most Sacred-Name advocates). Yet, we are willing to live with and use many English titles to refer directly to Yahweh and Yahshua! "Father, Creator, Savior, Redeemer, Son," and "Almighty" are all English translations of Hebrew titles and yet, in these instances, no Sacred-Name believer argues that we should be using the original Hebrew titles instead. If non-Hebrew languages are to be considered *pagan* by definition, shouldn't our disposition be one of learning and promoting the Hebrew language? After all, if our children can learn French and Spanish in school, why don't we see to it that they also learn Hebrew. Yet, we do not raise our children to speak and read Hebrew, as the primary language to be used in order to read or study the Bible. We are all very much content with waiting for that day when Yahweh will restore "the pure language."

(3) Yahweh respects every language and will – if necessary – converse in any one, through his inspired prophets or Apostles (as we will soon demonstrate from Scripture).

The reality of this necessity is still evident today, as Sacred-Name believers of all nations are forced to commune and preach the evangel in the language of the various cultures and nations. As long as we continue to do so, the phrase "*pagan* languages" (with its obvious negative connotation) has little practical meaning or theological application. It serves only to imply a deplorable state of sin, which even the best and most dedicated Sacred-Name believer can NEVER overcome as long as he or she continue to use a non-Hebrew form of communication!

B. However, let us for argument sake grant for a moment that all languages outside of Hebrew are *pagan*. What would be the consistent application of this statement, were it to be an inspired fact?

(1) If we were to follow the logical extension of this position, we would be forced to REJECT the current English spelling of the SACRED NAME!

Y-a-H-W-e-H is definitely NOT Hebrew! After all, what could be more injurious to the precious Name of the Father than to have it represented and spelled in a heathen *pagan* alphabet? Remember, we always argue that anyone (irrespective of their native tongue) can be taught to pronounce the Name of Yahweh. In like manner, one could just as easily argue that anyone can be taught to spell the Name of the Creator in its Hebrew form (most of us already do)! How hard could it be to learn four little Hebrew letters? Besides, we have an example of this in history. The most novice of Sacred-Name believers already knows that archeologist have uncovered portions of the Septuagint which contain the name of Yahweh written with Hebrew letters in an otherwise Greek text! Given this historical fact, why don't we argue that the name of Yahweh ought to be written in its Hebrew characters even in an English text, so as not to pollute it by spelling the name with *pagan* characters? After all, it must be logically admitted that if a language is considered *pagan*, the alphabet of that language must also be considered *pagan*!

(2) Furthermore, since it is also a historical fact that the present Hebrew alphabet consisting of "square-like" letters was developed *during* the Babylonian captivity and that the same is totally different from the *original* "paleo" Hebrew alphabet that Moses used, shouldn't we reject the current modern (shall we say *pagan*?) Hebrew rendering of the tetragrammaton?

What could be more *pagan* than to have the original Hebrew alphabet of the heavenly language altered and changed in order to make it resemble more the alphabet of *Babylon*? In the restoration of the "original pure" language, will Yahweh continue to use the current "Babylonian" Hebrew alphabet (which is not what Adam knew) or would he restore the *original* (paleo) alphabet He initially gave to mankind prior to sin?

Lastly, given the fact that Sacred-Name believers are aware of the *original paleo Hebrew*, why aren't we condemning the present Hebrew language as *pagan*?

Honestly, how much of all this are you willing to stomach? ALL OF IT, if you truly wish to practice this illogical position CONSISTENTLY!! That's why we must insist in maintaining that all things considered, there is no real theological advantage gained by labeling non-Hebrew languages as *pagan*.

C. It is accepted by most Sacred-Name believers that Aramaic and Hebrew are basically similar

languages, since Aramaic is a dialect derived from Hebrew. Because of this, many are under the impression that these two languages have so much in common, that an individual in Bible days could just as well speak Aramaic to an Israelite (who spoke only Hebrew) and still expect to be somewhat understood. However, this belief is not entirely true. The differences between Aramaic and Hebrew are far more evident than many Sacred-Name believers are even aware of.

Admittedly, there are numerous words in Aramaic which are either identical or extremely similar to those in Hebrew (a natural thing to be expected since one was derived from the other). Despite this, Aramaic differs so much from Hebrew that even the alphabet of these languages is different. Rather than extensively quoting linguistic scholars to prove this fact (a very easy thing to do), consider the following passage of Scripture:

(1) 2 Kg.18:26-28

Then said Eliakim the son of Hilkiah, and Shebna, and Joah, unto Rab-shakeh, "Speak, I pray thee, to thy servants in the Syrian (Aramaic) language; *for we understand it*: and talk *not* with us in the Jew's (Hebrew) language in the ears of the people that are on the wall."

But Rab-shakeh said unto them, "Hath my master sent me to thy master, and to thee, to speak these words? hath he not sent me to the men which sit on the wall, that they may eat their own dung, and drink their own piss with you?"

Then Rab-shaken stood and cried with a loud voice in the Jew's (Hebrew) language, and spake saying, "Hear the word of the great king, the king of Assyria:"

This passage should be enough to convince anyone that Aramaic must be a significantly different language to that of Hebrew. If this is not so, then why did the servants of Hezekiah beg the Syrian commander NOT to speak in Hebrew (a language understood by the men on the wall) but to speak to them in Aramaic? And, why did the Syrian commander refuse to speak in his own native language if the men on the wall could be expected to understand Aramaic, even though they spoke only Hebrew? To contend that Aramaic and Hebrew are "almost identical" languages — on the ground that some words are similar — is simply being naive. Think about this the next time you read a reference where a scholar is quoted as stating that the New Testament (or parts of it) was "originally written in Hebrew or Aramaic."

The point is this. If we insist on teaching that ALL languages outside of Hebrew are *pagan* by virtue of the argument that Hebrew is the one and true ORIGINAL heavenly language, then we must also condemn Aramaic as a *pagan* language — as surely it was NOT the original language spoken in Eden!! In addition, if it is true that Yahweh feels the same degree of animosity towards all non-Hebrew languages as many in the Sacred-Name Movement seem to express, then we should find inspiration unwilling to use any other language to communicate with man other than the "pure language" of Hebrew. Yet, this is not so!

D. Observe how, in the following verses, we find the Savior speaking in Aramaic. Remember, these verses are the very ones used by Sacred-Name advocates in an effort to prove that the New Testament was initially written in Hebrew!

(1) Mt. 5:22

But I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother without cause shall be in danger of the judgment: and whosoever shall say to his brother, *Raca* [an Aramaic word], shall be in danger of the council: but whosoever shall say, 'Thou fool,' shall be in danger of hell fire.

(2) Mt.10:25

It is enough for the disciple that he be as his master, and the servant as his lord. If they have called the master of the house *Beelzebub* [the Aramaic form of Baal-zebub], how much more shall they call them of his household?

(3) Mk.5:41

And He took the damsel by the hand, and said unto her, "*Talitha cumi*; [Aramaic]" which is, being interpreted, "Damsel, I say unto thee, arise."

(4) Mk.14:36 (see also: Rom.8:15 & Gal.4:6)

And He said, "*Abba* [Hebrew and Aramaic for father], Father, all things are possible unto Thee; take away this cup from Me: nevertheless not what I will, but what Thou wilt."

(5) Mt. 27:46

And about the ninth hour Yahshua cried with a loud voice, saying [in Aramaic], "*Eli, Eli lama sabachthani?*" that is to say, "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?"

The last two verses are interesting, as the Savior is recorded praying in Aramaic to his Father, and this, during the darkest hour of his life! Could it be that his prayer was not heard because Yahshua used Aramaic words and did not limit himself to using the "original pure language" of Hebrew? It is noteworthy to observe that Mt.27:36 is an Old Testament quotation of Psalms 22:1 which the Savior opted to speak in Aramaic rather than in its original Hebrew! How does one explain the Savior's personal preference for a language that was less pure, perhaps even *pagan*, and certainly not the original heavenly language of Hebrew?

E. One more point. We ought to remember that on the day of Pentecost (as recorded in Acts 2:7-11), it was Yahweh who "empowered" his disciples to speak in LANGUAGES OTHER THAN HEBREW!! These languages that the Spirit placed upon them were none other than the alleged "impure *pagan*" languages of the time!

If the various people identified by Luke were to understand the message being shared with them, it would be necessary for the miraculous power of Yahweh's Spirit to enable the disciples to speak and translate the full inspired message of the evangel (including titles). Again, if these different languages were considered *pagan* by inspiration, then we are at a loss to explain why Yahweh chose this method to propagate his revelation. Besides, how do we explain the "gift of tongues" discussed by Paul in 1st. Corinthians, chapters 12-14 (which even required an "interpreter") if the tongues spoken were *pagan*?

The object of this whole reasoning exercise (if it isn't already obvious) is to demonstrate that while there is such a thing as an *original* (Garden of Eden) language that came first and there are many languages (including Aramaic) which came afterwards, "coming afterwards" does NOT automatically mean it must be *pagan* or a bad thing!

Finally, let us remember that when the original pure language is restored, the "impure" Aramaic language will be removed along with all other languages (i.e. Greek, English, Latin, German, Spanish, etc.). This fact alone should be enough to deter us from falling in love with Aramaic!

II. Divine Titles in the Language of the Masses:

1. While proper names should be transliterated, titles can be translated:

A. Having established that linguistically Hebrew and Aramaic are distinctively different languages, observe how inspiration leads Daniel into TRANSLATING TITLES of the original "pure language" of Hebrew into the Chaldean (less than pure — allegedly *pagan*) language of Aramaic:

(1) *Elohim* into the Aramaic *Elah*: Dan. 2:20, 23, 28:

Daniel answered and said, "Blessed be the name of *God* (*elah*) for ever and ever: for wisdom and might are His:

I thank Thee, and praise Thee, O Thou *God* (*elah*) of my fathers, Who hast given me wisdom and might, and hast made known unto me now what we desired of Thee: for Thou hast now made known unto us the king's matter"

But there is a *God* (*elah*) in heaven That revealeth secrets, and maketh known to the king Nebuchadnezzar what shall be in the latter days. Thy dream, and the visions of thy head upon thy bed, are these:

(2) *Adon* into Aramaic *Mare*: Dan. 2:47, 4:24, 5:23:

The king answered unto Daniel, and said, "Of a truth it is, that your God is a God of gods, and a *Lord* (mare) of kings, and a Revealer of secrets, seeing thou couldest reveal this secret."

This is the interpretation, O king, and this is the decree of the Most High, which is come upon my *lord* (mare) the king.

But hast lifted up thyself against the *Lord* (mare) of Heaven; and they have brought the vessels of his house before thee, and thou, and thy lords, thy wives, and thy concubines, have drunk wine in them.

B. Paul too employs Greek & Aramaic translations:

(1) In Acts 17:16-31 we have the recording of an event involving the Apostle Paul and the inhabitants of Athens, the capital of Greece. We know from Scripture that the Apostle knew how to speak Greek (Acts 21:37). In fact, in the narrative of Acts 17, we are told that Paul availed himself of an "inscription" that must have been written in the language of the people of Athens, and therefore, if he read the same and spoke to the people about it, the Apostle must have done so in Greek! This would mean that Paul was not troubled by an inscription that employed the Greek word *theos*, a translation of the Hebrew title *elohim*. Since it is only logical that as he proceeded to preach the message of salvation to the people of Athens he must have continued to employ the term *theos* (a necessity, as he was speaking Greek), who else was the Apostle referring to by this Greek title other than to Yahweh? This fact demonstrates that as far as Paul was concerned, the Greek word *theos* (as a *common noun*) was equivalent in meaning and CONCEPT to the Hebrew word *elohim* (also as a *common noun*), proving once again that titles can be translated from one language to another.

The Apostle's choice of words become even more revealing when one considers that in verse 16 we are told that Paul was distressed because the city was full of idols. Shouldn't this fact have caused the Apostle to become even more determined not to employ the Greek term *theos*? Was Paul compromising the integrity of the evangel or the reputation of Yahweh by referring to him by the Greek title *theos*? Hardly! Was he then taking a big gamble and risking the possibility of being misunderstood and of having Yahweh confused with *Theos*, the name (*proper noun*) of an idol that some of these people served? Obviously, Paul did not think so!

Some have attempted to minimize the impact of this passage by arguing that while "Paul may have used the Greek word *theos* in this ONE instance, he did not use it in worship nor among the brethren." This sort of rationale would be amusing, if the matter was not so serious. Besides the fact this objection is based on pure conjecture, it is also a speculation resulting from the many decades that the Sacred-Name Movement has been indoctrinating its members with linguistic fallacies! It is still an attempt to hold on to the old school, despite the fact that the evidence has proven it wrong. Therefore, we ask: Is this passage of Scripture less inspired than the rest of the book of Acts? What is the difference between the *spiritual* act of attempting to evangelize the Athenians and the *spiritual* act of worshiping Yahweh? Are we to believe that a different standard of truth applies when it comes to evangelism than when it comes to worship? Does our calling to be the "salt of the earth" makes us less accountable to Yahweh than when we engage in direct worship? Is it possible that we are *allowed* to live one form of life as evangelist (being able to speak and use *pagan unclean words more freely*), that as worshiper we are literally *denied*? When the Bible states in John 4:23 that the Father is looking for those who will worship him in spirit and in truth, did it mean to exclude evangelist? Shall we continue? Obviously, an argument that proves too much ... proves nothing!

(2) In 1 Cor.16:22, Paul uses the Aramaic expression "Maran-atha." The same means according to Strong's:

3134 **maran atha**, of Chaldean origin (meaning *our Lord has come*); *maranatha*, i.e. an exclamation of the approaching *divine judgment*:

The first part (*maran*) of this compound word is the Aramaic translation of the Hebrew *adonay* (as we already saw in Dan. 2:47, 4:24, 5:23.). The expression is one and the same as if Paul would have said, "*adonay* may come." That this expression has been preserved in the actual Greek manuscript speaks to its authenticity. It also serves to illustrate that the Apostle did not see anything wrong with translating the Hebrew title (*adonay*) into another language (Aramaic).

Therefore, when all things are duly considered, we find that inspiration does not hesitate to render and translate divine Hebrew titles into various other languages. The argument that these must be transliterated because of the moral nature that Scripture ascribes to them is NOT biblical. We are NOT obligated to use the Hebrew titles to refer to Yahweh or Yahshua. And, even though we are free to learn and use the divine titles in their Hebrew forms, we cannot mandate and force others to do so. Our duty consist of transmitting from Hebrew into English the intended divine CONCEPT that these Hebrew titles conveyed to Israel, so as to make the English speaking world appreciative of the full glory of Yahweh! For if the Hebrew *elohim* can be rendered by inspiration into the Aramaic *elah* (or the Greek *theos*) and if the Hebrew *adonay* can be rendered by inspiration into the Aramaic *mare* (or the Greek *kurios*), – despite the obvious fact that all of these words as *proper nouns* can be objected to on the grounds of paganism or perverted substitution – then on what basis could we argue that these Hebrew titles cannot be rendered and translated into English? The question should not be whether these can be translated (for obviously they can), but rather, what words would be best suited to translate and carry over into English the CONCEPT intended by the Hebrew titles *elohim* and *adonay*?

2. The translations *god* and *lord*:

Perhaps there isn't a more sensitive issue among Sacred-Name believers than the English words *god* and *lord*! Sadly, the traditional rejection of these two words is mostly based on the linguistic misconception of the Hebrew word *baal*. As we stated in Part I of this treatise, many of the early Sacred-Name pioneers failed to see the distinction inspiration recognized existed between a *proper noun* and a *common noun* application of the same one Hebrew word. They interpreted Moses' admonition against "invoking the names" of false deities to refer to a linguistic prohibition instead of a theological mandate. As a result, they became convinced that some words — in of themselves — could not be used because a *pagan connection* or a practice of *perverted substitution* could be demonstrated. Despite of their lack of consistency, these *principles* were extended into English and the words *god* and *lord* were immediately rejected and their discontinuation mandated. As time went by and new generations of converts and leaders were adopted into the faith, the old school teachings were expanded and formulated into the backbone of the Movement's doctrinal foundation, without much of a serious challenge.

The real issue of this treatise has been *Inspired Titles and their relation to salvation*. However, since we have demonstrated that the Hebrew common nouns *baal* and *adonay* are acceptable to Yahweh, and given the fact that the rejection of the words *lord* and *god* has relied heavily on misconceptions regarding these and other Hebrew words, a legitimate question to ask at this time would be if the words *god* and *lord* can be used as English translations! Given the facts, we feel compelled to answer that *elohim* can be rendered into English as *god* and *adonay* as *lord*.

A. Linguistically speaking, it should be noted that we cannot definitely PROVE a *pagan connection* for either word. That's been tried and it has failed, as linguistic authorities which exist do not agree with our traditional contention. A review of most linguistic scholars finds that they trace our English word *God* ¹⁸

to the Teutonic language and not to the Babylonian deity *Gawd*, and also trace *Lord* to an Old English word that meant, "the keeper of the loaf." BUT, even if we could prove that linguist are wrong, we have already demonstrated that inspiration does not reject nor does it abstain from using certain words on the mere basis of a *pagan connection*! We could argue *perverted substitution*, but again we have seen that this *principle* is likewise contrary to the practice of Scripture! Therefore, whatever explanation we adopt in order to rationally justify our rejection of the words *god* and *lord*, must NOT continue to promote the old school argument that these words in of themselves are *pagan*, *unclean*, or *idolatrous*. As sincere as this attempt was, the facts prove it is not a valid argument inspiration would recognize. Yet, there are those who insist in rejecting the English word *god* on the basis that even if Christian etymologist do not agree that the English language derived it from Babylon, ¹⁹ the Bible does record a false deity by this name. Because of this, it is argued that contrary to modern etymologist, the Teutonic language (i.e. German and English) did in fact adapted and developed the word *god* from the name of the false deity recorded in the Bible known as *Gad*. In response to those who so argue, the following observations are made:

(1) We first encounter the Hebrew word *gad* in the book of Genesis where it is used as the name of Jacob's seventh son, born unto him by Zilpah, who was Leah's handmaid (Gen. 30:11-13). When Leah named the child, she described her motives for doing so by saying:

“A *troop* cometh: and she called his name *Gad*.”

Unfortunately, the English translation conceals the natural play of words of this text. In Hebrew, this verse reveals an interesting play on words,

“*Gadad* cometh: and she called his name *Gad*.”

Immediately we can see the connection between the name *Gad* and the word which the KJV renders as *troop*!

According to Strong's Analytical Concordance, *Gad* (Strong's #1410) is derived from *guwd* (#1464) which means:

“To crowd upon, i.e. attack:—invade, overcome.”

Strong's also argues that *guwd* is linguistically “akin to 1413,” that is, the word *Gadad*, which it defines as:

“To crowd; also to gash (as if by pressing into):—assemble (selves by troops), gather (selves together, self in troops), cut selves.

Therefore, we can easily determine the original meaning of the Hebrew word *Gad* to be that of *an assembling of force or might* with a specific goal to achieve, thus the rendering: *troop*.

On the other hand, Easton's Bible Dictionary (as do many other references) defines *Gad* as “fortune; luck.” Hence, the Hebrew word can also refer to “good fortune or luck.”

In essence, the word *Gad* means *the ability to deliver*. The deliverance may come through the use of power, force, attack and strength resulting in *good fortune* on account of the victory gained over one's enemies. The deliverance could also come through *wealth* or *abundance* (that is, extreme financial power). When used of *wealth*, it carries the meaning of *overwhelming abundance of distribution*. We have all heard the old adage: WEALTH IS POWER! It truly is! When used in relation to an *army*, it carries the meaning of *overwhelming abundance of power*.

When an Israelite named his child Gaddiel (*Gad-dee-el* as in Num.13:10), it had a connotation somewhat similar to Shaddai — which carries the meaning of bountifulness. The idea of mightiness to produce wealth, fortune or protection and deliverance is manifested in this word Gaddiel (that is, *El will deliver me through power and wealth*)! Therefore, concepts such as bountifulness, distribution, overwhelming abundance, force (army, troop) and invading (to oppress with force, attack and conquer through might or strength) are all inherent in the Hebrew word *Gad*.

(2) It can therefore be said that the word *Gad* carries the grandeur of mightiness in its intrinsic meaning. While not immediately apparent, a connection can now be demonstrated to exist between the revealed nature of Yahweh and the Hebrew word *Gad* as originally employed by the Scriptures.

In Genesis chapter 49, we read about the final prophetic blessing that Jacob pronounced upon each of his sons. Verse one states:

“And Jacob called unto his sons, and said, Gather yourselves together, that I may tell you that which shall befall you in the last days.”

Through out the chapter, Jacobs describes each of his twelve sons and attributes to each what will be their future characteristics or peculiarities. In Gen. 49:19 we read regarding *Gad*:

“*Gad*, a troop shall overcome him: but he shall overcome at the last.”

Once again, the wonderful play of words in the Hebrew text is hidden by the English translation.

Gad, *geduwd*²⁰ *guwd*²¹

Gad, a troop shall overcome him:

guwd ‘*aqeb*²²

But he shall overcome at the last.

Jacob’s entire proclamation upon his son is literally a play of words based on his son’s name. The idea of *Gad* as deliverance through force, might, power, and strength is most obvious in this text. Along these lines, the Dictionary of the Bible edited by James Hastings makes the following observation on page 309:

Gn 49:19 implies that the name means a raiding troop and connects it with the tribe’s experience in border warfare.

Perhaps here will be a good time to address a possible objection that could be proposed by some. In an attempt to minimize the impact of the fact that Leah named Jacob’s son with the name *Gad*, it could be argued that Leah was originally from a pagan home and may have been influenced secretly by pagan motives. However, when Leah named her son, inspiration records that she did so because she understood him as “a *troop* comes.” Later we read that when Jacob proceeded to bless his seventh son, he predicted the same idea on his son that Leah did! Could Leah had been under the prophetic unction of the Spirit of Yahweh when she named Jacob’s seventh son by the apparent prophetic name: “a *troop* comes?” If she was not guided by the Spirit in the naming of this child, we are at a lost to explain how she was able to select the very name that will later come to accurately portray the characteristics of *Gad* as an adult and his descendants. In naming Jacob’s seventh son as *Gad*, Leah was displaying the same level of inspiration as her husband will do many years later!

The Schocken Bible, Volume I, attempts to preserve the Hebrew play of words by rendering the translation of Gen. 49:19 as follows:

“*Gad*, goading robber-band will goad him, yet he will goad at their heel.”

With “robber-bands” the author means “bands of robbers.” Notice that Jacob’s prophecy is that his son *Gad* will be *attacked* and to some extent *overcome*, but in the end, he will secure the victory and the *deliverance*. This is what *gad* really means in Hebrew!

In fact, the men of *Gad* would in time develop a reputation for being fierce in battle.

1Ch.5:18-19

The sons of Reuben, and the Gadites, and half the tribe of Manasseh, of valiant men, men able to bear buckler and sword, and to shoot with bow, and skillful in war, were four and forty thousand seven hundred and threescore, that went out to the war.

And they made war with the Hagarites, with Jetur, and Nephish, and Nodab.

1Ch.12:14-15

These were of the sons of Gad, captains of the host: one of the least was over an hundred, and the greatest over a thousand.

These are they that went over Jordan in the first month, when it had overflowed all his banks; and they put to flight all them of the valleys, both toward the east, and toward the west.

Even Moses under the influence of inspiration foretold of the military nature that would characterize the people of the tribe of *Gad*.

Deut.33:20-21

And of *Gad* he said, Blessed be he that enlargeth Gad: he dwells as a lion, and tears the arm with the crown of the head. And he provided the first part for himself, because there, in a portion of the lawgiver, was he seated; and he came with the heads of the people, he executed the justice of Yahweh, and his judgments with Israel.

The Encyclopaedia Judaica, (vol. 7, pg 246) makes the following remarks about Moses' description of *Gad*:

Moses declared: "Poised is he like a lion to tear off the arm and scalp" (Deut. 33:20), showing that *Gad* was a tribe of fighting warriors. Indeed, in the era of the monarchy, the Gadites are described as "expert in war,"...

Regarding *Gad's* military reputation, Easton's Bible Dictionary remarks:

"This tribe was fierce and warlike ..."

The Complete Word Study Old Testament, on page 2307 of its "Lexical Aids," while commenting on the meaning of the word *Gadhadh* (Strong's # 1413), it states:

The name of *Gad* was drawn from this root because he had military capabilities (Deut. 33:20; 1 Chr. 5:18; 12:8).

All things considered, based on the biblical testimony seen thus far, if *Gad* later became the name of a pagan deity, this would be no different to the other Hebrew words that we have reviewed in this treatise. Originally, it would have been a clean word that later got corrupted (just like: *el*, *adon*, *baal*, and countless others were).

(3) However, it is the prophet Habakkuk which gives us a glimpse of how the Hebrew word *gad* can be applied to Yahweh:

Hab. 3:13-18

Thou did walk through the sea with thine horses, through the heap of great waters.

When I heard, my belly trembled; my lips quivered at the voice: rottenness entered into my bones, and I trembled in myself, that I might rest in the day of trouble: when he comes up unto the people, he will *invade them with his troops* (Heb. *Guwd*).

Although the fig tree shall not blossom, neither shall fruit be in the vines; the labor of the olive shall fail, and the fields shall yield no meat; the flock shall be cut off from the fold, and there shall be no herd in the stalls:

Yet I will rejoice in Yahweh, I will joy in the God of my salvation.

Here we see the contextual use of the word *gad* in reference to the delivering hand of Yahweh Almighty! All fears is dispersed! All crying ceases! All intimidation and disdain is no more when Yahweh rises to do battle for his people! Yahweh's *gad* qualities are demonstrated in the furious unleashing of his power! At the end, all that the inspired prophet can muster to say is "... I will joy in the Elohim of my salvation." And why not rejoice? After all, Yahweh through his powerful display has brought *good fortune* and *deliverance* as a result of "gadding" (so to speak) on behalf of his people.

(4) As if what we have seen thus far were not enough, we have the fact that in the book of Revelation, John records the following for us:

Rev.7:5:

Of the tribe of Juda were sealed twelve thousand. Of the tribe of Reuben were sealed twelve thousand. Of the tribe of *Gad* were sealed twelve thousand.

Rev.21:12

And had a wall great and high, and had twelve gates, and at the gates twelve angels, and names written thereon, which are the *names of the twelve tribes of the children of Israel*.

Now the obvious question would be, if Yahweh so hates the word *gad* as many Sacred-Name believers have advocated, then why is the Almighty intended to honor that name throughout eternity? Was it not in the power of Yahweh to change and alter the name of *Gad*? Certainly it was! Therefore, the Hebrew word *gad* cannot be as deplorable a word to the Almighty as many have supposed.

(5) If indeed *gad* later became the name of a pagan idol, as we have demonstrated it did not change the fact that as an *original* Hebrew word it had a positive meaning and application. Therefore, if it is true (as many in the Sacred-Name Movement argue) that the English word *God* was derived into the Teutonic language from the Hebrew word *Gad*, then it must be admitted that despite its Anglo-Saxon history of linguistic travesty and evolution, it is amazing that the idea of power, force, and might has been preserved during the transition.²³ While we are not to be understood as promoting the use of the word *God* per se, we are arguing against those who wish to reject it based upon faulty linguistic premises. For as we have demonstrated, the supposed "pagan connection" of the English word *God* to the Hebrew word *Gad* is at best irrelevant.

(6) As to the word *lord*, The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible maintains that it is:

The English renderings of various words that appear in biblical Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek to express the idea of a person who commands respect or exercises authority. In many cases 'Lord' is a title of honor and majesty used in addressing God ... a) [Heb.], 'Adon,' is the basic Hebrew word. It is a title of courtesy and respect used in addressing superiors – e.g., in the case of a slave speaking to his master or a subject to the king. God is called the 'Lord of all the earth'.

The Oxford English Dictionary traces *lord* to:

(keeper of the loaf) ... denotes the head of a household in his relation to the servants and dependents who 'eat of his bread ...

Harper's Bible Dictionary defines *lord* as:

... a title of dignity and honor acknowledging the power and authority of the one addressed. In the OT 'lord' is used to translate various titles for God (e.g. *Adonai*, *El Shaddai*) ... After [the resurrection] one of the most important OT texts to be applied to the Risen One was Psalms 110:1 ... The application of this text to [Yahshua] meant that the title *mari*, 'my Lord,' addressed to him during his earthly life in recognition of his unusual authority was upgraded as a messianic address. Thus, we get the liturgical acclamation in Aramaic *marana tha*, 'our Lord, come' (1Cor.16:22; Rev.22:20).

While we may disagree with *Harper's* contention that the Savior was addressed by the Aramaic *mari* instead of the Hebrew *adonay*, the observations made still stand.

Harper's Bible Dictionary continues its insightful commentary on *lord* by saying:

Scholars once thought that the use of the term 'Lord' (*mara*) in the absolute sense was not possible in Aramaic, but new evidence from the Dead Sea Scrolls shows that it was possible to refer to God as 'Lord' or 'the Lord,' not only as 'my Lord' or 'our Lord.' Consequently, it is possible that the formula from early Christian preaching, 'God has made him both Lord and [Messiah]' (Acts 2:36), goes back to the earliest Aramaic-speaking church. The title 'Lord,' while not connoting divinity in the metaphysical sense, means that at his exaltation [Yahshua] entered upon a new

function as the representative of God's Lordship in the world and over the church (Phil.2:11). It is henceforth through the exalted [Yahshua] that God exercises Lordship or kingly rule.

Again, the overwhelming number of scrolls and fragments found in the Dead Sea caves were written in Hebrew and not in Aramaic. But the point made is solid, in as much as it removes any doubt of the importance of the nature of *inspired titles*.

Finally, we have the following comments made by The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible:

To an early Christian accustomed to reading the OT, the word 'Lord,' when used of [Yahshua], would suggest his identification with the God of the OT. It expressed [Messiah's] divinity without explicitly asserting his deity, which was an idea startling to non-Christian Jews ... This does not, however, lead to the conclusion that Christians borrowed the title 'Lord' from paganism. The evidence of Acts, taken together with 1 Cor. 16:22 and the very Jewish book of Revelation, shows that it belongs to the very earliest stratum of Christianity. Phil. 2:5-11 may, indeed be representative of a pre-Pauline hymn or creed.

Perhaps The Holman Concise Bible Dictionary expresses it best when it observes,

"The Lordship of [Yahshua] has ethical consequences ... [Yahshua Messiah] either joins people together, or he separates them, when they deny his right to be Lord."

C. We ought to be willing to admit that the Hebrew titles *elohim* and *adonay* can be translated into English as *god* and *lord*. The fact that Christianity has named their Trinity as the *Lord God*, is no different to the situation we have with Hebrew titles, where both *elohim* and *adonay* were also the names given to false pagan deities! Any argument of the old school that is used to reject *god* and *lord* as English *common nouns*, can also be used to reject *elohim* and *adonay* (along with a host of other Hebrew words, such as: Adam, Eden, Sabbath, Father, Ancient of Days, Most High, Everlasting One, Covenant, Rock, Fish, Brother, Kinsman, King, Judge, Shepherd, and many more that many modern scholars maintain were borrowed by Israel from the Canaanite's religion!).

However, we have presented conclusive proof that inspiration does not treat words and languages in the manner that the Movement has been advocating for several decades. Therefore, if we truly wish to be honest with the facts, admitting that *god* and *lord* ²⁴ are perfectly acceptable English translations is a linguistic necessity.

Some have expressed the concern that such an admission would risk confusing the flock. Obviously, no true loving minister of Yahweh wants to confuse his flock. However, a true loving minister of Yahweh would NOT want his flock to remain in error either! We have a responsibility before Yahweh to teach the truth to those who have been entrusted to our care. The logistics as to how this must be done, is obviously a wisdom issue that must first be addressed by every leader in every organization. But, that it has to be done, is a fact none can deny!

D. Using *God* or *Lord* is NOT a mandate:

To be sure we are not misunderstood, our contention is NOT that *god* or *lord* must be used, but that linguistically, they CAN be used as English translations of *elohim* and *adonay*. However, while we do NOT have the liberty to refuse to acknowledge and proclaim the divinely appointed titles revealed to us by Scripture, we DO have the liberty to determine how to best translate these titles from Hebrew to English. There is no mandate that we must use *god* or *lord*, especially when there are other English alternatives (like Sovereign or Master instead of *lord*; Deity or Divinity instead of *god*) that can convey the Hebrew concept intended by Scripture. All we must assure is that what ever renderings we determine to be the best English translations, we must *consistently* apply so as to secure the intended inspired concepts conveyed by the Hebrew titles as much as it is linguistically possible. Therefore, while translating *adonay* into English as "Master, Ruler, or Sovereign" is acceptable, to render it as "Savior" or "King" is NOT because this is not the idea that *adonay* in Hebrew is trying to convey.

3. Challenging Christianity on a Mute Point:

If we honestly evaluate — without prejudice or bias — the growth and development of the Sacred-Name Movement, we would have to admit our erroneous linguistic principles have cost the Movement dearly. Little has been gained by challenging Christianity for employing the terms *god* and *lord*. Instead, our most valiant efforts have only resulted in the fragmentation of our Movement and in the development of some very radical organizations. The inconsistency of applying our own principles is an observation which has been made in numerous occasions about the Sacred-Name Movement (even by our own brethren). The result has been that the more radical and extremist groups among our Movement are the one experiencing the fastest growth,²⁵ as they tend to be more consistent with the linguistic principles advocated by the Sacred-Name Movement! Needless to say, this represents a very sad state of affairs. And, while it is true that our past linguistic issues are not the sole reasons why we are currently where we are, it has certainly played a major role in preventing the unification of the Movement we so much love and support.

All things duly considered, Christianity should only be challenged if it refuses to acknowledge that *god* and *lord* are mere titles and that Christians are morally obligated to use the Names of Yahweh and Yahshua! If they insist on referring to Yahweh constantly and exclusively by these (or for that matter, by any other) English titles and are determined to continue using the pagan name that has shamefully supplanted the true blessed name of the Savior, then on that ground we ought to condemn their use of *god* and *lord*. This distinction is critical, as it is the only venue the evidence will allow us if we wish to be honest with the facts.

Besides, there are far more worthy points of contentions that we would do better in our challenge against Christianity (such as: the Two-House Restoration of Israel, Yahweh's Holy Days, The Torah, Prophecy, Covenant Living, The Harmony of the New and the Old Testament, Restoring our Hebrew Roots, The Origins of Israel, etc.). As a Movement, we must learn to concentrate our efforts on major subjects instead of just trying to win minor battles at the expense of losing the war. We are spending too much precious resources defending and propagating ideas and concepts which unfortunately are not supported by inspiration. We must end this destructive behavior that has succeeded in keeping our Movement apart, fragmented, and weak.

Final Appeal

So much has been said about the English words *god* and *lord* in our final section, that we run the risk of being misunderstood (already many have). So for the sake of re-assuring the main point of our treatise, let us be reminded that our primary issue was NOT about whether *god* or *lord* are acceptable English translations. Rather, our objective has been to demonstrate the inspired importance that certain titles have for Yahweh and Yahshua. The topic of *god* and *lord* became a related but *minor* issue because of our contention that inspired Hebrew titles can and should be translated. Having argued this point, it was only natural that we should address the question that would have been in the mind of most Sacred-Name believers: “Yes, but can these titles be translated into English as *god* and *lord*?” However, it would be a great misfortune if the real issue of this treatise would to be clouded by a far minor issue.

In the NT rendering of the KJV, from the book of Acts to the book of Revelation the Savior is referred to by his name approximately a total of 371 times, with the following break down:

- (1) By his personal name alone: 63 times (17%)
- (2) As the Sovereign Yahshua: 36 times (10%)
- (3) As Yahshua Messiah: 173 times (46%)
- (4) As the Sovereign Yahshua Messiah: 99 times (27%)

Please observe that contrary to the practiced recorded in the Evangels (which was prior to the resurrection and ascension of Messiah), from the book of Acts onward, the Savior is referred to by his sole name only 17% of the times. By comparison, 83% of the times the inspired authors of the NT refer to the Savior by name and title combination! This biblical action is very similar to what we do in a secular setting to dignitaries as *President* Bush, *Senator* Bob Dole, *First Lady* Clinton, *Dr.* John Doe, etc. Now, compare this to the behavior of most in the Sacred Name Movement today! Read their publications, hear their conversations, and titles/name combinations are a rare event. We feel and argue that this is due to our trying too over zealously to promote the true names to the point that we feel that titles are not really that important! Sadly, we often treat mere human dignitaries with greater care to their respective titles than we do the Creator. The fact remains that titles give us information about the individual that we cannot possibly derive from his mere name! Does this mean that titles are more important than names? As he have already stated, "Of course NOT!" Yet, it is no less true that while not more important than names, they are still extremely important, especially, when the title happens to be inspired!!

To further illustrate this point, suppose that your personal name is John Doe. In spite of this fact, you do not wish to hear your five-year-old son calling you by your name. However, he melts your heart whenever he calls you by the title *daddy*. There are times too that our Heavenly Father wishes to hear the same from our lips (as in Gal.4:6, "And because you are sons, Elohim has sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father")! Does this take away from the awesomeness of the name of the Almighty? No! It merely adds to its majesty!!

Conclusion

No one will deny that false doctrines are detrimental to truth, as they serve only to prevent real progress and spiritual growth. Because of the enslaving power associated with erroneous doctrinal beliefs, the masses can easily be blinded. Once they have fallen victim to a popular doctrinal perversion, it becomes easy to develop "fanatical attitudes" which in turn promote extremism even among leaders and scholars! This is exactly what every Sacred-Name believer has been battling with when attempting to share his faith with others in the Christian world! It is readily recognized that most Christian believers refuse the message of the Sacred-Name Movement only because its acceptance would require radical changes in their doctrinal beliefs and worship practices. Yet, we in the Sacred-Name Movement are UNWILLING to show any sympathy, as we are convinced that truth can NEVER be compromised. Yes, we RIGHTFULLY insist that Christians be willing to change their beliefs, practices, and even their affiliations in order to conform to truth. We demand that they be willing to SLAUGHTER THEIR RELIGIOUS COWS, HOWEVER, SACRED! Should we, then, do any less ourselves? Will we lack the courage and moral commitment that we so adamantly demand from others? If we refuse to drink our own medicine, are we any better than the Pharisees Yahshua condemned?

The problems that plague our beloved Sacred-Name Movement are difficult and numerous. However, as varied as these may be, they all have one common denominator: radical human behavior. At its best, human nature is a powerful tool which Yahweh can use in order to promote divine revelation and knowledge. At its worse, it is a stumbling block, as it succumbs to the sinful dictates of PRIDE and our UNWILLINGNESS to accept change – despite the facts. Like all other Bible subjects, the information presented in this treatise requires a commitment to learning and a willingness to apply the knowledge gained. For while Scripture assures us that knowing the truth can set us free, it is our practice of the same that distinguishes us as Yahshua's true disciples! As we look not at others but at ourselves, we pray we retrace our steps and do NOT that which Christendom does to maintain their tradition, image and prestige.

All things considered, it is high time for us to awake out of our sleep and come to grips with our faults as a people. It is time for a "house cleansing." There is sin in the camp and we ought to examine ourselves and act immediately to remedy the situation. To succumb to fear would be easy. To carry on, pretending this information was never presented, is also possible. However, what would be our defense when we stand before the judgment seat of the Sovereign Yahshua Messiah? Either we face up to the facts now, OR WE WILL DO SO LATER ON JUDGMENT DAY! The decision is ours.

The authors of this treatise are NOT wiser or more "guided" than their fellow Elders. We are no more gifted with the ability to conduct Bible research than any other servant Yahweh has called into the ministry. It is just that Yahweh has chosen to use us to carry and teach this message. The authors of this treatise, therefore, thank Yahweh for entrusting to us the propagation of these truths. We hope that just like Peter cried out, "Now I know that Yahweh is no respecter of persons ..." that even so all will finally say, "Who am I that I should fight against the Spirit of truth!" For, if we cannot change because of all the ramifications involved (be it pride, ego, prestige, fear, etc.), then the authors can better understand and empathize with Christianity and why they cannot but defend their empire, proving once again that we often build our castles and then call them truth!

May the blessings of
Yahweh Elohim
and the enlightenment that comes
through the knowledge of
Adonay Yahshua Messiah
be with you.

If the information contained in this treatise has been a blessing to you, please let us know.

Critical dialogue is always welcomed. We do not conceive ourselves to be beyond correction. Feel free to share your disagreements with us regarding any portion of this information.

Any financial help that you may feel led to give to our current *missionary* efforts in the US Virgin Islands will be greatly appreciated, as it will also help us to continue producing other publications of similar interest to the body of Messiah.

Additional copies may be ordered in quantity. Call 340-775-7949

Yah's Messianic Assembly

P.O. Box 1303

St. Thomas, V.I. 00804

Dale George - Elder

Tel. 340-775-7949

E mail: wehy7@yahoo.com

Restorahtion Ministry In Messiah

(Qahal Yahweh)

P.O. Box 206

St. Thomas, V.I. 00804-0206

Silvio (Saadyah) Soto - Rabbi

Tel. 340-777-5615

E mail: sholiachtal@yahoo.com

-

¹ For Example: The Prophetic Word Magazine, published and produced by “The House of Yahweh,” makes the following statement on pg 15 of their April-May 1996 issue: “... From this alone we see that the word **GOD** was never a Name for the Creator – it was a **TITLE FOR PAGAN GODS!** For facts about who you are actually worshiping when you call upon **Lord** and **God**, write for our Free Booklet: *Who Is Lord God, Who Is Baal?*” (Emphasis part of the original quote).

² Thus, on page 13 of the July/August 1997 issue of the Master Key, published and produced by “Yahweh’s Assembly in Messiah,” we read: “ To worship this idol, or any idol, is destructive to one’s own life, and those whose names aren’t written in the Lamb’s Book of Life will receive wrath from Yahweh because they worship the idol ‘God.’ Baal God worship in Jeremiah’s time was one of the sins of the children of Israel. They, like many today, worshiped the Queen of Heaven and her son ... In conclusion, the pagan idol known as ‘God’ from the beginning, was never glorified by Yahweh, nor has Yahweh ever said He would give His glory to it. Neither has He said that the word ‘god’ would be His own name or title. But He has said just the opposite. ‘You who forget My holy Name and spread a table for Gawd (God) and forget my holy mountain, I will destroy (Isaiah 65:11)”

³ The Institute For Scripture Research of South Africa has published a Sacred-Name English Bible known as THE SCRIPTURES. In it, they literally list over 100 words that are deemed and considered “unacceptable” because of their proven *pagan connections*. Yet, they have little choice but to consciously employ many of these same words in their translation!

⁴ Unger’s Bible Dictionary, pg.112: “1. A very common name for god among the Phoenicians. The word is also used of the master and owner of a house (Exod.22:7; Judg. 19:22); of a landowner (Job 31:39); of an owner of cattle (Exod. 21:28; Isa. 1:3), etc. The word is often used as a prefix to names of towns and men, e.g., Baal-gad, Baal-hanan, etc. 2. The name of the chief male god of the Phoenicians.”

⁵ Strong’s #1166. [Heb.], *ba’al* baw-al’; a primary root; to be master; hence (as demonstrated from 1167) to marry:– have dominion (over), be husband, marry (-ried, x wife).

⁶ Light, a publication produced by Yahweh’s New Covenant Assembly, on page 17, vol.5, number 2, 1993, states: “More and more scholars are becoming aware of the Hebrew roots and flavor of the New Testament. Some leading Scholars are at last coming to agree with Charles C. Torrey that the entire Bible was written in Hebrew both in the Old and New Testament as well.” *Author’s Note: It should be noted that Dr. Torrey argued for an Aramaic origin of the NT and NOT Hebrew as stated by the above quote.*

⁷ For example, in The Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible, pg. 414, we read: “**Adon**: This title (‘lord’; Greek Adonis) is closely related in meaning to ‘Baal’ and is also of foreign origin, as indicated by its appearance in Canaanite names like Adoni-zedek (Josh. 10:3).”

⁸ According to The Englishman’s Concordance, *adonay* is used in the OT in reference to Yahweh some 425 times.

⁹ This liberal form of theology is represented by the Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, vol. II, pg.291, where it states: “The conquest of Canaan by Israel was a process extending over several centuries ... Little by little Israel acquired agriculture, industries, and all the other forms of Canaanitish civilization. With this came inevitably the adoption of the worship of the local gods of Canaan ... The ancient shrines of the land became His [that is, Yahweh’s] shrines, and the legends connected with them were retold as stories of His dealings with the patriarchs. The agricultural ritual and the harvest festivals of the *be’alim* were re-consecrated to His service. By the time of David, the process was complete. Jahweh had appropriated everything that belonged to the *be’alim* that was worth saving.

10

Ho.2:16-19

(16) And it shall be at that day, says Yahweh, that thou shalt call me Ishi; and shalt call me no more Baali.

(17) For I will take away the names of Baalim out of her mouth, and they shall no more be remembered by their name.

(18) And in that day will I make a covenant for them with the beasts of the field, and with the fowls of heaven, and with the creeping things of the ground: and I will break the bow and the sword and the battle out of the earth, and will make them to lie down safely.

(19) And I will betroth thee unto me for ever; yea, I will betroth thee unto me in righteousness, and in

judgment, and in loving kindness, and in mercies.

¹¹ A good example of altering the true intended sense of Scripture and the meaningfulness of inspired titles is how Acts 2:36 is rendered in the Sacred-Name Bible known as The Sacred Scriptures Bethel Edition, produced and published by "Assemblies of Yahweh," where it reads: "Let all the house of Israel therefore know assuredly that Yahweh as made him both King and the Messiah, this Yahshua whom you impaled." It should be noted that this Bible in almost all other places throughout the NT it renders the Greek *kurios* consistently as "sovereign." There is no justification for the rendering "King" in this verse (especially when the context of Acts 2:36 is an attempt by Peter to apply the prophecy of Ps.110:1 to the Savior)! By deliberately rendering *kurios* as "King," the editors of this Bible demonstrate their disdain for the title *adon* and their willingness to remove it from the Scripture by employing a translation totally unrelated to *kurios*.

¹² For more information on this subject, write to us for the booklet, The Truth About Baptism.

¹³ An example of the inconsistencies to be found in the Movement is afforded us by comparing two Sacred-Name publications. "The House of Yahweh" published a booklet entitled, Who is Lord God? Who is Baal?, where the use of *adonay* and *elohim* (among other words) is condemned by demonstrating their *pagan connection* as attested by numerous sources. "Yahweh's New Covenant Assembly" in their bi-monthly publication Light of March/April 1993 retaliated by printing a rebuttal defending the use of *elohim*, arguing that "If Yahweh refers to Himself as Elohim in the very book He inspired Moses to write, then is not Elohim a term sanctioned by Yahweh Himself? ... How can one arrive, then, at such an absurd conclusion that it is wrong to use 'Elohim'?" It is curious, however, to observe that the six page article in Light made no attempt to defend *adonay* or to acknowledge its usage in the Hebrew Scriptures, even though everyone of its arguments in defense of *elohim* also applies to *adonay*!

¹⁴ Unfortunately, our copy of the source of this information was destroyed. A surviving photocopied segment (page 42-43) entitled, Semitic Mythology under the heading "Distribution of Semitic Races," the author makes the following statements: "In the sacred writings of the Jews this original name [Yhw] is correctly preserved in proper names as Yaw and Yah, but for some unexplained reason it was extended into a verbal form, apparently, Yahweh ... In this book I use the form Yaw ... Some have argued that the god Yaw was a Moon-god, but the sources both Aramaic and Hebrew indicate his identity with the Rain and Thunder-god Adad. A coin from Gaza in Southern Philistia, fourth century B.C., the period of the Jewish subjection to the last of the Persian kings, has the only known representation of this Hebrew deity, The letters Y H W are incised just above the hawk (?) which the god holds in his outstretched left hand ... Because of the winged chariot and mask it has been suggested that Yaw had been identified with Dionysus on account of a somewhat similar drawing of the Greek deity on a vase ... The coin was certainly minted under Greek influence, and consequently others have compared Yaw on his winged chariot to Triptolemos of Syria ... It is more likely that Yaw of Gaza really represents the Hebrew, Phoenician and Aramaic Sun-god El, Elohim, whom the monotheistic tendencies of the Hebrew had long since identified with Yaw ... In a mound north-west of Beisan, modern Ta'annek, has been found a letter of the fifteenth century written in cuneiform by Ahi-Yami, which proves that Yaw was a deity of the Canaanites."

The same source on page 65 in reference to the Heb. *El*, states, "It seems plausible to assume that this Semitic general word originally denoted a Sky-god."

¹⁵ The key word which is usually emphasized in Ex. 23:13 is "mention." The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon, define *mention* in this verse as meaning "boast of, praise." Gesenius does the same thing and defines the word as "To make mention of ... especially to make mention of with praise, to praise, to celebrate ..." Hence, the real Torah prohibition regards *invoking* or *calling upon* other deities *in worship*! The law is not intended against merely vocalizing the names of false deities. Owen's Analytical Key to the Old Testament more accurately renders Ex. 23:13 as "... you shall not call upon the names of other deities **in worship, praise, celebration, in boasting of them, or to give honor to them in any way**. Neither let such be heard out of your mouth." Therefore, simply mentioning, vocalizing, or writing the name of another deity is not in any sense a violation of the Torah. If any wishes to disagree with this interpretation of Ex.23:13, he or she will be left to explain the numerous occasions that the prophets of Yahweh (not to mention Yahweh himself) referred to false deities directly by their names.

¹⁶ Strong's # 8123: *shim-shone*; from 8121; sunlight.

Strong's #8121: *sheh'mesh*; from an unused root meaning to be

brilliant; the sun; by implication, the east; fig. a ray ...

¹⁷ See The Columbia Encyclopedia, Sixth Edition, Vol. 3, under the heading, *Zeus*.

¹⁸ The Oxford English Dictionary states regarding *god*: "The ulterior etymology is disputed ...There are two Aryan roots...: one meaning '**to invoke**'..., the other '**to pour, to offer sacrifice**'..."

¹⁹ Dictionary of the Bible edited by James Hastings, pg 333: The English word 'God' is not itself a product of the Jewish-Christian tradition, but existed in the Germanic family of languages in pre-Christian times. Its original sense is doubtful, and according to the Shorter OED the sense 'what is invoked' or 'what is worshiped by sacrifice' have been suggested as the primary meaning.

²⁰ Strong's #1416: *ghed-ood'*; from 1413; a crowd (espec. of soldiers): – army, band (of men), company, troop (of robbers).

²¹ Strong's #1464: *goode*; a prim. Root [akin to 1413]; to crowd upon, i.e. attack: – invade, overcome.

²² Strong's #6119: *aw-kabe*; from 6117; a heel (as protuberant); hence a track; fig. the rear (of an army):

²³ Harper's Dictionary of the Bible, states under the heading, "God": "A general term for the deity (or, in the plural, deities). In the Bible, the word is used to refer both to the deity worshiped in the Judeo-Christian tradition (God) and to the deities worshiped by other people (god or gods). In the OT, the word "God" most often translates the Hebrew *EL* (or the plural form, *Elohim*), the general Semitic term for deity which is probably derived from a root denoting power or strength.

²⁴ In an article by a popular Sacred-Name organization, the author attempted to argue against the use of the English word *lord* on the basis that etymologically, *lord* means, "the keeper of the loaf." He concluded by sarcastically asking his readers, "Would you want to call the Savior by a word that means he is "the keeper of the loaf?" To this question one could reply: First, the Bible calls the Savior "the Bread of Life". Second, Bread is the symbol that represents the very body of Messiah during our celebration of Passover. Third, in John 6:32 Yahshua argues that he is the Bread that the Father has given unto man. Therefore, the answer to the question postulated by the article could be: YES! In fact, what better word to signify in English that Yahshua is both the Bread of Life and the Sovereign ruler of our lives than *Lord*?

²⁵ "The House of Yahweh" in Abilene, Texas led by Israel Hawkins is reported to attract over 1,500 people to their annual celebration of the Feast of Tabernacle. No other Sacred-Name organization that we know of can even boast of 500!