

Summation to Volume I

In this first volume, the arguments advanced by the Judaeo-Christian and Moslem religions for not knowing and using the sacred name have been closely scrutinized. For the Jews the sacred name “Yahweh” is far too sacred for anyone to utter, except for those they deem to be the most pious. The Editorial Board for the *New American Standard Bible*, meanwhile, sums up the Christian view for neither using nor publishing the sacred name (an opinion also shared by the Moslems). They conclude:

It is known that for many years YHWH has been transliterated as Yahweh. No complete certainty attaches to this pronunciation. However, it is felt by many who are in touch with the laity of our churches that this name conveys no religious or spiritual overtones. It is strange, uncommon, and without sufficient religious and devotional background. No amount of scholarly debate can overcome this deficiency. Hence, it was decided to avoid the use of this name in the translation proper. (NASB, p. IX)

As the preceding investigation has revealed, these arguments are false, confused, and unscriptural. Simply because the laity of modern churches feels that the sacred name has no religious or spiritual overtones, or that they think that the name is strange and uncommon, does not give them authority to relegate it to insignificance. Truth comes from Yahweh and his Scriptures, never from the clergy, and certainly not from the laity! Neither can centuries of failure by these respective churches to teach, use, and give proper devotion to the sacred name dismiss the value granted this name in Scriptures. Rather, such justifications only speak to the failings of modern churches to cope with and understand these important tenets.

Our research into Scriptures and other ancient testimony has demonstrated a doctrine quite different from the popular opinions preached with regard to the importance and worth of the sacred name “Yahweh.” This doctrine can be summarized with the following conclusions:

To begin with, it is true that our heavenly father is described with an assortment of generic names and descriptive titles. Yet, despite the attempt by religionists to raise some of these titles and generic names to the rank of a personal name, the Scriptures clearly prove that there is only one personal name for the almighty, the name אֱלֹהִים . As we shall demonstrate in our next volume, only Satan, the great accuser of the people of Yahweh, has set himself up as a deity with “many” personal names.

In Scriptures a personal name represents the very character and essence of the individual holding it. The name Yahweh, which our heavenly father has magnified above all things, proves to be the greatest name of all. It is the only name considered sacred in all of Scriptures and is treasured by the men of Yahweh as extremely valuable. Yahweh is a name that is to be held in high esteem, loved, praised, and for which we must give thanks. Above all it is meant to be used in the worship of Yahweh. At no time is it to be defamed or treated as worthless. The sacred name stands as a memorial to all generations of mankind, a reminder that Yahweh will keep his word. It was by this name that Yahweh swore his oaths; and it is for his name's sake that he will accomplish those oaths.

The evidence proves that the sacred name is not a Hebrew or Jewish invention. It is an eternal name, a name that existed before any human walked upon the face of the earth—a name that shall continue for eternity. It was revealed to mankind by Yahweh himself as early as the days of Adam and Eve. Subsequently, Yahweh has revealed his sacred name time and time again to various prophets and men of Yahweh. For those of us today its revelation is found within the pages of Scriptures. The sacred name is meant to be used by everyone, regardless from whatever national background they may stem. For all who search, the correct pronunciation of the sacred name is readily attainable. Yahweh has kept the true pronunciation alive not only by its correct and natural Hebrew vocalization but in the pages of ancient Greek, Latin, and Samaritan documents. There is simply no excuse for using surrogates like “Lord” or “God,” or hybrids like “Jehovah.”

“Yahweh” is a name for which use the men and women of Yahweh are willing to die. This devotion was not only true in the days of the prophets but was just as true during the time of the earthly ministry of Yahushua the messiah and his apostles. Though forbidden by Jewish Talmudic law to speak the sacred name, Yahushua and his followers while confronting those religious authorities both taught and used it. Doing so cost Yahushua and many of his followers their lives. The reason for this deep devotion to the sacred name by the people of Yahweh is its intimate link with the Covenants of Promise and the eternal inheritance provided therein. The promise of an eternal inheritance of land brings with it the necessity for a resurrection and eternal life. The guarantee for this agreement is Yahweh's sacred name, which he attached to the promises when he swore to it by an oath. To all those who repent and call to Yahweh by using his sacred name, Yahweh has guaranteed a share in this inheritance.

Because Yahweh is honor bound to fulfill his word, for the sake of his good name, the sacred name demands that forgiveness must be granted for those who repent so that the inheritance can be given by grace. Only in this way can Yahweh fulfill his oath to mankind, since the nature of mankind is mastered by sin and unable to meet the qualifications required to obtain the inheritance on personal merit. When the people of Yahweh do receive their inheritance, they will also receive the sacred name Yahweh as their own personal family name, further binding them into eternal unity with father Yahweh.

We find salvation in only one name: the sacred name Yahweh. It is not found by uttering the name "Jesus Christ" or even its original Hebrew form "Yahushua *ha-messiah*." The name Allah, used by the Muslims, is nothing more than the Arabic form of the Hebrew generic term *eloah*. It too has no intrinsic worth for salvation. Neither will titles, such as lord, *adonai*, *eloahim*, and so forth, help us. The evidence also shows that when the New Testament texts speak of accomplishing things in the name of Yahushua (or "the king," "the sovereign," and so forth) it was done in metonymic style and refers directly to the name Yahweh. Yahushua did great works in his father's name, not his own earthly name. Therefore, when Yahushua said to do things and request things "in my name," he meant in his heavenly name, the name he came in, the name he inherited and now shares with our heavenly father.

Finally, it will not be possible to simply utter the sacred name when the time is appropriate and be saved. During the great tribulation period persecution will separate the sheep from the wolves. Satanic forces will viciously attack those using the sacred name and only those who truly trust in Yahweh and his word will oppose and resist this relentless pressure. The elect, who will rise in the First Resurrection, must first follow in the footsteps of Yahushua and drink his cup of death. Accordingly, they will be persecuted and murdered, not only because they keep Yahweh's commandments but because they, like Yahushua and the prophets, will insist upon "coming in" and using Yahweh's sacred name.

When Yahweh the messiah returns it will be too late for the wicked to use the sacred name. Nevertheless, they, along with the rest of mankind, will be given a second chance during the approximate 1,000-year period called Judgment. At that time all who ever lived shall know the sacred name and shall be aware of Yahweh's commandments. If by the end of this Judgment period the wicked still refuse to repent, it will be clear that they cannot change. The quickening of the pious, coming from all nations of the world, into "*eloahim*" beings will occur at the end of Judgment. It will happen in a "twinkling of an eye" and only once. After that it will be too late for the wicked to repent and gain salvation. They will instead be consumed alive in the great Gehenna fire that engulfs the world as father Yahweh arrives.

In our next two volumes we shall have much more to say with regard to the suppression of the sacred name in literature, who is behind its concealment, and why. We shall also examine in-depth the two Yahwehs, their distinctions, and their unity. Yet the evidence presented so far clearly demonstrates that there has been an immense failure on the part of present-day religious leaders and their institutions, regardless of their claim to scriptural authority, to adequately address the important doctrine of the sacred name. This failure has resulted in their committing the same error charged against the ancient religious leaders of the Israelites; they have concealed the "key of knowledge" that can open the door to salvation. With this valuable key restored a great void in man's understanding of the Scriptures can once again be filled.

☩☩☩ be with you.

The Documentary Hypothesis

The idea that the Pentateuch was not composed by Moses but was the work of several later authors is called “The Documentary Theory,” more accurately, “Hypothesis.” Its origination actually began with the Elohist’s view that terms such as *eloahim* and *el* were alternate names for Yahweh. Jews of the Middle Ages had raised these generic terms and titles to the rank of personal names in a bizarre attempt to conceal the sacred name and to use these words as substitutes. As a result, men began to read the books of Moses as if there were multiple names for the almighty.

In the twelfth century C.E. a Jewish scholar from Spain, named Abraham ibn Ezra, first proposed a multiple authorship of the Pentateuch (*Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*, chaps. VII-X). Abraham, faced with certain passages that pointed to a later editor’s hand, concluded that Moses did not write all of the five books attributed to him. His views set in motion a host of other critics who questioned Moses’ authorship. These critics included Jews and even Christians like Martin Luther. Christian humanists and philosophers like Masius (died 1573) and Thomas Hobbes (1651) added fuel to the fire. Isaac de la Peyrere (1655) then suggested that Moses had not even written the five books but rather several other men had.

As the result of Abraham ibn Ezra and some of those who followed him, the developing Documentary Hypothesis gained momentum under the Dutch Jewish philosopher Benedict Spinoza (*Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*, chaps. VII to X). With a backdrop of religious misinterpretation, a lack of understanding of the parable nature of the Scriptures, and a limited knowledge of Hebrew, Spinoza concluded that all of the Old Testament, from Genesis to Nehemiah, was composed by the scribe Ezra in the fifth century B.C.E.

Spinoza was followed by Richard Simon, a French priest who wished to emphasize the importance of the Church over the Scriptures. Simon argued that the Scriptures were so laden with inconsistency in order and chronology, and with stylistic differences, that it was impossible for Moses to have been the only author. He reasoned, as a result, that Catholic tradition was a more secure basis for faith than the Scriptures! Though officially denied by the Church, his sentiments nonetheless reflected the true underlying prejudice of most members of the Judaeo-Christian and Moslem faiths, a fact demonstrated by their actions rather than their words.

The debate was now raging, but unfortunately only false alternatives were presented—the various sides knowing little about which they spoke. Leclerc, a protestant, replied to Simon that he had gone too far but conceded that portions of the Pentateuch were written by scribes later than Moses. Then came

the French physician, Jean Astruc, who published a work in 1753 entitled, *Conjectures About the Original Memoranda It Appears Which Moses Used to Compose the Book of Genesis*. Astruc made the claim that the deity was known by two different names, Yahve [Yahweh] and Elohim [*eloahim*], and that these two different names were the products of two different traditions. He suggested that the repetitions, contradictions, and chronological problems that scholars had come to “believe” actually arose as the result of the interweaving of these two different ancient sources. These sources were more ancient than Moses, he noted, but Moses brought them together.

After Astruc there arose men of greater skill, like the German scholars Johann Gottfried Eichhorn (*Einleitung*, 1780–1783) and K. D. Ilgen (*Die Urkunden des Jerusalemischen Tempelarchivs in ihrer Urgestat*, 1798). Then came Alexander Geddes (*Introduction to the Pentateuch and Joshua*, 1792), who proposed a fragmentary theory for the origin of the Pentateuch. He held that it was developed during the Solomonic era from many separate fragments dating back to the time of Moses and before. These men were followed by a work published in 1806–1807 by W. M. L. De Wette, entitled *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 1807, who reasoned yet another source should be added to the Yahweh and *eloahim* traditions, which he called the Deuteronomic code. Between 1807 and 1853 the “fragmentary hypothesis” and the “supplementary hypothesis” were fully developed.

In 1853 Hermann Hupfield (*Die Quellen der Genesis und die Art ihrer Zusammensetzung*) set forth the argument that there were in fact two separate Elohim sources. Hupfield’s work drew a great deal of attention from the Tanach (Old Testament) scholars. Hupfield was followed in 1866 by K. H. Graf, who developed the suggestions of the scholars E. Reuss, J. George, and W. Vatke and held that the document labeled E¹ (called P for Priestly Code), rather than being the earliest of the documents, was in fact the most recent. A. Kuenen (*The Religion of Israel*, 1869-1870) assured the triumph of the J, E, D, and P order for these assumed separate documents. These conclusions set the stage for the primary mover of the modern Documentary Hypothesis, Julius Wellhausen.

Wellhausen restated the Documentary Hypothesis with great skill and persuasiveness and supported the J, E, D, P sequence as an evolutionary process (*Die Komposition des Hexateuchs*, 1878; *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*, 1878). According to Wellhausen, Israel’s concept of God evolved from the animism and polytheism of the patriarchal days into the henotheism in the time of Moses, and from there to the ethical monotheism of the prophets of the eighth century B.C.E. His evolutionary views in Biblical literature were often likened to those of his contemporary Charles Darwin, and he was certainly influenced by the evolution movement which was gaining popularity among scholars of that time. From Wellhausen stems the numerous modern interpretations advocated today.

From such work the Tanach scholars came to accept the hypothesis that the Pentateuch was the result of the blending together of J (Yahweh), E (*eloahim*), D (Deuteronomy), and P (Priestly Code) documents. The belief

that there were four major documents that lay behind the five books of Moses is now almost universally accepted by biblical scholars. But one must keep in mind that the thrust of the work of these men has been to attack the credibility of the Scriptures. This assault comes from both religious and secular scholarship.

Many of the proponents of this multi-authorship view are priests and rabbis, whose purpose is to extol the virtues of "the Church" and their own respective religious "traditions" over the value of Scriptures. In their mind-set, what they perceive as "contradictions" in the Scriptures serve to justify their reliance on "Church," i.e. "Christian," "Moslem," or "Jewish" traditions. Human derived religious philosophy and interpretation is then perceived as a more secure basis for their faith. Though claiming a "belief" in the Scriptures, their actions show that their true intent is to justify their own respective religious interpretations and traditions as well as their own personal views.

It was as a result of this attack on the credibility of the books of Moses that the modern Elohist school and their Documentary Hypothesis gained popularity. Both the secular and religious Elohists had found a vested interest in discrediting the Pentateuch. The secular scholars pointed to their findings as justification for not giving any credence to the Scriptures, while the religious Elohists used it to attack the Scriptural doctrine that there is only one personal name for our heavenly father.

For a response to the Documentary Hypothesis see Appendix B.

The Variations in the Pentateuch

Variations found in the Pentateuch do not reflect its authorship by various writers other than Moses (the so-called Documentary Hypothesis; see App. A). Rather, it reflects the compilation of material by Moses over an extended period of time and its final composition by his scribes at the time of his death. For example, the book of the covenant was composed shortly after Yahweh gave the commandments and judgments at Mount Sinai (Exod., 24:1–8). Moses then went back up to Mount Sinai and received the instructions for the building of the ark of the testimony and the tabernacle, for the establishment of the Levitical priesthood, as well as receiving the Ten Commandments on stone (Exod., 24:9–31:18).

After the revolt by the Israelites at Mount Sinai (the incident with the golden bull), Yahweh then had Moses write the Levitical regulations of sacrifices, which did not come into effect until the beginning of the next year (Exod., 32:1–40:38; Lev.; Num., 1; and cf. Jer., 7:21–25). The laws and speeches recorded in Deuteronomy did not come into existence until forty years later, when the Israelites were encamped on the east side of the Jordan river (Deut., 1:1–5). These details alone show that there were great spans of time that separated the various manuscripts that formed the basis of the books of Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy.

Genesis also shows clear signs of containing different source documents. For example, the creation story as recorded in Genesis, 1:1–2:3, a second version in Genesis, 2:4–4:26. Genesis, 5:1–9:29, certainly starts another independent book, beginning with the statement, “This is the book of the generations of Adam.” Genesis, 10:1–32, begins still another text with, “And these are the generations of the sons of Noah: Shem, Kham, and Yapheth.” Such statements indicate that Moses had at his disposal various source materials much earlier than himself. But we must keep in mind that Moses was also a prophet and had direct communication with Yahweh. These various books may well have been written during different periods of instruction about the history of the world. In either case, the difference in time alone would account for normal variations between the different books which were combined together to form Genesis. Neither does the realization that Moses used earlier books, themselves derived from earlier prophets of Yahweh, detract from the fact that the Pentateuch was produced by him.

Another reason for variation was the different intentions of some of these smaller books within the larger books. The different purposes were recognized

even by Jewish writers of the first century C.E. Josephus, for instance, in his Preface to his work on Jewish Antiquities, writes:

Some things the lawgiver (Moses) shrewdly veils in enigmas, others he sets forth in solemn allegory; but wherever straight-forward speech was expedient, there he makes his meaning absolutely plain. (pref., 4)

Signifying the separation between the book that formed Genesis, 1:1–2:3, and the book that formed Genesis, 2:4–4:26, Josephus writes:

And here, after the seventh day, Moses begins to interpret nature, writing on the formation of man in these terms (Jos., *Antiq.*, 1:2)

It is at this very point that modern critics separate the “P” and “J” documents. Yet, the fact that different documents were placed together into one book hardly justifies the conclusion that the Pentateuch, as a single work, was the product of different authors.

Another detail used as justification to remove Moses as the author of the Pentateuch is the editorial annotations and comments that were made by someone other than Moses. Throughout Exodus until Deuteronomy we find someone speaking in the third person, noting the things that Moses said or did. At the end of Deuteronomy, someone describes the death of Moses, which hardly could have been done by Moses himself. Yet, internal evidence, at minimum, proves that Moses was the undeniable author of numerous documents in the Pentateuch, since these are directly said to be his: i.e. Exod., 17:14, 24:4–8, 34:27; Num., 33:1f; Deut., 31:9–13, 24ff; etc.

Next, there is no reason why Moses, who was an aged man of 80 years when he was first called as a prophet and 120 years when he finished, would not have used his own scribes to write his final work. K. A. Kitchen, from the University of Liverpool, notes that “there is no objective reason why Moses should not have written, or have caused to be written (at dictation—hence Third person pronouns), considerably more of the contents of the present Pentateuch” than the utter minimum specifically charged to him in the text (NBD, pp. 849f).

The difference between these so-called “utter minimum” documents, all of which are specifically accredited to Moses, demonstrate all of the variations in the so-called J, E, P, and D materials. The simple explanation is that towards the end of his life, and probably with the aid of his brother, the High priest Aaron, and his successor, Yahushua (Joshua) the son of Nun, Moses brought together all of his various books and had his scribes combine them into the Pentateuch (which originally was but one book and then later divided into five parts). The scribes, under the direction of Moses, then wrote the various commentaries and spoke in the third person. At the death of Moses, Joshua, now leader of the Israelites, had the scribes add the description of Moses’ death (a detail acknowledged as late as the B. Baba Bathra, 14b). For these reasons, all ancient

accounts properly attribute the Pentateuch to Moses. Scribes acting under the direction of Moses and Joshua can hardly discredit this fact.

There are many other details which also speak for Moses as the author of the Pentateuch. Among these, for example, is the criterion in the Documentary Hypothesis that assumes that divine names are a basis for separating documents. This logic proves faulty for several reasons. First, evidence from ancient manuscripts and the LXX shows that there was a much greater variety in the use of these names in earlier manuscripts than in the later MT. The scribes of the MT are known to have actually stripped out the sacred name Yahweh in various places. The LXX, in fact, demonstrates that the name Yahweh was used to a much greater extent in earlier manuscripts of the Pentateuch.

Second, a study of divine names used in the Moslem Koran brought to light the fact that certain suras preferred Allah, while others preferred Rab; just as certain parts of Genesis use *eloahim* while others use Yahweh (R. D. Wilson in PTR, 17, pp. 644–650). Yet there is no support among scholars for a multi-authorship approach to studies on the Koran based upon divine names.

Third, the use of “Yahweh *eloahim*” in Genesis, 2:4–3:24 (cf. also Exod., 9:30) also gives problems for the Documentary approach. Why would the divine names be combined if they are supposed to represent indications of separate authors? The LXX contains numerous other examples demonstrating that this combination was much more prevalent in earlier manuscripts (e.g. Gen., 4:6, 9, 5:29, 6:3,5).

Other important objections are voiced by Gleason L. Archer, Jr. (SOT, pp. 97–98). Archer writes that the documentary view “has been characterized by a subtle species of circular reasoning.” He adds:

The Wellhausen theory was allegedly based upon the evidence of the text itself, and yet the evidence of the text is consistently evaded whenever it happens to go counter to the theory. For example, the documentarians insisted, ‘The historical books of the Old Testament show no recognition of the existence of P legislation or a written Mosaic code until after the exile.’ When in reply to this claim numerous references to the Mosaic law and P provisions were discovered in the historical books, the reply was made, ‘Oh well, all those references were later insertions made by priests.’ This means that the body of evidence which is relied upon to prove the theory is rejected when it conflicts with the theory. Or to put it in another way, whenever the theory is opposed by the very data it is supposed to explain, the trouble-shooting team of Redactor and Interpolator, Inc. is called to the rescue. Elusive tactics like these hardly beget justifiable confidence in the soundness of the result. (p. 97).

Archer also concludes:

The Wellhausen school started with the pure assumption (which they have hardly bothered to demonstrate) that Israel's religion was of merely human origin like any other, and that it was to be explained as a mere product of evolution. It made no difference to them that no other religion known (apart from offshoots of the Hebrew faith) has ever eventuated in genuine monotheism; the Israelites too must have begun with animism and crude polytheism just like all the other ancient cultures. The overwhelming contrary evidence from Genesis to Malachi that the Israelite religion was monotheistic from start to finish has been evaded in the interests of a preconceived dogma—that there can be no such thing as a supernatural revealed religion. Therefore all the straightforward accounts in Genesis and the rest of the Torah relating the experiences of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Moses have been subjected to a cynical re-analysis intended to show that a monotheistic veneer has been applied to those old polytheistic worthies by so-called Deuteronomists or the late priestly school. (p. 98)

Finally, it is simply ignored by the critics that if the books of Moses had been of later, multiple authorship the fraud would have easily been discerned. It would have been very difficult, indeed, to pass off recent creations as fathered by so famous a figure as Moses, let alone one book after another. These pseudo-texts would have been quickly discredited by one school or the other, and especially by the supporters of Baal worship, which proved to be the predominant faith in Israel and did much to pollute the people of Judah. Yet the Pentateuch was untouched by such criticism because the authorship by Moses was irrefutable.

The Greek-speaking Judaeian Theory

Saul Lieberman (GJP, pp. 1–67) is among those who argue that Greek was well-known in Palestine among the Jews. He largely bases his proof on the statement made by Rabbi Simeon the son of Rabban Gamaliel, noting that his father had a thousand students, five hundred of whom studied the Torah, while five hundred studied Greek wisdom (B. Sot., 49b). What is ignored is the fact that Gamaliel and his family, as stated in the Baba Qamma had to seek permission to learn Greek.

The evidence points to this acquisition of Greek as part of governmental necessity, not a statement of general practice. The fact that Gamaliel had 500 students (a figure which is probably inflated) who were learning Greek only reflects the nepotism then in existence, for Patriarch Gamaliel would have been permitted to fill many government posts with kinsmen. These five hundred students, trained in Greek by the Patriarch to hold government positions where such a language was necessary, hardly speak for the millions of Jews living in Galilee and Judaea.

A second pillar in the argument that the Jews of the first century Judaea and Galilee commonly spoke Greek are the fair number of Greek loan-words (possibly about 1500) found in Talmudic literature and a number of Greek inscriptions found upon various Jewish tombstones (see HC, pp. 35–39, 48f). What is ignored is the fact that most of the Talmud was written long after the vast majority of the Jews had been dispersed from Judaea and Galilee at the end of the Bar Kochba revolt in 135 C.E. The Palestinian Talmud was not completed until around 400 C.E. and the Babylonian version in about 500 C.E. After the Bar Kochba revolt Jews were forbidden residency in Jerusalem, the majority of the Jewish population of Palestine was exiled from their homeland, and the land of Palestine came under the domination of non-Jewish peoples who did speak Greek.

That by the fifth century the Jews would have acquired some Greek loan-words is obvious, since from the early second century C.E. the Jewish state had ceased to exist and aliens became dominant in the land. But Greek loan-words found in Hebrew from the fifth century tell us nothing of the language of first-century Judaea and Galilee. Even in the English language, where literally thousands of French words have entered our dictionaries due to the Norman conquest of England, one would hardly claim that common Englishmen living 400 years before that conquest would know French.

Jewish tombstones located in Greek-speaking countries like Egypt, Syria, and so forth, dating from the first century or before—as well as those placed within Palestine after the first century C.E.—can hardly be set up as proof that during the first century C.E. the lands of Judaea and Galilee, where the Hebrew-Aramaic language dominated, the common man knew Greek. It has been calculated (SRHJ, I, p. 167–171) that “every fifth ‘Hellenistic’ inhabitant of the Eastern Mediterranean was a Jew,” and that “Diaspora Jewry far outnumbered that of Palestine even before the destruction of the Second Temple.” But the number of Greek-speaking Jews living outside of Palestine cannot serve as a gauge for how many Jews residing in Judaea and Galilee spoke Greek. One set of circumstances has no bearing upon the other.

The language of first century Judaea and Galilee must be understood in the context of the national and cultural policies then in existence, not what existed in neighboring Greek-speaking countries or in literature produced centuries later when the political and cultural situation was entirely different. Nor can some tombstones belonging to wealthy Jewish merchants or pro-Roman Jews in the government of Judaea inscribed with Greek stand to outweigh ancient testimony on the subject. The common Jewish man in Judaea did not place inscriptions on his tombstone, so any comparison is sorely flawed.

The loss of the Judaeian state, beginning in 70 C.E. with the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple, and then its total annihilation after the Bar Kochba revolt in 135 C.E., marked the end of the domination of the Hebrew language over Judaea and Galilee. Yet, tombstones found in Greek-speaking countries or loan-words found in literature centuries later do not erase the fact that prior to 70 C.E. the Hebrew-Aramaic tongue held sway and Greek, for the most part, was snubbed. To ignore the words of Josephus, an educated Jew born and raised in Judaea and living in the time frame at question, and to postulate that the common people of Judaea and Galilee spoke Greek merely to satisfy a desired religious objective is unwarranted, without historical foundation, and borders on dishonesty.

Composition Dates for the New Testament Documents

All of Saul's fourteen epistles were written before his death during the latter part of the reign of Nero (died in 68 C.E.). Keph (Peter) died with Saul (Eusebius, *H.E.*, 2:25:5–7), therefore his two books (called Peter) were also composed before that date. Saul is recorded as oftentimes quoting the book of Luke (Eusebius, *H.E.*, 3:4:7), indicating that Luke was written before Saul's death. This also must be true of the book of Acts, also written by Luke, for in it Luke makes no mention of Saul's death but does discuss Saul living at Rome. The optimistic note on which Acts ends, showing Saul proclaiming Yahweh in Rome without hindrance, suggests a date before the outbreak of persecution there (64 C.E.).

The apostle Jacob (James) died shortly before the fall of Jerusalem in 70 C.E. (Eusebius, *H.E.*, 2:23:10–25, 3:11:1; Jos., *Antiq.*, 20:9:1). Therefore, the book of James was composed before that momentous event. Irenaeus (3:1:1) notes that Mark wrote his book after the departure of Peter and Paul. As William Smith (DB, p. 381) notes, "Again we may as certainly conclude that it was not written after the destruction of Jerusalem (70 C.E.), for it is not likely that he would have omitted to record so remarkable a fulfillment of our Lord's predictions." The book of Jude was published about 65 C.E. (DB, p. 329). Matthew wrote his work "while Peter and Paul were preaching at Rome" (Iren., 3:1:1), and therefore before the death of the latter in about 67 C.E. Its primacy is also testified to by its position as the first of the books of the New Testament.

The only New Testament documents that might be later than 70 C.E. are those of the apostle John, the books of John, and 1–3 John. The book of Revelation, written by another John (by some called Θεολογου [*theo-logou*], or "deity speaking," i.e. "the divine" or "prophesier"), was definitely composed later. That Revelation was composed by a different John than the apostle of that same name was well-known in the early centuries and has been suspected by scholars in recent years. For example, Eusebius (*H.E.*, 3:39:5ff) records the statements of Papias (about 140 C.E.), a man who personally knew John, the author of Revelation. Eusebius states:

It is here worth noting that he (Papias) twice counts the name of John, and reckons the first John with Peter and James and Matthew and the other apostles, clearly meaning the evangelist, but by changing his statement places the second with the others outside that number of the apostles, putting Aristion

before him and clearly calling him a presbyter. This confirms the truth of the story of those who have said that there were two of the same name in Asia, and there are two tombs at Ephesus both still called John's. This calls for attention: for it is probable that the second (unless anyone prefer the former) saw the revelation which passes under the name of John. The Papias whom we are now treating confesses that he had received the words of the apostles from their followers, but says that he had actually heard Aristion and the presbyter John. He often quotes them and gives their traditions in his writings.

Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria (c. 247–265 C.E.), held the same opinion (frag. 1:4–6). While analyzing the different texts and records he concludes, "I think, therefore, that it was some other one of those who were in Asia (who wrote Revelation); for it is said that there were two monuments in Ephesus, and that each of these bears the name of John" (frag. 1:5). According to the Apostolic Constitutions (7:46), this particular John the presbyter was ordained by the apostle John. The ancients, therefore, knew that it was John the Elder (presbyter) who wrote Revelation not John the apostle.

Present-day scholars have also recognized the separate origin for Revelation and the works of the apostle John through textual differences. I. H. Marshall of the University of Aberdeen, for example, comments that after close examination by various scholars, "it is certain that one author is responsible for the three Epistles (1–3 John)" and that "it is reasonably certain that John's Gospel and 1 John are by the same author" (NBD, p. 644). Nevertheless, Revelation shows clear signs of being composed by another's hand. Marshall continues that on textual differences the "theory of common authorship" of Revelation with the other four books of the apostle John "is very difficult to maintain" (Ibid.). He adds, "Further, the Greek of Revelation is unlike that of any other book in the New Testament; despite suggestions that it was originally written in Aramaic, and so possibly by the same person who wrote John and 1–3 John in Greek, the theory of common authorship must remain doubtful" (ibid., p. 645). He then presents as one of the major theories advanced by scholars to explain these differences "the possibility that John's Gospel and 1–3 John are by John the apostle and Revelation by another John who is otherwise unknown to us" (ibid.). Also see A. Wikenhauser (NTI, pp. 547–553).

The time factor between the two Johns further points to a separate origin for Revelation. The apostle John was very probably about thirty years old—the age of maturity, the age when a man could enter the priesthood (Num., 4:1–3, 23–39)—or older at the time he began to follow the messiah, whose ministry lasted from 27–30 C.E. According to ancient testimony, the John who wrote Revelation did so in the fifteenth year of Domitian, i.e. 96 C.E. (Eusebius, *H.E.*, 3:18:1–3:23:4). He is said to have died in the reign of Trajan

(*ibid.*, 3:23:4; *Iren.*, 2:22:5), who ruled from 98 to 117 C.E. This detail would bring the age of the apostle John to about 100 years of age at the time Revelation was composed and places his death at well over 100.

It seems much more reasonable to conclude that the John who wrote Revelation was a student of the apostle John. This point is indicated when Papias states that he had learned the words of the apostles from their followers, and that one of those he had heard it from was John the presbyter (Elder). It is also understood by the fact that as late as the beginning of the fourth century C.E., when Eusebius wrote, there persisted the story “that there were two of the same name in Asia” and there remained two tombs at Ephesus, where the apostle John lived and died, both retaining the name John. The close association of the younger John with the older, and the fact that both held the same personal name and resided in the same city, all served as a source of confusion for those who lived in later times and in other parts of the world. The two Johns were apparently merged into one identity by later Christians because many simply did not know the specifics.

Once the separate authorship for Revelation is established, the dates for John and 1–3 John are more readily attainable. John the presbyter was younger than the apostle John and the date for his writing of Revelation while on the island of Patmos (though he is often confused with John the apostle) is placed around 96 C.E. (Eusebius, *H.E.*, 3:18, 20, 23, cf. 3:39). Further, the book of John was placed last among the four synoptic texts, the suggestion by its position is that it was produced last. Nevertheless, as with the book of Mark, John’s synoptic text and letters lack any reference to the fall of Jerusalem. This absence would indicate a composition before that date (70 C.E.). I. H. Marshall notes that the writings of John could have begun as early as “the sixties” (NBD, p. 645). W. Smith (DB, p. 316), as well as others, would date the book of John to about 78 C.E., but this is based upon identifying the apostle John with the author of Revelation. If the reference in 2 John, 1:1, “to the elect lady,” is to Mariam (Mary) the mother of Yahushua, which is most likely based upon the statement in John, 19:25–27, then it would appear that at least one of these epistles was written quite early, for Mariam would have already been 50 to 60 years old at the death of Yahushua in 30 C.E. (Eusebius, *H.E.*, 1:13, 3:7). Therefore, a date of 50 to 55 C.E. for these letters would be most probable.

The evidence, as a result, shows that every book of the New Testament, except for Revelation, was either written before 70 C.E. or, as in the case of the works of the apostle John, possibly very shortly thereafter—though even in John’s case the indications are that it was before. The weight of the evidence makes it highly probable that almost all of the apostles had died prior to the fall of Jerusalem and the destruction of the Temple in 70 C.E. It also indicates that every book of the New Testament, except for Revelation, had been written prior to that date as well.

אָדֹנָי in Psalm, 110:1

The Hebrew word אָדֹנָי (*a-d-n-i*) in this verse should be translated as “my *aden*,” *aden* meaning, “a basis (of a building, a column, etc):—foundation, socket” (Strong’s, Heb. #134), or “any foundation” (HEL, p. 5). It does not here mean “*adonai*” or “my sovereign (or lord),” as popularly understood. Proof that the original is to be read as “*aden*” and not “*adon*” comes from the context of the passage as discussed by the messiah with the Pharisees (Matt., 22:44; Mark, 12:36; Luke, 20:42f). In this conversation, Yahushua asked the Pharisees, “What do you think concerning the messiah? Whose son is he?” They responded, “David’s.” Yahushua then inquired of them about the puzzle their answer created: “How then does David in the spirit call him אָדֹנָי (*a-d-n-i*)?, saying ‘A statement of Yahweh to אָדֹנָי, Sit at my right hand, until I set your enemies as a stool for your feet.’ If therefore David (who wrote the Psalm) calls him אָדֹנָי, how is he his son?” No one was able to answer the riddle.

The Pharisees believed in the resurrection (Acts, 23:8). Therefore, if אָדֹנָי meant “my *adon* (sovereign)” there would have been no puzzle. A man’s son can easily become king, and therefore sovereign over the father. Also, after the resurrection, the offspring of David, being the messiah, will live at the same time as his resurrected ancestor David. Yet he would be in a higher political position than his father. If “*adon*” is meant, then there is no dilemma. The question is easily answered. But if the original word used was “my *aden* (foundation),” then the Pharisees were faced with an enigma of the most perplexing kind. Yahushua’s question forced the Pharisees to deal with the fact that the messiah was David’s “foundation” as well as his son or offshoot. How could he be both at the same time? The Pharisees could not answer.

The solution to the problem, of course, is that Yahweh the son (Yahweh the archangel), being the creator, was the father of Adam, the ancestor of David (Luke, 3:23-38). The messiah, accordingly, was the foundation of David, not only as his progenitor but the foundation upon which David’s legal authority as king rested. When Yahweh the son was combined with the seed of the woman named Mariam, herself a descendant of David, then Yahweh the angel also became the offspring of David through his female descendant. The messiah, therefore, was both the foundation of David and his offspring. This process will be dealt with in great detail in our third volume, *The Two Yahwehs*.

Vowel pointing was not provided with the Hebrew Scriptures until about the sixth century C.E., so it is difficult to know exactly what all the rabbis believed before that time. Nevertheless, it is clear that later scribes, by the fact that they vowel pointed the Hebrew to read “*adonai*” rather than “*adeni*,” either ignored the context of Psalm, 110:1, or out of ignorance mistook אָדֹנָי to

mean *adonai*. It is also possible that the Jewish scribes after the first century C.E. deliberately translated יהוה to mean “sovereign” rather than “foundation” as a direct result of their inability to answer Yahushua’s question. This point is reflected in the later Jewish text of Matthew reproduced by Shem Tob, which clearly reflects Jewish tampering—i.e. it replaced the sacred name with traditional Jewish substitutes like *ha-shem* (the name), *adonai*, and *eloahim* (see Howard, *Matt.*, pp. 201-203).

Shem Tob provided a complete Hebrew text of Matthew in his fourteenth century Jewish polemical treatise entitled *Even Bohan*. The purpose of his work was to provide arguments out of the New Testament against Christian doctrines. In the passage at question, Shem Tob’s text has יהוה, a more definite form of “my sovereign.” The original text from Psalm, 110:1, only has יהוה. By reading יהוה as יהוה the Jewish scribes were clearly trying to read their own understanding into the text and thereby discredit the Christian argument. Yet, the discussion in the New Testament, by the failure of the Pharisees to answer Yahushua’s question, strongly indicates that at least the men of Yahushua’s time correctly understood יהוה to mean “my foundation.”