

My Name Forever

by Michael McHugh

מה שמו ומה שם בְּנוֹ כִּי תִדַּע

What is his Name,
and what is his Son's Name,
if thou canst tell?

1. In the Hebrew Scriptures “יהוה” represents the personal name of the Creator, the Elohim of Israel. It is found there over 6,600 times.¹ Often called the “Tetragram” or “Tetragrammaton” (meaning roughly, “The Four Letters”) by technical writers and lecturers, this word, יהוה, is composed of the four letters *Yud* י, *Hei* ה, *Vav* ו, and *Hei* ה. Do we know what it means or how to pronounce it? In most Jewish and Christian circles it is not spoken. Jews call him in Hebrew, *Adonai* אֲדֹנָי (Lord), or *HaShem* הַשֵּׁם (The Name), while Christians use, “The LORD.”² These are titles. They are substitutions for his Name. But, why? Why is his Name not used when speaking to him or about him? To answer this question we must go to the Mishnah, which was compiled at the beginning of the third century. Our answer lies there, in the so-called “Oral Torah” or “Oral Law” which embodies Pharisaic/Rabbinic tradition from second Temple times.

Sanhedrin 10:1 All Israel have a portion in the world to come... ***BUT THESE ARE THOSE WHO HAVE NO PORTION IN THE WORLD TO COME***: one who says that resurrection is not found in the Torah, one who says the Torah is not from heaven, and an epicurean. R. Akiva says: one who reads the uncanonical books and one who whispers [a charm] over a wound and says, (Exodus 15) “I will bring none of these diseases upon you which I brought upon the Egyptians, for I am HaShem who heals you.” Abba Shaul says: ***ALSO ONE WHO PRONOUNCES THE NAME ACCORDING TO ITS LETTERS.***³

2. This speaks for itself, does it not? Among those who have no portion in the world to come, according to the Rabbis, is he who pronounces the Name as it is written. It appears that the Name was only allowed to be spoken by the priests in the temple courts when they were blessing the people.

Sotah 7:6 How is the Priestly Blessing done? In the province they say it as three blessings, but in the temple as one blessing. ***IN THE TEMPLE HE SAYS THE NAME AS IT IS WRITTEN,***⁴ but in the province, its pseudonym.

1 Avraham Even-Shoshan: *Concordantzia Chadashah* (Kiryat Seifer, 1983), pp. 440-448.

אֲבְרָהָם אֶבְרֹן-שׁוֹשָׁן: קוֹנְקוֹרְדִּינְאָה תְּדִשָּׁה (קְרִיַת סֵיפֶר, 1983), ד' 440-448.

2 In most English Bibles “LORD” and “GOD” (all capital letters) are regularly employed to represent the Tetragram where it appears in the Hebrew text.

3 The Hebrew reads: אִף הַהוֹגָה אֶת הַשֵּׁם בְּאוֹתֵיהֶם: י

4 The Hebrew reads: בְּמִקְדָּשׁ אֹמֵר אֶת הַשֵּׁם כְּכַתְּבוֹ: See also Tamid 7:2.

3. According to the Mishnah, when the “Priestly Blessing” of Numbers 6:24-26 was recited over the people in the temple, the Name was spoken as it was written. When the blessing was said outside the confines of the temple courts, the “Pseudonym” was used. It is generally understood that “Adonai” is the pseudonym to which reference is made but we know that *HaShem* אֱשֶׁם (The Name) was also used.⁵

4. Why is the Name not spoken in Jewish and Christian circles? Because the Rabbis have forbidden it. In so doing they violate the Torah and disregard the will of the One who wants his Name mentioned in every generation.

Exodus 3:14-15 ...יהוה...This is my Name forever, and this is my Mention (“memorial” KJV) to all generations.

5. The Creator expressly states here that יהוה is his Name forever. It is how he wants to be remembered or “mentioned” to all generations. While “memorial” (as the King James Version renders the Hebrew *zeikher* זֵכָר) might be appropriate for one who is dead, it is not fitting for him who is The Living One. The word *zeikher* זֵכָר, from the root *Zayin Kaf Reish* .ז.כ.ר, conveys the thought that this is how he wants his people to “call him to mind” or “mention” him.⁶ One specific way to mention him is to take our oaths in his name. This is expected of us.

Deuteronomy 10:20 You shall fear יהוה your Elohim; him shall you serve, and to him shall you cleave, and in his Name shall you swear.

6. This instruction is for both houses of Israel as well as the Gentile. It is valid for the native-born Hebrew and grafted-in Goy. It is in force for all who would learn his ways and be his people.

Jeremiah 12:16-17 “And it shall come to pass, if they will diligently learn the ways of my people, to swear by my Name, ‘יהוה lives,’ as they taught my people to swear by Ba’al, then shall they be built in the midst of my people. But if they will not listen, I will totally uproot and destroy that nation,” says יהוה.

7. So, how can we obey the Torah by mentioning his Name and using his Name in our oaths if we are obeying the Rabbis who tell us not to do so? It is obvious we can’t do both. We have to make a choice. Where will our allegiance be? Will it be to the Torah or to the Rabbis? Should we continue listening to those who set aside the commandments of the Almighty? What does Isaiah say? What does Yeshua say?

Isaiah 8:20 To the Torah and to the testimony! If they will not speak according to this word, they have no light.

Isaiah 29:13 Adonai has said, “Because this people draw near with their mouth, and with their lips they honor me, but they have removed their heart far from me, so that their fear toward me is the **erudite commandment of men...**”⁷

5 Yoma 3:8, 4:2, 6:2; Sanhedrin 7:5, 8.

6 William Gesenius: *Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon* (Erdmans, 1974), pp. 244-245.

7 The Hebrew is: מִצְוַת אֲנָשִׁים מְלֻמְדָה:

Shem Tov's Hebrew Matthew 15:1-9 Then the sages and the Pharisees came to Yeshua and said to him, “Why do your disciples transgress the **reforms** of antiquity in that they do not wash their hands before eating?” But Yeshua said to them, “And why do you transgress the words of Elohim for the sake of your **reforms**?... You despise the words of Elohim by your **reforms**... Woe, hypocrites! Behold Yeshayah prophesied of you, saying, ‘Thus says יהוה: Because this people draw near with their mouth, and with their lips they honor me, but they have removed their heart far from me, so that their fear toward me is the **erudite commandment of men**...’”⁸

Shem Tov's Hebrew Matthew 23:2-3 The Pharisees and sages sit in the seat of Moshe. So now, keep doing everything he tells you, but do not do according to their **reforms** and **precedents**, for they talk and do not act.⁹

8. The practice of not saying the Name is one of the “reforms” of the Rabbis. It is at variance with the Torah, it is at variance with the Prophets and it is at variance with Messiah. This practice has, like Baal worship, caused the people of Elohim and the world at large to forget his Name.¹⁰ We cannot take back the lost ground, however, without a systematic and objective approach to the whole subject and the will to make a difference in our own spheres of influence. In order to approach it thus, we’re going to have to examine and embrace the linguistic evidence we find in the pages of the Tanakh, the Hebrew Scriptures.¹¹

9. As you probably are already aware, the majority of the Tanakh was written in the Hebrew language. It would seem logical, therefore, to assume that the Creator’s Name, first encountered in a Hebrew context, written to a Hebrew speaking audience, would be a Hebrew name. Many, surprisingly, believe that the Name is “heavenly” in nature and therefore not a Hebrew name at all. Such unverifiable subjectivity must be completely abandoned if we are ever to get to the heart of the matter. The facts indicate that the Creator’s Name is a Hebrew name. I am of the opinion that we shall discover within the structure of the Hebrew language itself the form of this Name or we shall not discover it at all.

8 The Hebrew quotation from Isaiah is word for word, including מִצְוַת אֲנָשִׁים מִלְמַדָּה - “the erudite commandment of men.”

9 Two of the eight currently available, complete Shem Tov Hebrew Matthew manuscripts read, “Keep doing everything *he* tells you,” meaning Moses. The other six read, “Keep doing everything *they* tell you,” referring to the Pharisees. The latter is in line with the Greek text from which come our English translations. In my mind, whether Yeshua said, “He,” or “They,” does not alter the meaning within the immediate context. The reference to Mosaic authority is an appeal to submit to Moses. If we are to listen to the Pharisees, it is only so far as their teaching accurately reflects Moses. If not the actual words, the “he” reading of the two Shem Tov documents is at least a clarification. Either way, we are to obey Moses and not pattern our lives after the Pharisees. This conclusion should be inescapable in any language.

It is not within the scope of this article to either endorse or discredit the Shem Tov Hebrew text of Matthew. I have quoted from it because it sheds much light on the position the Master took against the oral traditions of his day. For a crash course in the “reforms” and “precedent” based practices of Pharisaic/Rabbinic Judaism and an introduction to Shem Tov’s Hebrew text of Matthew, “THE HEBREW YESHUA VS. THE GREEK JESUS” is a good place to start and is easy reading. Go to www.hebrewyeshua.com.

10 See also Jeremiah 23:27.

11 The word “Tanakh” is a Hebrew acronym which stands for “Torah, Prophets and Writings.” Christians generally refer to this collection of books as the “Old Testament.”

Eh'yeh אֶהְיֶה

10. Let's start with the basics. When the Almighty first revealed his Name to Moshe in Exodus 3:14 he explained it as signifying, "I Am." This is extremely important as the meaning of the Name, "יהוה," will eventually lead us to its true pronunciation. Meaning and pronunciation are inseparable.

Exodus 3:14-15 And Elohim said to Moshe, "I Am That I Am." And he said, "Thus shall you say to the sons of Yisra'el: I AM has sent me to you." And Elohim said moreover to Moses, "Thus shall you say to the sons of Yisra'el: יהוה the Elohim of your fathers, the Elohim of Avraham, the Elohim of Yitzchak, and the Elohim of Ya'akov, has sent me to you. This is my Name forever, and this is my Mention to all generations.

11. "I Am That I Am" translates the phrase *eh'yeh asher eh'yeh* אֶהְיֶה אֲשֶׁר אֶהְיֶה. *Eh'yeh* אֶהְיֶה is a verb of the Pa'al, or Kal, conjugation. We'll discuss the seven conjugations in more detail later. For now it is enough to know that this conjugation is the simplest and conveys action in its simplest or most basic form.¹² The root of this verb is *Hei Yud Hei* ה.י.ה. (הֵי יוּד הֵי) and has a basic meaning of, "TO BE, TO EXIST."¹³ The *Aleph* א at the beginning of the three letter root signifies the imperfect or future tense, first person singular - "I will..." The meaning of the root *Hei Yud Hei* ה.י.ה. (to be) taken together with the *Aleph* א modifier at the beginning (I will) signifies, "I will be," or, "I am."

12. Immediately after saying, "*Eh'yeh* אֶהְיֶה has sent me to you," the Creator says, "יהוה... has sent me to you." This would seem to indicate that יהוה, like *eh'yeh* אֶהְיֶה, is a verb. We should expect it to also be of the Kal conjugation. The root of this verb is *Hei Vav Hei* ה.ו.ה.¹⁴ and has a basic meaning of, "TO BREATH... hence, to live... and in the use of the language, *to be*, i.q. the common word הֵי." ¹⁵ The *Yud* י at the beginning of the three letter root signifies the imperfect or future tense, third person singular - "He will..." The meaning of the root *Hei Vav Hei* ה.ו.ה. (to be) taken together with the *Yud* י modifier at the beginning (He will) signifies, "He will be," or, "He is." Our search, then, is for how to say, "He will be," using the root *Hei Vav Hei* ה.ו.ה.

13. What can we learn of how he wants to be mentioned from Exodus 3:14? On the surface, it would appear, very little. But in actuality we have already learned a great deal. By way of inference we have learned that the Name is a verb of the Kal conjugation. And by knowing the tradition of "no mention" we can learn how the Name is not said. How? Simply by looking at the vowels the scribes put within it. In Exodus 3:14 and wherever else יהוה stands by itself in the Hebrew text it appears as *Y'hvah* יְהוָה or *Y'hovah* יְהוֹה, depending on the edition of the Tanakh. We get "Jehovah" from this. Whenever יהוה is found with *Adonai* אֲדֹנָי (Lord) as in יהוה אֲדֹנָי it appears as *Y'hvih* יְהוֹה or *Yehovih* יְהוֹה. Why? Well, it has to do with the nature of the Hebrew language, how it fell into disuse, and, of course, Rabbinic tradition.

12 See Table 3 at the end of this article.

13 Gesenius: *Lexicon*, p. 221.

14 Gesenius: *Lexicon*, p. 337.

15 Gesenius: *Lexicon*, p. 219.

The Hebrew Language

14. Hebrew is, and always has been, a language of consonants. A few of those consonants, were sometimes also used to represent vowel sounds. They are four: *Aleph* א, *Hei* ה, *Vav* ו, and *Yud* י. Not surprisingly, they are known as “VOWEL-LETTERS.”¹⁶ The *Aleph* א and *Hei* ה can represent an “ah” sound like the “a” in “father.” The *Vav* ו can be an “oh” like the “o” in “no” or an “oo” like the “u” in “flute.” The *Yud* י can represent “ee” like the “i” in “machine” or “ay” like the “ei” in “eight.”

15. Different words are often written with exactly the same consonants. For instance, in print, the letters דבר can be understood as, "he spoke," "it was spoken," "word," "word of," "plague," or "pasture."¹⁷ The pronunciation and meaning depend on the context and the place of the word in the sentence. This poses little difficulty to native speakers of the language. Context and syntax are usually enough to decide which word a certain combination of letters represents, even when the word contains no vowel-letters. Even if multiple pronunciations are possible for any particular combination, it's not too difficult to know how it should be pronounced. Many more examples could be cited, but it would not benefit us here. Just thumb through the Analytical Lexicon sometime and you'll see how many combinations are possible for certain words.

16. Many assert that Aramaic replaced Hebrew as the common dialect of Jewish life sometime during the Babylonian captivity. John Parkhurst, in his *Lexicon of New Testament Greek*, gives seven reasons why this is not so. I will quote him briefly.

1st. Prejudice apart, Is it probable that any people should lose their native language in a captivity of no longer than seventy years?...

2dly. It appears from *Scripture*, that *under the captivity* the Jews actually retained not only their language, but their manner of writing it, or the form and fashion of their letters. Else, what meaneth Esth. viii. 9, where we read that the decree of *Ahasuerus*, or *Artaxerxes Longimanus*, was written unto every province according to the writing thereof, and unto every people after their language, *and to the Jews according to their writing, and according to their language?*...

3dly. *Ezekiel*, who prophesied during the captivity to the *Jews* in *Chaldea*, wrote and published his prophecies in *Hebrew*...

4thly. The prophets who flourished soon after the return of the *Jews* to their own country, namely *Haggai* and *Zechariah*, prophesied to them in *Hebrew*, and so did *Malachi*, who seems to have delivered his prophecy about an hundred years after that event...

5thly. *Nehemiah*, who was governor of the *Jews* about a *hundred years* after their return from *Babylon*, not only wrote his book in *Hebrew*, but in ch. xiii, 23, 24, complains that some of the *Jews*, during his absence, had married wives of *Ashdod*, of *Ammon*, and of *Moab*, and that their children could not speak יהודית *the Jews' language*, but spake a mixed tongue... But how impertinent is the remark, and how foolish the complaint of

16 J. Weingreen: *A Practical Grammar For Classical Hebrew* (Oxford, 1979), p. 7.

17 Benjamin Davidson: *The Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon* (Zondervan, 1972), p. 144.

Nehemiah, that the *children of some* Jews, who had taken foreigners for wives, could not speak *pure Hebrew*, if *that* tongue had ceased to be vernacular among the *people* in general a *hundred* years before that period?...

6thly. It is highly absurd and unreasonable to suppose that the writers of the New Testament used the term *Hebrew* to signify a different language from that which the *Grecizing* Jews denoted by that name; but the language which those Jews called *Hebrew* after the Babylonish captivity, was not *Syriac*, or *Chaldee*, but the same in which the law and the prophets were written...

Lastly. It may be worth adding, that Josephus, who frequently uses the expressions *την Ἑβραίων διαλεκτον* [the Hebrew dialect], *γλωτταν την Ἑβραίων* [the Hebrew tongue], *Ἑβραϊστι* [in Hebrew]¹⁸, for *the language in which Moses wrote*... tells us... that towards the conclusion of the siege of Jerusalem he addressed not only John, the commander of the Zealots, but *τοις πολλοις the (Jewish) multitude* who were with him, *Ἑβραϊζων in the Hebrew tongue*, which was therefore *the common language* of the Jews at that time, i.e. about forty years after our Savior's death.

On the whole, I conclude that the Jews did not exchange the *Hebrew* for the *Chaldee* language at the captivity...¹⁹

17. The text of the Mishnah,²⁰ compiled at the beginning of the third century C.E. by Judah the Prince, corroborates this point of view. Written almost entirely in Hebrew,²¹ it reflects not only the "Oral Tradition" of second temple times, but the language in which that tradition was communicated. In the words of the Mishnah, "A man is obligated to speak in his Rabbi's tongue" (Eduyot 1:3). M. H. Segal, in discussing the Hebrew of the Mishnah, has this to say on the subject:

In conclusion, we must refer briefly to the linguistic trustworthiness of the Mishnaic tradition... Its trustworthiness is established by the old rule, older than the age of Hillel, that a tradition - which of course, was handed down by word of mouth - must be repeated in the exact words of the master from whom it had been learnt: *חַיִּב אָדָם לומר* *בְּלִשׁוֹן רַבּוֹ* [A man is obligated to speak in his Rabbi's tongue]²². This rule was strictly observed throughout the Mishnaic and Talmudic periods (cf. 'Ed. i.3, with the commentaries; Ber. 47a; Bek. 5a), and was in fact, the basis of the authority of the Oral Law. So careful were the Rabbis in the observance of this rule that they often reproduced even the mannerisms and the personal peculiarities of the Masters from whom they had received a particular tradition, or *halaka*. This rule makes it certain that, at least in most cases, the sayings of the Rabbis have been handed down in the language in which they had originally been expressed.²³

18 Translations in brackets [] added for clarity.

19 John Parkhurst: *A Greek And English Lexicon To The New Testament* (London, 1809), pp. 181-182.

20 The Mishnah is a compilation of what had been, until then, the "Oral Law" of Judaism.

21 The Hebrew of the Mishnah is appropriately known as "Mishnaic" Hebrew or "MH."

22 Translation in brackets [] added for clarity.

23 M. H. Segal: *A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew* (Oxford, 1983), p. 19.

18. The decline of Hebrew as a spoken language is thought to have begun with the fall of the Hasmonean dynasty and the rise of Herod to power in 63 B.C.E. A number of circumstances contributed to its final demise. Mr. Segal sums it up well.

The destruction of many of the native families in the bloody wars which accompanied the coming of the Romans and the establishment of the Herodians (whose original language was probably Aram.); the closer connexion between Jerusalem and the Aram. Jewries of Syria and the Eastern Diaspora which followed on the incorporation of Palestine in the Roman Empire; and the settlement of those Aram.-speaking Jews in Jerusalem, all tended to spread the use of Aram. at the expense of MH. But MH still remained a popular speech, as is testified by numerous passages in its literature... Finally, the destruction of Jewish life in Judea after the defeat of Bar Kokba (135 C.E.), and the establishment of the new Jewish centre in the Aram.-speaking Galilee, seem to have led to the disappearance of MH as a popular tongue.²⁴

19. It appears that Hebrew remained a spoken tongue well into the fourth century.²⁵ As such, its mode of written communication (letters and vowel-letters) was more than adequate to facilitate understanding. As it fell into disuse by the masses, however, it became more and more difficult to decipher written texts. This problem became most acute in relation to the Tanakh. As use of the language diminished, the proper reading of the sacred scrolls increasingly came into question. How could the accepted reading of the text be maintained and perpetuated as the language slowly died? This was the challenge. Sometime in the sixth or seventh century C.E. a group of scribes rose to the occasion. They invented a set of vowel signs or "points" to accompany the consonants and preserve the "traditional" reading of the Hebrew Scriptures.²⁶ They were placed within, above and below the letters of the text.²⁷

Y'hvah יהוה and *Y'hovah* יהוה

20. Since Pharisaic "reform" dictated an outright ban on speaking the Name "according to the letters," whenever the scribes encountered "יהוה" they inserted into it, with a slight modification, the vowels of the word *Adonai* אֲדֹנָי (Lord). This was to signify to those who would read the text that *Adonai* אֲדֹנָי was to be read instead. Depending on the edition of the Tanakh, this looks like *Y'hvah* יהוה or *Y'hovah* יהוה. Now, the discerning student is going to notice right away that neither set of these vowels matches exactly the vowels under *Adonai* אֲדֹנָי. Bear with me for just a few lines. I'll try to make the reason as simple as possible.

21. The first difference is in the vowels under the initial letter. Under the *Yud* י of *Y'hvah* יהוה and *Y'hovah* יהוה is a *Sh'va* (,). Under the *Aleph* א of *Adonai* אֲדֹנָי is a *Hataf Patach* (ֿ). The difference in

24 Segal: *Grammar*, p. 15.

25 Segal: *Grammar*, p. 15, footnote 2.

26 William Gesenius: *Hebrew Grammar* (Oxford, 1983), p. 37.

27 The Hebrew Alephbet and basic vowels, according to the Sephardic pronunciation used in Israel today, are in Tables 1 and 2 at the end of this article.

vowels is due to the difference in the nature of the two letters. The *Yud* י, being a standard consonant, can take a *Sh'va* at the beginning of a word. The *Aleph* א, being in essence a mild guttural, cannot. It must take a compound *Sh'va*, (in this case a *Hataf Patach*) at the beginning of a word. The scribes simply transferred the *nature* of the short vowel under the *Aleph* א to the vowel under the *Yud* י rather than the exact vowel.

22. The second vowel in *Adonai* אֲדֹנָי is a *Holam* (̣). In the case of *Y'hvah* יְהוָה it is missing. This is, I believe, to make doubly sure *Adonai* אֲדֹנָי would be read, as *Y'hvah* יְהוָה is quite redundant and impossible to pronounce.

Y'hviah יְהוֹיָה and *Y'hoviah* יְהוֹוִיָה

23. Often times the words *Adonai* אֲדֹנָי and *יהוה* appear side by side in the Hebrew text. When the scribes encountered this combination they inserted the vowels for the word *Elohim* אֱלֹהִים (*Elohim*) into the Tetragram so that *Adonai Elohim* would be read instead of *Adonai* being read twice. Depending on the edition of the Tanakh, this looks like *Adonai Y'hviah* יְהוֹיָה אֲדֹנָי or *Adonai Y'hoviah* יְהוֹוִיָה אֲדֹנָי. Again, there is a discrepancy between the vowels under the *Yud* י of *יהוה* and the *Aleph* א of *Adonai* אֲדֹנָי for the same reasons as stated above. The pronunciation *Y'hviah* יְהוֹיָה is every bit as impossible as *Y'hvah* יְהוָה.

24. It is worth noting that the edition of the Tanakh which uses *Y'hvah* יְהוָה also uses *Y'hviah* יְהוֹיָה. The other edition uses *Y'hovah* יְהוֹוָה and *Y'hoviah* יְהוֹוִיָה.

25. All this has been said to help us see that the vowels under *יהוה* are not its real vowels. The following entry is from the popular four volume Even-Shoshan dictionary used in Israel. It verifies what has just been asserted.

יְהוָה, יְהוֹיָה... נִבְטָא "אֲדֹנָי" או "הַשֵּׁם" או "אֲדֹשֶׁם" - אִם נִקְוָדוּ "יְהוָה"; או "אֱלֹהִים, אֱלֹקִים" - אִם נִקְוָדוּ "יְהוָה", מִשּׁוּם הָאִסוּר לְהַגּוֹת אֶת הַשֵּׁם בְּאוֹתֵינוּ:
יְהוָה, יְהוֹיָה... pronounced "Adonai" or "HaShem" or "Adoshem" - when its vowels are "יְהוָה"; or "Elohim, Elokim" - when its vowels are "יְהוָה", because of the prohibition of uttering the Name according to its letters.²⁸

26. By the looks of the vowel points under the Tetragram in this entry, it appears that there must be at least a third edition of the Tanakh. The vowel under the initial *Yud* י, when the Tetragram is to be read as *Elohim*, is the short *Hataf Segol* (̣) which regularly stands under the *Aleph* א of *Elohim* אֱלֹהִים. This combination in *יהוה* is ridiculous, as a *Hataf Segol* is never found under a *Yud* י in a legitimate word. It is under the *Yud* י in *יהוה* only to remind the reader to read, "*Elohim*," and not, "*Adonai*."

27. It becomes evident that the vowels assigned to *יהוה* in the Scriptures are not the vowels which would allow one to speak it "according to its letters." *Y'hovah* יְהוֹוָה and *Y'hoviah* יְהוֹוִיָה are not, therefore, legitimate pronunciations. They are, in essence, linguistic bastards. They represent the vowels of the

28 Avraham Even-Shoshan: *HaMilon HeChadash* (Kiryat Seifer, 1985), Vol. 2, p. 483.

אֲבְרָהָם אֶבְרָן-שׁוֹשָׁן: הַמִּילּוֹן הַחֲדָשׁ (קִרְיַת סֵפֶר, 1985), כְּרֶדֶךְ שֵׁנִי, ד. 483.

nouns *Adonai* אֲדֹנָי and *Elohim* אֱלֹהִים, respectively, imposed upon the letters of a verb. Gesenius sums up the matter nicely.

As it is thus evident that the word יהוה does not stand with its own vowels, but with those of another word, the inquiry arises, what then are its true and genuine vowels?²⁹

Y'hó יהוה, Yáhu יהוה and Y'hu יהוה

28. Since the Name cannot be learned by looking within the Tetragram itself, we have to look elsewhere. The first step in ascertaining its true pronunciation is, I believe, observing how it is pronounced when it is part of men's proper names. It appears three ways:

- *Y'hó* יהוה is how the Name appears at the beginning and in the middle of a man's name. It has two syllables. The first letter, *Yud* י, is pronounced as the “y” in “yes.” The *Sh'va* () under the initial *Yud* י (י) indicates “the absence of a vowel.”³⁰ It is such a slight sound that one hears little more than the consonant with which it is associated. The first syllable is *Y'-*י. The next letter, *Hei* ה, is the first letter of the second syllable. Pronounced as the “h” in “hoe,” it is often treated as though it were a silent letter and disappears from both speech and the printed page. The horizontal line () under the *Hei* ה (ה) is the accent mark. The accent is on the second syllable due to the nature of the *Sh'va* under the first. The letter which follows the *Hei* ה is *Vav* ו, the third letter of the Tetragram. It is not a consonant here, but a vowel, as there is a *Holam* () above it. The *Vav/Holam* combination (ו) is pronounced “oh” like the “o” in “no.” The second syllable is *-hó* הוה. The *Sh'va* under the *Yud* י, followed by the often silent *Hei* ה, helps us understand why *Y'hó* יהוה is often found in a man's name shortened to *Yó* יו.
- *Yáhu* יהוה is how the Name appears at the end of a man's name. The accent was assigned to the first syllable. The *Kamatz* () under the initial *Yud* י (י) is pronounced “ah” like the “a” in “father.” The first syllable is *Yá* יא. Instead of the *Vav/Holam* combination (ו) after the *Hei* ה of the second syllable there is a *Shuruk* (ו) which is pronounced “oo” like the “u” in “flute.” The second syllable is *-hu* הוה. *Yáhu* is often found shortened to *Yáh* יא.
- *Y'hu* יהוה is how the Name sometimes appears at the end of one particular name. The characteristics and pronunciation of the *Yud* י and the *Sh'va* of the first syllable is the same as in *Y'hó* יהוה. The pronunciation of the *Hei* ה and the *Shuruk* (ו) of the second syllable is the same as in *Yáhu* יהוה. Although the second syllable should take the accent due to the nature of the *Sh'va* under the initial *Yud* י, the scribes saw fit to exclude it.

29 Gesenius: *Lexicon*, p. 337.

30 Menahem Mansoor: *Biblical Hebrew Step By Step* (Baker Book House, 1992), p. 33.

Y'hó יהוֹ

29. When found at the beginning of someone's name, the Name is pronounced *Y'hó* יהוֹ as in *Y'hónatan* יהוֹנָתָן (Jonathan) in 1 Samuel 14:6 & 8. Jonathan means, “יהוה Has Given.” When it appears in the middle of a man's name the pronunciation is the same - *Y'hó* יהוֹ as in *El'Y'hóeinai* אֱלִיְהוֹעֵינַי (Elieoenai). Elieoenai means, “My Eyes Are Toward יהוה.” We find this name in 1 Chronicles 26:3. As already mentioned, and as is common in modern Hebrew, the *Hei* ה in Biblical Hebrew often vanishes. So it is that we find *Y'hó* יהוֹ often shortened to *Yó* יוֹ, Thus *Y'hónatan* יהוֹנָתָן becomes *Yónatan* יוֹנָתָן in 1 Samuel 13:2, 3 & 22 while *El'Y'hóeinai* אֱלִיְהוֹעֵינַי becomes *El'Yóeinai* אֱלִיְיֹעֵינַי in 1 Chronicles 4:36.

Yáhu יהוּ

30. When the Name appears at the end of a proper name it is pointed *Yáhu* יהוּ as in *MikhaYáhu* מִיכָיָהוּ (Michaiah) in 2 Chronicles 17:7, and *EliYáhu* אֱלִיָּהוּ (Elijah) in I Kings 17. “Michaiah” means, “Who Is Like יהוה?” while Elijah means, “יהוה Is My Elohim.” This pronunciation also gets shortened. Thus *EliYáhu* אֱלִיָּהוּ appears in Malachi 3:23 as *EliYáh* אֱלִיָּה and *MikhaYáhu* מִיכָיָהוּ becomes *MikhaYáh* מִיכָיָה in Nehemiah 12:35.

Y'hu יהוּ

31. There are several examples of an exception to how the Name looks at the end of proper names, but only in one name. In Judges 17 verses 1 & 4, I Kings 22:8 ff, 2 Chronicles 18:7 and Jeremiah 36:11 & 13, where we would expect to find Michaiah as *MikhaYáhu* מִיכָיָהוּ, we find instead *MikháY'hu* מִיכָיָהוּ. To my knowledge, this is the only name in which the Name is ever pointed like this.

Ecclesiastes 11:3 and *Sham Y'hú* שָׁם יְהוּ

32. We see three evidently related, but distinct pronunciations of the Name in the Hebrew Scriptures. How do we explain this phenomenon? Perhaps we should ask another question first: Do any of these pronunciations reflect a legitimate verbal form? With this question, we reach a critical point in our study. No longer can we simply observe the Biblical data. Now we must evaluate it. The key to a proper analysis and the answer to our question is found hidden away in the little read book of Kohelet (Ecclesiastes). There, in the eleventh chapter, is a verse which apparently has been overlooked in all the discussions about the Name. I came across it accidentally while reading the Hebrew text one day many years ago. One phrase all but shouted at me from the printed page.

קהלת יאג אמ־ימלאו העבים גשם על־הארץ יריקו ואם־יפול עץ בדרום ואם בצפון מקום שיפול העץ שם יהוא:

Ecclesiastes 11:3 If the clouds fill up with rain, they empty upon the earth; and whether the tree falls to the south or to the north, in the place where the tree falls, **there it shall be.**

33. "There it shall be," translates *sham y'hú יהוא שם*. *Sham שם* means "there." The Analytical Hebrew Lexicon, which breaks up each word in the Hebrew text into its component parts, gives us some very interesting information about the word *y'hú יהוא*. It is a third person singular, masculine, Kal future (he will...) form of the verb *Hei Vav Hei ה.ו.ה.* (to be)! ("Tree" is a masculine word in Hebrew.) A note in brackets also informs us that *y'hú יהוא* is apocopated (abbreviated as "ap." or "apoc."). "Apocopated" simply describes "the loss of one or more sounds or letters at the end of a word..."³¹ Here is the entry:

יהוא Kal fut. 3 per. sing. masc. [for יהו ap. for יהוה § 24. rem. 3] הוה³²

34. According to the Analytical Lexicon the word *y'hú יהוא* is a shortened verbal form of *Yeheveh יהוה*. It reflects the meaning of the Name exactly and is identical in pronunciation with how it is pronounced at the end of Michaiah's name sometimes. The note in brackets also directs us to section 24 remark 3 at the front of the lexicon where we read that *y'hú יהוא* is a shortened "Syriac" form of *Yih'veh יהוה*.

The verbs *היה to be* and *חייה to live*, which would properly have in the fut. apoc. *יהי*, and *יחי*, change these forms into *יהי* and *יחי*... A perfectly Syriac form is *יהוא Ec. 11.3*, for *יהוה*, ap. *יהו* (from *היה to be*).³³

35. In the first quote from the Analytical Lexicon we are told that *y'hú יהוא* is a shortened form of *Yeheveh יהוה*, while in the second we read that it is a shortened form of *Yih'veh יהוה*. The discrepancy arises from the fact that neither of the longer forms is found in any Hebrew literature. The longer forms are hypothetical reconstructions based on what we know of Hebrew verb patterns. Since it is the shortened form which mirrors the pronunciation of the Name in Michaiah's name, it is the shortened forms of *y'hi יהי* and *y'hu יהו* which next require our attention.

Y'hi יהי and Y'hu יהו

36. So, we have in the words *y'hi יהי* (root *Hei Yud Hei ה.י.ה.*) and *y'hu יהו* (root *Hei Vav Hei ה.ו.ה.*) shortened forms of the imperfect. Normally this shortened form represents a nuance of meaning called the "jussive,"³⁴ which expresses a "command or wish"³⁵ and is recognized in *Lamed-Hei ל"ה* verbs³⁶ by the

31 Merriam-Webster: *New Collegiate Dictionary* (G. & C. Merriam Co., 1997), p. 53.

32 Davidson: *Lexicon*, p. 300.

33 Davidson: *Lexicon*, p. 51.

34 Gesenius: *Grammar*, p. 129.

35 Gesenius: *Grammar*, p. 131.

36 *Lamed-Hei ל"ה* verbs have a *Hei ה* as the third letter of the root.

loss of the ה־ ending of the usual imperfect.³⁷ The third person masculine imperfect of *Hei Yud Hei* .ה.ג.ה is *yih'yéh* יְהִי. The shortened form is *y'hi* יְהִי. Although we have no concrete witness as to the long form of the third person masculine imperfect of *Hei Vav Hei* .ה.ו.ה, we have the shortened form - *y'hú* יְהִי. Working backwards from there, based on the vowel pattern of *yih'yéh* יְהִי, the grammarians surmise that the regular imperfect is *yih'yéh* (*yih'wéh*)³⁸ יְהִי or *yehevéh* (*yehewéh*) יְהִי as seen in the last two quotes above.

37. It seems odd, though, does it not, that the form of the Name as it appears within so many personal names reflects not the usual form of the imperfect, but the shortened form, the form that usually stands for the jussive? So, what about Ecc. 11:3? Are we to understand it as, “Where the tree falls, there **let it be**?” Is it a jussive? Actually, no, it is not. Gesenius, in his Hebrew Grammer, says the jussive is often used for the regular imperfect. He cites twenty specific instances where *y'hi* יְהִי is used in place of the full form *yih'yéh* יְהִי:

Moreover, in not a few cases, the jussive is used, without any collateral sense, for the ordinary imperfect form, and this occurs not alone in forms which may arise from a misunderstanding of the defective writing... but also in shortened forms, such as יְהִי Gen 49¹⁷ (Sam. יְהִי), Dt 28⁸, 1S 10⁵, 2S 5²⁴, Ho 6¹, 11⁴, Am 5¹⁴, Mi 1², Zp 2¹³, Zc 9⁵, *ψ* 72^{16f.} (after other jussives), 104³¹, Jb 18¹², 20^{23.26.28}, 27⁸, 33²¹, 34³⁷, Ru 3⁴.³⁹

38. It is evident that in the passages cited above by Gesenius, where *y'hi* יְהִי is used for the ordinary imperfect, the final *Hei* ה of the full imperfect form disappears. This is common for *Lamed-Hei* ל"ה jussives. It is also evident that in Ecclesiastes 11:3 where *y'hú* יְהִי is used for the ordinary imperfect, it does not lose its final letter, but exchanges it for an *Aleph* א. This is most uncommon for *Lamed-Hei* ל"ה jussives. Should we understand this phenomenon as a “perfectly Syriac form” as Benjamin Davidson says? Or should we go with the opinion of Gesenius that the true reading of Ecc. 11:3 is found in the few manuscripts which read *sham hu* הוּא שָׁמָּה (there he is) instead of *sham y'hú* יְהִי שָׁמָּה (there he will be)?⁴⁰ Or is there yet another way of looking at it? Could it be that this shortened form of the imperfect, which does not lose its final letter, is used for the usual imperfect because the usual imperfect was never used for this particular verb? Perhaps we should abandon our search for the “ordinary imperfect” of *Hei Vav Hei* .ה.ו.ה and view *y'hú* יְהִי as the legitimate heir to the throne. Perhaps in this particular *Lamed-Hei* ל"ה verb the jussive and imperfect are not merely interchangeable as they appear to be in other *Lamed-Hei* ל"ה verbs,⁴¹ but indistinguishable.

39. Stop and think for just a moment. The Name is a third person singular, masculine, Kal future verbal form from the three letter root *Hei Vav Hei* .ה.ו.ה (to be). At the end of Michaiiah’s name it is sometimes represented as *Y'hu* יְהִי. It drops the final *Hei* ה as it does within every man’s name. It is a shortened form. *Y'hú*(א) יְהִי in Ecc. 11:3 is also a third person singular, masculine, Kal future verbal form, from the root *Hei Vav Hei* .ה.ו.ה. It, too, is a shortened form, but does not drop its final letter.

37 Gesenius: *Grammar*, p. 210.

38 In modern Israeli Hebrew, the *waw* ן of Biblical Hebrew has a “v” sound.

39 Gesenius: *Grammar*, p. 323.

40 Gesenius: *Grammar*, p. 211.

41 Gesenius: *Grammar*, pp. 211-212.

Rather, it is changed from a *Hei* ה to an *Aleph* א. What do we get when we change the “Syriac” style *Aleph* א back to its original *Hei* ה? We get *Y’hú(ה)* יהוה. Is there any difference in speech between *y’hú(א)* יהוה with an *Aleph* א and *Y’hú(ה)* יהוה with a *Hei* ה? No. Neither the *Hei* ה nor the *Aleph* א affect the pronunciation. They are both, for all intents and purposes, silent. And what do we get when we return the lacking *Hei* ה to the Name as it sometimes appears at the end of Michaiah’s name? We get *Y’hu(ה)* יהוה. And when we supply the accent it would have in normal speech we have *Y’hú(ה)* יהוה. Is there any difference in meaning between *Y’hú(ה)* יהוה with a *Hei* ה and *y’hú(א)* יהוה with an *Aleph* א? Grammatically, no. Both express, “He will be.” But contextually there is a tremendous difference, for *y’hú(א)* יהוה means generically, “he will be,” while *Y’hú(ה)* יהוה is the Name and quite specifically communicates, “He Will Be.” Perhaps that is precisely the reason why *Y’hú יהוה* in Ecc. 11:3 was written with an *Aleph* א and not a *Hei* ה. A change of the final letter from a *Hei* ה to an *Aleph* א would be all that was necessary to distinguish the ordinary, everyday, purely grammatical, “he will be,” from the One whose name means, “He Will Be,” would it not?

***Yahweh* יהוה**

40. By far, the most common pronunciation of the Name is *Yahweh* יהוה. One popular line of reasoning in support of this pronunciation has to do with a statement made by Josephus. According to him, the Tetragram consisted of “four vowels.” Speaking of the high priest’s garments, he says the following:

A mitre also of fine linen encompassed his head, which was tied by a blue ribbon, about which there was another golden crown, in which was engraven the sacred name: it consists of four vowels.⁴²

41. After reading this some have mistakenly concluded that since Josephus calls the letters of the Tetragram, “Four vowels,” they were pronounced as such: The *Yud* י is pronounced “ee,” the first *Hei* ה is pronounced “ah,” the *Vav* ו is pronounced “oo,” and the final *Hei* ה is pronounced, “ay.” Put them all together and you have, “ee-ah-oo-ay,” hence - *Yahweh*.⁴³ The Scriptural evidence presented here, however, does not lead us to this pronunciation. Nor does the structure and character of the Hebrew language itself. In order to properly understand what Josephus meant by, “Four vowels,” we must know something about that language, as he originally wrote *The Jewish War* in Hebrew. He then translated it into Greek. Here it is in his own words:

I have proposed to myself, for the sake of such as live under the government of the Romans, to translate those books into the Greek tongue, which I formerly composed in the language of our country...⁴⁴

42 Flavius Josephus: *The Jewish War* 5:5:7 [5:235] (Translated by William Whiston)

43 *The Sacred Name* (Qadesh La Yahweh Press, 2002), pp. 103-104.

44 Josephus: *The Jewish War* 1:1 (Translated by William Whiston)

42. It has already been shown that the common language of Israel during the time of Josephus was Hebrew. The comment about the “Four vowels,” then, was originally expressed in Hebrew. The only thing left of *The Jewish War* in that tongue is said to be a “pseudepigraphic medieval Hebrew paraphrase...”⁴⁵ It would not surprise me one bit to find the Hebrew of that document to be written in a distinctive, Mishnaic Hebrew style. Perhaps closer scrutiny would reveal it to be a bona-fide copy of the original and not from medieval times at all. For now, though, we must be content with the concept that the words, “Four vowels,” is an English translation of a Greek translation of a Hebrew original which we do not have. The translation is at best, second hand. It leaves us English-speakers with problems on several fronts.

43. First, though it is true, as was pointed out earlier, that *Hei* ה, *Vav* ו, and *Yud* י are known as “vowel-letters,” it is not true they are always vowels. It would be accurate to say that in a language of consonants, such as Hebrew, they can double as vowels. And when they do, they are always preceded by a consonant. The consonants are said to be “vowel carriers.” Vowels do not stand by themselves. It is, therefore, quite impossible for the *Yud* י of יהוה to be a vowel. It must be a consonant. The “Four vowels,” for this reason, cannot be four vowels.

44. Secondly, there is no such thing as a Hebrew verb comprised solely of vowels. It is the prescribed modification of consonants and vowels which colors the verbal root with the various shades of meaning necessary for successful communication. For this reason also, the “Four vowels” cannot be four vowels.

45. Thirdly, it is precisely this modification of the Hebrew verb which not only leads us away from the concept of the “Four vowels” being pronounced as four vowels, but mitigates against the use of *Yahweh* as a valid verbal form of any kind. The Hebrew verb is conjugated or “built” in seven different ways. Each conjugation carries a slightly different nuance of meaning. In simplified form they are as follows:

1. Pa'al (Kal) - Simple
2. Niph'al - Simple Passive
3. Pi'el - Intensive
4. Pu'al - Intensive Passive
5. Hiph'il - Causative
6. Hoph'al - Causative Passive
7. Hitpa'el - Intensive Reflexive

46. Each conjugation has its own peculiar vowel patterns for the perfect (past), imperfect (future), and present tenses. Each conjugation, with its corresponding vowel patterns, modifies the simple, root meaning of the verb, conveying a slightly different nuance of meaning.⁴⁶ Not all verbs use all seven conjugations.

⁴⁵ <http://www.preteristarchive.com/JewishWars/>

⁴⁶ See Table 3 at the end of this article for an example.

47. The vowel pattern of the word *Yahweh* יהוה identifies it as a verb of the Hiph'il,⁴⁷ the so-called "causative" conjugation, from the root *Hei Vav Hei* ה.ו.ה (to be) which would literally mean, "He Will Cause To Be." That's a problem, though, because the root *Hei Vav Hei* ה.ו.ה, like its counterpart *Hei Yud Hei* ה.י.ה, has never developed forms in the Hiph'il conjugation. In other words, *Yahweh* יהוה, is a verb which does not exist in the Hebrew language. It is wholly unintelligible.⁴⁸ Even if, for sake of argument, *Yahweh* יהוה did represent a legitimate verbal form, the accent would be on the last syllable (*Yahwéh* יהוה) and his Name would mean, "He Causes To Be." However, the "I AM THAT I AM" of Exodus 3 was communicated in the Kal conjugation, not the Hiph'il. Therefore, the meaning of his Name is not to be associated with the Hiph'il conjugation.

48. As a Hebrew speaker, Josephus knew all these things. Unless he was guilty of promulgating disinformation, what he most likely meant to convey by, "Four vowels," and what his contemporaries most likely understood when they heard it, was, "Four vowel-letters." I believe the Hebrew original of *The Jewish War* would bear this out. From our vantage point, however, there is nothing in the words of Josephus which would lead us to understand that the "Four vowels" were pronounced as such, let alone as "Yahweh." The structure and nature of the Hebrew language defy it.

Yáhu-Hei "ה" יהו?

49. On the basis of its purely imaginary nature, *Yahweh* should be disqualified from consideration as the actual pronunciation of the Name. As a Hiph'il verbal form or a word made up of all vowels it is a phantom. Its legitimacy ought to be seriously called into question. We know nothing, really, of its origin. The case for this particular pronunciation rests somewhat precariously on Greek and Latin manuscript evidence. The variants are many. The pronunciation of יהוה is reportedly represented in Greek and Latin⁴⁹ as:

Greek

Ιαὼ, Ιαοὺ, Ιευσώ (*Y'hó Yáhu*, or *Y'hu*)

Ιαβέ, Ιαωουε, Ιαωουεη, Ιαωουηι Ιαωουεα (*Yahweh?*)

Ιαουαί, Ιαβαι (*Yahwai?*)

Latin

IAHO (*Y'hó*)

Jabe (*Yahweh?*)

IAUE (*Yahweh?*)

50. In reading some of these transliterations, it does seem like the sound "Yahweh" is what the transliterators were after, doesn't it? This puzzled me for some time as "Yahweh" is nonsense in Hebrew. Then, one day, I came across this pseudo-scholarly statement about the Name:

The יהו represents *YAHU-*, and the final ה represents *-EH* or *-WEH*.⁵⁰

47 See the paradigm for *Lamed-Hei* ה"ל verbs in section 24, p. 50 of the Analytical Lexicon.

48 Perhaps this is the real reason some think of the Name as "heavenly." If it isn't a Hebrew word, it doesn't have to mean anything in Hebrew, does it?

49 *The Sacred Name* (Qadesh La Yahweh Press, 2002), pp. 108-111.

50 C. J. Kostner: *Come Out of Her My People* (Institute For Scripture Research, 1998), p. 1.

51. Something in the way that was written just didn't sound right. And then it hit me: It's not the Hebrew which represents the transliteration, but the transliteration which represents the Hebrew! What if we turned the sentence around to reflect reality? "-EH represents the final ה and YAHU- represents the יהו." That rang a bell. If *Yahweh* really is an ancient pronunciation, is it possible that it is in essence a blended form of *Yáhu-Hei* "ה" יהו - the form *Yáhu* יהו and the name of the final letter *Hei* ה spoken at the end?⁵¹ Could there have been more than one or two original "pseudonyms" used during second temple times? In addition to *Adonai* אֲדֹנָי and *HaShem* הַשֵּׁם, could there have been, or was there also *Yáhu-Hei* "ה" יהו? This might account for the occurrences of a few Greek transliterations which seem to communicate a *Yahweh*-like sound to our ears. That is, of course, speculation on my part, but apart from speculation I have no explanation as to its origin.

Summary

52. Those of us who believe that the written Word is the standard by which all things are measured need to act like it. The practice of addressing the Almighty exclusively by the title, "LORD," is a Rabbinical dictum which is not in harmony with the Word. Sure, he is the Master, but that is not his Name, *the* Name by which he wants to be mentioned. We should be using his Name. In fact, if we were following Biblical protocol, we would be using his Name ninety-eight percent more often than the pseudonyms, "Adonai," or, "LORD." That's right - ninety-eight percent! In the Hebrew text יהוה is found alone over 6,600 times and joined with *Adonai* אֲדֹנָי (Lord) another 285 times.⁵² Compare that with the 140 times *Adonai* אֲדֹנָי (Lord) is used by itself,⁵³ and we can see how far we've sailed off course. Isn't it about time we threw the worthless compass overboard and started using the one that points north?

53. We began our study by looking for a form of the verb *Hei Vav Hei* ה.ו.ה which would communicate, "He will be." This is what his Name means. We found such a form in Ecclesiastes 11:3. We found, moreover, that the vowel points of this verb match precisely the form of the Name as it appears in numerous instances at the end of the name, "Michaiah."

54. Since *y'hú* אֶהְיֶה at Ecc. 11:3 is an authentic verbal form, is it not simple deduction to consider the form *Y'hu* יהו at the end of the name, "Michaiah," as the genuine article as well? Should these two not be taken as corroborating witnesses? When we can take *y'hú* אֶהְיֶה at Ecc. 11:3, exchange the substitute *Aleph* א for the original *Hei* ה, and come up with the same thing as when we take *Y'hu* יהו within the name *MikháY'hu* מִיכָיְהוּ (Michaiah), and restore the proper accent and dropped *Hei* ה, do we not have everything we need to identify יהוה as the authentic form of the Name? Let me diagram it.

51 Try saying *Yáhu-hei* "ה" יהו quickly and repetitively sometime and see what comes out of your mouth.

52 Even-Shoshan: *Concordantziah* , pp. 17-18, 440-448.

אָבֶן-שׁוֹשָׁן: קוֹנְקוֹרְדַּנְצִיָּה, ד' 18-17, 448-440.

53 Even-Shoshan: *Concordantziah* , pp. 17-18.

אָבֶן-שׁוֹשָׁן: קוֹנְקוֹרְדַּנְצִיָּה, ד' 18-17.

Ecc. 11:3
שֵׁם יְהוָה
sham y'hú(א)

Michaiah
מִיכָיָהוּ
MikháY'hu



55. This leads us to understand the pointing *Y'hó* יְהוָה and *Yáhu* יְהוָה within other men's names as modifications. In both cases the unaccented syllables are the authentic ones. Both unaccented syllables are found together in the unaccented *Y'hu* יְהוָה at the end of *MikháY'hu* מִיכָיָהוּ (Michaiah). The Name, therefore, is not a “full form imperfect” like *Yih'veh* (Yih'veh) יְהוָה or *Yeheveh* (Yeheweh) יְהוָה. If it were, what need would the scribes have had to change the pronunciation of the “shortened” imperfect *Y'hú* יְהוָה to *Y'hó* יְהוָה and *Yáhu* יְהוָה in the majority of proper names? If his Name was *Yih'veh* (Yih'veh) יְהוָה or *Yeheveh* (Yeheweh) יְהוָה the shortened form *Y'hú* יְהוָה would have been all the change necessary to keep it from being spoken in keeping with Rabbinical tradition. And yet it is readily apparent that the “shortened” form has been altered. That speaks volumes in and of itself.

56. But it does not tell us why the name “Michaiah” is not pointed consistently. Why the ambivalence? Why is it written now as *MikhaYáhu* מִיכָיָהוּ, and now as *MikháY'hu* מִיכָיָהוּ? Could it be that the scribes who pointed the text, in those places where it reflects the actual verbal form, wanted to be sure that his Name indeed endured “forever,” to “all generations,” at least in a few places? Could it be that the name Michaiah was chosen to carry this honored distinction because his name means, “Who Is Like יְהוָה?” Regardless of exactly why, when all the witnesses have been questioned, there it is, the Name above all names. It is available to seekers of every generation, embedded in the name *MikháY'hu* מִיכָיָהוּ and in the text of Ecc. 11:3.

57. I would like to know why this phenomenon has not been entered into the equation. Why has this information not made it into any discussions about his Name? Is it not applicable? Is it not pertinent? If not, why?

58. I have one further observation to make. In each instance where the Name is represented as *Y'hó* יְהוָה, it is at the beginning of the man's name. The authentic, unaccented *Y'-* יְ- is the first syllable. In each instance where the Name is represented as *Yáhu* יְהוָה, it is at the end of the man's name. The authentic, unaccented *-hu* יְ- is the last syllable. Perhaps it contains a riddle?

יְהוָה is the **beginning** and the **end**, the **first** and the **last**.

Table 1 - The Hebrew Alphabet

Letter	Hebrew Name	Pronunciation	Letter	Hebrew Name	Pronunciation
א	אֵלֶף <i>Aleph</i>	silent '	ל	לָמֶד <i>Lamed</i>	l
ב	בַּיִת <i>Beit</i>	b, v	מ	מַיִם <i>Meim</i>	m
ג	גִּמְלָל <i>Gimel</i>	g	נ	נוֹן <i>Nun</i>	n
ד	דָּלֶת <i>Dalet</i>	d	ס	סָמֶךְ <i>Samekh</i>	s
ה	הָא <i>Hei</i>	h	ע	עַיִן <i>Ayin</i>	silent '
ו	וָו <i>Vav</i>	v	פ	פֶּא <i>Pei</i>	p, f
ז	זַיִן <i>Zayin</i>	z	צ	צַדִּי <i>Tzadi</i>	tz
ח	חַיִת <i>Heit</i>	ch (as in Scottish "loch")	ק	קוּף <i>Kuf</i>	k
ט	טַיִת <i>Teit</i>	t	ר	רֵישׁ <i>Reish</i>	guttural "r" (like French)
י	יּוּד <i>Yud</i>	y	ש	שֵׁין <i>Shin</i>	sh, s
כ	כָּף <i>Kaf</i>	k, kh (harsh "ch")	ת	תָּו <i>Tav</i>	t

Table 2 - The Hebrew Vowel System

Vowel	Hebrew Name	Pronunciation	Placement
ֿ	קָמָץ <i>Kamatz</i>	“ah” like “a” in “father”	below letter
ֿ	פָּתַח <i>Patah</i>	“ah” like “a” in “father”	below letter
ֿ יְ	חִירֵק <i>Hirik</i>	“ee” like “i” in machine	below letter before <i>Yud</i> below letter
ֿ יִ	צִירֵה <i>Tzeireh</i>	“ay” like “ei” in “eight”	below letter before <i>Yud</i> below letter
ֿ	סֶגוּל <i>Segol</i>	“eh” like “e” in “met”	below letter
ֿ וּ	חוֹלָם <i>Holam</i>	“oh” like “o” in “no”	above <i>Vav</i> above letter
וּ	שׁוּרוּק <i>Shuruk</i>	“oo” like “u” in “flute”	within <i>Vav</i>
ֿ	קִבּוּץ <i>Kubbutz</i>	“oo” like “u” in “flute”	below letter
ֿ	שׁוּא <i>Sh'va</i>	silent	below letter
ֿ	חִטּוֹף פָּתַח <i>Hataph Patach</i>	short, unaccented “ah”	below letter
ֿ	חִטּוֹף סֶגוּל <i>Hataph Segol</i>	short, unaccented “eh”	below letter
ֿ	חִטּוֹף קָמָץ <i>Hataph Kamatz</i>	short, unaccented “oh”	below letter

Table 3 - The Seven Hebrew Conjugations⁵⁴

Conjugation		Signification of Action	Verbal Example א.כ.ל - to eat	Translation
Pa'al (Kal)	Perfect Imperfect	Simple	אָכַל יֹאכַל	he ate he will eat
Niph'al	Perfect Imperfect	Simple passive	נֶאֱכַל יִנְאָכַל	it was eaten it will be eaten
Pi'el	Perfect Imperfect	Intensive	אָכַל יִאָכַל	he devoured he will devour
Pu'al	Perfect Imperfect	Intensive Passive	אָכַל יִאָכַל	he was devoured he will be devoured
Hiph'il	Perfect Imperfect	Causative	הֵאָכַל יִהְיֶה	he fed he will feed
Hoph'al	Perfect Imperfect	Causative Passive	הֵאָכַל יִהְיֶה	he was fed he will be fed
Hitpa'el	Perfect Imperfect	Intensive Reflexive	הִתְאָכַל יִתְאָכַל	it was digested it will be digested

54 The translation of the word א.כ.ל - "to eat" was taken from Abraham S. Halkin's "201 Hebrew Verbs," page 12.