

March 2003

Frank W. Nelte

WHAT ARE 'THE NAMES OF BLASPHEMY'?

Most of us are very familiar with this statement in Revelation 17:3 ...

So he carried me away in the spirit into the wilderness: and I saw A WOMAN sit upon A SCARLET COLOURED BEAST, full of NAMES OF BLASPHEMY, having seven heads and ten horns. (Revelation 17:3 AV)

Here we see "a beast" which is ridden, or controlled, by "a woman". And this "beast" is covered with "names of blasphemy". Both, "the beast" and also "the woman", are involved with these names of blasphemy. Can we know what these "names" are?

I don't want to spend any time in this article on discussing this "beast". Briefly, this "beast" appears to be code-language for the so-called "Holy Roman Empire" that started with the Imperial Restoration by the emperor Justinian in 554 AD. "The woman" that rides this "beast" appears to be code-language for the Roman Catholic Church, which is identified in verse 5 as having harlot daughters. Since in this vision we see this "beast" being ridden by "the woman", this must refer to empires that were from their inception under the control, to a greater or lesser degree, of the Roman Catholic Church system.

So let's now see what we can understand about these "names of blasphemy", because it should be quite clear that whatever these blasphemous names are, WE need to be very careful to not be involved with them. It is surely self-evident that God would certainly not want us to use such names. And to make sure we don't use them, we need to be very clear about what those names are. Could we in God's Church perhaps ever be deceived about SOME of these "names of blasphemy" and perhaps even be using some of them ignorantly?

For a start let's understand what the Bible means by "blasphemy".

THE MEANING OF "BLASPHEMY"

Our English word "blasphemy" comes to us from the Greek word "blasphemia". This Greek word "blasphemia", in turn, is formed from the two Greek words "blapto" and "pheme". The Greek verb "blapto" means "to hurt, harm, injure". The Greek noun "pheme" means "fame, report". [Comment: "Blasphemy" is also similar to the Late Latin word "blasphemare", by which it in fact entered into the English language. But this Late Latin word is based on the earlier Greek word "blasphemia". So while our English word "blasphemy" is technically led back to the Latin word, this Latin word is in fact derived from the earlier Greek word. And it is this earlier Greek word that shows us the meaning of this word. So for all practical purposes the meaning of our English word can be traced back to the biblical Greek word "blasphemia".]

Thus the word "blaspheme" literally means "to hurt or injure or damage the fame or reputation". Webster's Dictionary defines this word as "to speak of or address with irreverence". We generally think of the word "blasphemy" in relationship to God ... when somebody speaks in any way that could hurt or damage GOD'S REPUTATION! Blasphemy is something that is HIGHLY OFFENSIVE TO GOD! Amongst other things, blasphemy certainly violates the third commandment, which instructs us to not take God's name in vain.

The subject of blasphemy first comes up in the Old Testament, while Israel was still in the wilderness. Here is the situation:

A young man, whose mother was an Israelite and whose father was an Egyptian, thus the young man himself was only a half-Israelite, got into an argument and a quarrel with an Israelite man. In the process of the quarrel this half-Israelite "blasphemed God's name" and also cursed ... he would have blended perfectly into our modern society, where people vent their anger and their frustrations by cursing and by frequently including some form of God's name in such emotional outbursts.

Here is the account:

And the Israelitish woman's son BLASPHEMED THE NAME of the LORD, and CURSED. And they brought him unto Moses: (and his mother's name was Shelomith, the daughter of Dibri, of the tribe of Dan:) (Leviticus 24:11 AV)

The Hebrew verb here translated as "blasphemed" is "naqab", and it is variously rendered into English as: "to blaspheme, to curse, to pierce, to strike through". The Hebrew verb translated as "cursed" in this verse is "qalal" and besides being translated as "to curse" it also has the meaning of "to make light of, to make despicable, to esteem lightly". So we can summarize these two Hebrew verbs as follows:

Both these verbs ("naqab" and "qalal") are commonly translated as "to curse". But where "naqab" has the added meaning of doing this IN A CUTTING WAY, the verb "qalal" has more a focus on doing this with DISDAIN AND CONTEMPT. Now while the verb "qalal" is never translated into English as "blaspheme", we should note that THE UNDERLYING EMOTIONS expressed by these two Hebrew verbs will often, though not necessarily always, go together. That is: those who speak in ways that cut and injure the reputation of God's name will often also have an attitude of disdain and contempt. Both of these verbs obviously express a lack of the proper fear of God. And further, blaspheming God's name is in fact a way of cursing ... as is shown by the verb "naqab" being equally correctly rendered into English as "to curse".

So this man who had cursed and blasphemed was brought to Moses, and God then revealed His judgment for this matter as follows:

Bring forth him that hath cursed without the camp; and let all that heard him lay their hands upon his head, and LET ALL THE CONGREGATION STONE HIM. And thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel, saying, Whosoever CURSETH his God shall bear his sin. And he that BLASPHEMETH THE NAME of the LORD, he shall surely be put to death, and all the congregation shall certainly stone him: as well the stranger, as he that is born in the land, when he BLASPHEMETH THE NAME of the LORD, shall be put to death. (Leviticus 24:14-16 AV)

God pronounced the death penalty for blasphemy. Clearly God views blasphemy in an extremely serious light. So the "names of blasphemy" on the "beast" of Revelation 17 are something that God views extremely seriously, something that is worthy of the death penalty. In other words, both, "the beast" and also this "woman", really DESERVE the death penalty in the eyes of God.

Let's look at another situation in the Old Testament. After David had committed adultery with Bathsheba and then killed her husband Uriah, Bathsheba gave birth to a baby boy. When David repented and acknowledged his guilt, the prophet Nathan told David:

Howbeit, because by this deed thou hast given great occasion to the enemies of the LORD TO BLASPHEME, the child also that is born unto thee shall surely die. (2 Samuel 12:14 AV)

The Hebrew verb here translated as "to blaspheme" is "na'ats", and this verb primarily means "to despise, to provoke, to spurn". It is also at times translated as "to blaspheme". In other words, Nathan in effect told David that his conduct had given people THE EXCUSE, or the apparent justification, to say: "Look at what David did ... first he committed adultery and then he murdered an innocent man ... so how could he POSSIBLY be 'a man of God'?" Or people could reason: "If THAT was a man of God, then I don't want any part of that religion". People could use David's bad example to despise God as having favourites, implying that anyone other than David would have received a far greater punishment from God for such sins. So in order to avoid such charges God was going to take the life of the child, even after David had clearly come to repentance. David's conduct had clearly brought harm upon God's name, and that would have been even greater if God had allowed the child to live.

Now the point for our discussion here is that "blasphemy" also includes conduct that amounts to despising or provoking or spurning. Other Hebrew words that are at times also translated as "to blaspheme" have the meaning of "to defy" and "to reproach" and "to provoke". So when such conduct is directed against God, it falls into the category of blasphemy.

Let's look at some New Testament examples for how this word is used.

THE WORD BLASPHEMY IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

When Jesus Christ said to a paralyzed man "your sins are forgiven", the Pharisees reasoned as follows ...

And the scribes and the Pharisees began to reason, saying, Who is this which speaketh BLASPHEMIES? Who can forgive sins, but God alone? (Luke 5:21 AV)

Now while the Pharisees here were wrongly critical of Jesus Christ, this verse does, however, show quite clearly what the word "blasphemy" means. The word means that someone claims some of God's prerogatives. And this in turn means that any human being or human organization or human kingdom that lays claim to ANY NAME or ANY TITLE that involves something that belongs to God is in fact guilty of blasphemy.

The Pharisees in this regard understood correctly what blasphemy is, but they didn't understand that Jesus Christ as the Son of God was fully within His rights to exercise some of His godly powers (in this case to forgive sins).

When the soldiers mocked and reviled Jesus Christ shortly before He died for our sins, this mocking and taunting also amounted to blasphemy. Notice ...

And many other things BLASPHEMOUSLY spake they against him. (Luke 22:65 AV)

Further, when totally unrepentant and unconverted people CLAIM to be true Christians, then that is also a matter of blasphemy, as Jesus Christ Himself explained in Revelation 2.

I know thy works, and tribulation, and poverty, (but thou art rich) and I know THE BLASPHEMY OF THEM WHICH SAY THEY ARE JEWS, AND ARE NOT, but are the synagogue of Satan.

(Revelation 2:9 AV)

In this context "Jews" is a codeword for "Christians". It is blasphemy for anyone to falsely claim to be a Christian, because such a claim brings a reproach on God.

The Apostle Paul gave Timothy a description of conditions that are extant today, in our age. As Paul wrote ...

This know also, that IN THE LAST DAYS perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, BLASPHEMERS, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, (2 Timothy 3:1-2 AV)

Blasphemy is something that is EXTREMELY COMMON AND PREVALENT TODAY! It is an every day occurrence, and very common in the entertainment media. We are exposed to examples of blasphemy all the time.

So, to summarize: blasphemy against God is anything that insults God, that provokes God, that shows disdain or contempt for God, that reproaches God, or even defies God. Also, to claim any names or any titles or any powers that belong to God is another form of blasphemy. It is also blasphemy for anyone to falsely claim to be a Christian. Keep this in mind when we later take a look at "saints".

So let's now get back to the "names of blasphemy". This expression is only used in the Book of Revelation.

And I stood upon the sand of the sea, and saw a beast rise up out of the sea, having seven heads and ten horns, and upon his horns ten crowns, and upon his heads THE NAME OF BLASPHEMY. (Revelation 13:1 AV)

So he carried me away in the spirit into the wilderness: and I saw a woman sit upon a scarlet coloured beast, FULL OF NAMES OF BLASPHEMY, having seven heads and ten horns. (Revelation 17:3 AV)

In Revelation 13:1 the Greek Received Text reads "onoma", the singular "NAME". But the Byzantine Majority Greek Text reads "onomata", the plural "NAMES". Thus some translations have the plural "names" in Revelation 13:1, while others here have the singular "name". I don't suppose that it makes much difference whether Revelation 13:1 reads "the name of blasphemy" or whether it reads "the names of blasphemy", because in Revelation 17:3 it is very clearly the plural "NAMES of blasphemy", which is further endorsed by the expression "FULL OF ...". Clearly Revelation 17:3 tells us that there are MANY BLASPHEMOUS NAMES involved here.

So let's see if we can identify some of these names of blasphemy.

IDENTIFYING SOME OF THE "NAMES OF BLASPHEMY"

The first key to correctly identifying these names is to correctly identify the parties involved. These Scriptures in Revelation are dealing with the Roman Empire and its various resurrections, and also with the Roman Catholic Church. This tells us WHERE to look for these names of blasphemy.

Next, we need to realize that we are dealing with AN ABUNDANCE OF NAMES! It is not a matter of having a handful of such names. The expression "full of" tells us that there are very many such

blasphemous names associated with that religious and political system, probably hundreds if not even thousands.

So how can we know whether a name is blasphemous or not?

The answer here is quite easy:

IF ANY NAME OR ANY TITLE INCORPORATES ANY ATTRIBUTE WHICH BELONGS TO GOD, THEN IT IS INDEED BLASPHEMOUS FOR ANY HUMAN BEING OR ANY ORGANIZATION TO CLAIM SUCH A NAME OR TITLE FOR HIMSELF OR FOR ITSELF!

So we simply have to examine any number of names and see whether they incorporate anything that is really a name or title belonging to God. And I suspect that some of those blasphemous names may be more difficult to identify than some of us have imagined. Satan is extremely subtle and a master of disguise.

Realize that all of us were born into a world where all these blasphemous names were already fully established! Many of these blasphemous names have enjoyed full public acceptance for many centuries. And some may indeed be fairly easy to identify. But Satan is fully prepared for some people readily identifying some of the blasphemous names he has palmed off on a gullible humanity; and so he has planned ahead by also providing OTHER blasphemous names that are far more subtle ... they can only be identified if we are prepared to do some research into these names, because on the surface they seem to be good and right.

Now another point to consider:

The Catholic Church has invented a large number of names and titles, both for religious leaders, and also for various spirit beings. If it can be shown that SOME of these are indeed blasphemous, does that really leave any room for OTHER NAMES OR TITLES invented by the same Catholic Church to be perfectly right and acceptable to God?

No, it doesn't!

In James 3:11 we see the principle we should keep in mind in this regard.

Doth a fountain send forth AT THE SAME PLACE SWEET WATER AND BITTER? (James 3:11 AV)

Applied to our circumstances we might ask the rhetorical question:

Can one religious organization be "FULL of names of blasphemy" and at the same time also produce religious titles that are PERFECTLY CORRECT BEFORE GOD?

No, it doesn't work that way!

It is not as if the "beast" of Revelation 17:3 has three or four or five good and right names written upon it, and ALL THE REST are names of blasphemy. That's just not the way things work when Satan is involved. ALL the names which that "beast" and that "woman" have produced are blasphemous ... ALL OF THEM! We should NEVER look to Satan to reveal "some truth" to us. We should NEVER look to

Satan for understanding of what is right in the sight of God. Revelation 17:3 does not leave any room for even a single name given to the world by this false religious system to be true and right before God. Would we ever look to Satan to tell us HOW we should address God? Would we ever let Satan tell us by what name we should address Satan himself ... like Satan could tell us: "I'd like you to call me by the name Lucifer"?

EVERY SINGLE NAME AND TITLE which has been INVENTED by Satan or his proxy churches must AUTOMATICALLY be highly suspect. Satan is not for nothing the father of all lies (John 8:44). Don't expect Satan to publicly advertize that the names he has provided for religious use are in fact blasphemous.

Now let's start with some specifics.

NAMES THAT INCORPORATE THE WORDS "HOLY" AND "REVEREND"

Here is what we are told in Psalm 111 ...

He sent redemption unto his people: he hath commanded his covenant for ever: HOLY AND REVEREND IS HIS NAME. (Psalms 111:9 AV)

What this means is that any human being who uses the words "holy" or "reverend" as a name or title is guilty of blasphemy ... human beings applying these words to themselves are defiling God's reputation.

So all of the following are names of blasphemy when applied as titles to human beings:

- Reverend ...
- Most Reverend ...
- Most Holy Reverend ...
- Father
- Holy Father
- Most Holy Father

The same holds true when the word "holy" is applied to a human organization devoid of any contact with God. Thus the term "HOLY Roman Empire" is also blasphemous.

Likewise, God selected Jerusalem as the place where He will dwell. The Catholic Pope, on the other hand, has selected Rome. And the Pope's reference to the Vatican as "the HOLY See" is another blasphemous title.

[Comment: In Catholic usage a "See" is the charge or territory of a bishop. The word is also sometimes applied to a cathedral town. The word is derived from a word for "Seat".]

So we have two more blasphemous names for our list:

- Holy Roman Empire

- the Holy See.

THE SAINTS OF GOD

A "saint" is someone who has been "set apart" by God from all other people, by God bestowing His Holy Spirit on that person. It is the indwelling Holy Spirit that identifies any person as "a saint". So various servants of God throughout the Bible can correctly be described as "the saints of God".

HOWEVER ...

At no time did God ever intend for the word "saint" to be A TITLE that would be used for specific human beings. Elevating the word "saint" to the level of a title has turned the word into a name of blasphemy when used to refer to people who have never had God's Spirit. Acts 5:32 makes clear that God only gives His Holy Spirit to those who obey Him and keep His laws.

New Testament usage makes quite clear that, while it is correct to identify servants of God as "saints", it was NEVER intended that we speak about these servants of God as "SAINT Peter" and "SAINT Paul" and "SAINT John", etc.. Whenever any of such men are mentioned by name (e.g. in Galatians 2:9 Paul mentions James, Peter and John) their names are NEVER preceded by the title "saint".

So the following are all names of blasphemy:

- Saint Theresa
- Saint Patrick
- Saint Francis
- Saint Louis
- Saint Tom, Dick and Harry, etc..

The Catholic Church has in this way created HUNDREDS of names of blasphemy. God did not intend the word "saint" to be an elevated title for anyone. And even more so, it is wrong to apply such a title to people who were never at any time converted by the indwelling of God's Spirit. And the Catholic Church has certainly never been in a position to correctly evaluate which people have had the Holy Spirit dwelling in their minds.

THE TITLE "FATHER"

Here is what Jesus Christ said in this regard:

And call no man your father upon the earth: for one is your Father, which is in heaven. (Matthew 23:9 AV)

This is a reference to not using the word "father" as A SPIRITUAL TITLE. Christ did not mean that it is wrong to refer to our physical fathers as "father".

The word "pope" is just another word that means "father". So the following are also names of blasphemy:

- Father John

- Father Brown
- Most Holy Father
- Pope John Paul
- Pope Pius XII
- Pope Leo X, etc..

John Paul II is pope number 264, though some of them had more than one shot at being pope, like Benedict IX who was pope #145 and #147 and #150, before finally abdicating for good when he was still only 28 years old. Thus the list of popes gives us all by itself a good 260 names of blasphemy for writing on the scarlet coloured beast of Revelation 17:3. And there are multiple thousands of Catholic clerics who use the title "Father", giving us multiple thousands more instances of blasphemous names.

Okay, that covers the most obvious names of blasphemy, the ones that use the words "reverend" and "father" and "holy" and "saint". They are the easy ones to spot. But what about some of the less obvious names of blasphemy? Can you also identify them?

I will now discuss THREE NAMES, all of which can be traced back to the Catholic Church. Two of them are INVENTIONS of the Catholic Church, and one of them is supposedly a faithful preservation by the Catholic Church of a Hebrew word, though there is no proof to support this claim. But all three of these names would not exist without the Catholic Church.

So here they are:

The first of these three names of blasphemy is LUCIFER.

The second of these three names of blasphemy is JEHOVAH.

The third of these three names of blasphemy is YAHWEH.

All three of these names depend totally on the Catholic Church, and without "the woman" and "the scarlet coloured beast" none of these three names would exist today.

Let's look at each of these three names more closely.

THE NAME "LUCIFER"

This one I have been trying to explain to people for about 15 years. Some years ago I wrote a short article explaining this specific point in detail.

Very briefly:

The Old Testament was written in Hebrew. The New Testament was written in Greek. Jerome translated both into Latin. Now the name "lucifer" is a Latin word, which was simply taken up into the English language.

Isaiah 14:12 is speaking about SATAN. It says:

How art thou fallen from heaven, O LUCIFER, son of the morning! how art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations! (Isaiah 14:12 AV)

Jerome's Latin Vulgate text for this verse reads:

quomodo cecidisti de caelo LUCIFER qui mane oriebaris corruisti in terram qui vulnerabas gentes (Isaiah 14:12 VULGATE)

Even if you cannot read Latin, note the capitalized word "LUCIFER" in Jerome's text. There is no doubt that Jerome knew full well that this verse is speaking about Satan.

The Hebrew word here translated as "lucifer" is "HEYLEL", and it does NOT mean "light bringer". "Heylel" really means something like "arrogant, boastful fool". The confusion arises because the root word "halal", from which this noun "heylel" is formed, has TWO distinct meanings, both of which are abundantly demonstrated in the Hebrew text of the Old Testament. On the one side "halal" means: bright, to shine, praise, etc.. This is the positive meaning of this word. But on the other side "halal" also means: to boast, to be mad, to be foolish, to rage, etc.. This is the negative meaning of this word. THE CONTEXT of Isaiah 14:12 shows clearly the incredible BOASTING Satan was engaging in (claiming he would knock God off His throne, etc.), and that makes clear that this noun must REFLECT the negative meaning of "halal"; i.e. an incredibly arrogant boaster. Verses 12-15 of Isaiah 14 show WHY God calls Satan "heylel" ... the name "heylel" is a reference to what we are told in these verses, it is NOT a reference to what we are not told!

It might be interesting to note that Jerome also placed the word "lucifer" into Job 11:17, where Zophar is speaking to Job and literally says at the end of that verse: "... you shall be as the morning" (i.e. if you, Job, put away from you iniquity and wickedness, see verse 14). The Hebrew text here uses the two words: "boqer", a noun meaning "morning", and "hayah", a verb meaning "to become". Jerome has translated this Hebrew noun "boqer" into Latin as "ut lucifer" ("ut" is an adverb meaning "just as", and "lucifer" is a noun meaning "light bringer"). So where the Hebrew text has the meaning of "TO BECOME LIKE THE MORNING", Jerome's Latin text has the meaning of "JUST AS A LIGHT BRINGER".

Now while this basically conveys the same general meaning in this particular situation, we should note that Jerome did NOT use the Latin words for "morning" here, which would have been the correct TRANSLATION for the Hebrew noun "boqer". Instead Jerome INTERPRETED the Hebrew word for "morning" and rendered it as "light bringer". In so doing Jerome changed the meaning somewhat. In this verse Zophar was saying that if Job would repent and put iniquity away from him, then he would be RENEWED, like a morning introducing a new day. Jerome's Latin text changes the focus of Zophar's statement to mean that if Job would repent and change then he would be like a light bringer. That is a different focus.

HOWEVER, ignoring all these technicalities, we should notice that Jerome in Job 11:17 translates the well-known Hebrew noun "boqer" into Latin as "lucifer", and later in Isaiah 14:12 he translates the unique (i.e. this is the only place where this word is ever used!) Hebrew noun "heylel" also into Latin as "lucifer". In other places where the Hebrew text has the word "boqer" (e.g. Genesis 1:5, 6, 13, etc.) Jerome translated this into Latin as "mane", which means "the early morning", but in Job 11:17 he translated it as "lucifer". It should be quite clear that the two Hebrew words "boqer" and "heylel" do not mean the same thing! Therefore it is wrong to translate both of them into Latin as "lucifer"! In actual fact neither word means "light bringer".

Now we come to the New Testament.

2.Peter 1:19 is speaking about JESUS CHRIST. This verse reads:

We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and THE DAY STAR arise in your hearts: (2 Peter 1:19 AV)

Jerome's Latin Vulgate text for this verse reads:

et habemus firmiorem propheticum sermonem cui bene facitis adtendentes quasi lucernae lucenti in caliginoso loco donec dies inlucescat et LUCIFER oriatur in cordibus vestris (2 Peter 1:19 VULGATE)

Again, notice the capitalized word "LUCIFER" in Jerome's text. There is no doubt that Jerome knew full well that THIS verse is speaking ABOUT JESUS CHRIST.

The Greek word here translated as "Lucifer" into Latin and as "the day star" into the English text is "PHOSPHOROS". Now "phosphoros" absolutely and without any reservations of any kind does NOT mean "day star"! The Greek word for "star" is "aster", from which we get words like "astronomy", etc.. And there is nothing about any "star" in this specific verse.

In fact, the Greek word "phosphoros" is 100% identical in meaning to the Latin word "lucifer". The Greek "phos" and the Latin "lux" both mean "light". And the Greek verb "phero" and the Latin verb "fero" both mean "to carry". These two words are 100% identical in meaning.

So in the Latin Vulgate version we find that Jerome CORRECTLY translated the Greek word "phosphoros", which is speaking about Jesus Christ, into Latin as "Lucifer". This was then INCORRECTLY translated into English as "day star". Had the translators of the KJV really been honest, then they would have correctly translated 2.Peter 1:19 as ...

We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and LUCIFER arise in your hearts ...

[Comment: By the time the KJV translators produced their text, the word "lucifer" had already been accepted into the English language. And while those translators used the Greek texts for translating the New Testament, and the Hebrew texts for translating the Old Testament, they also made extensive use of Jerome's Latin Vulgate translation for comparisons in both, the New Testament and the Old Testament. So given that the word "lucifer" was already a known term, and given that the Greek word "phosphoros" is clearly being used as a name or title for Jesus Christ in 2.Peter 1:19, it would have been appropriate to translate "phosphoros" as "Lucifer" in this verse. "Light bringer" would be an equally correct translation on the understanding that we would view this word "Light bringer" as a name or as a title for Christ.]

Unfortunately they were not prepared to be THAT honest!

Next, Jerome in his Latin Vulgate version then INCORRECTLY translated the Hebrew word "heylel", which is speaking about Satan, into Latin as "Lucifer". This INCORRECT translation into Latin was then RETAINED by the translators into English, and so the word "Lucifer" was incorrectly accepted as a name for Satan.

So the KJV translators made TWO mistakes in this context. Firstly, they RETAINED Jerome's mistranslation in Isaiah 14:12. Secondly, they IGNORED Jerome's correct translation into Latin in 2.Peter 1:19, and instead opted to MISTRANSLATE the Greek word here into English as "the day star".

It is absolutely beyond question that in 2.Peter 1:19 Jesus Christ is called "Lucifer", if you want to speak Latin. Now if you don't want to speak Latin, then you shouldn't use a Latin name in Isaiah 14:12 either!

IT IS AN INCREDIBLE DECEPTION OF A MONUMENTAL MAGNITUDE TO RENDER "PHOSPHOROS" IN 2.PETER 1:19 AS "DAY STAR"! SUCH A TRANSLATION IS UTTERLY BIZARRE!

The Bible in 2.Peter 1:19 makes quite clear that JESUS CHRIST is "the light bringer", or, if you prefer Latin, that Jesus Christ is "LUCIFER"!

We should immediately realize that there is absolutely NO WAY that Jesus Christ would ever share a description that applies to Himself with Satan! No way would God in the Bible use ONE NAME to refer to Jesus Christ in the New Testament and then use the same name to refer to Satan in the Old Testament. And I've dealt with so-called "leading ministers" who have actually defended Satan's supposed RIGHT to the name "Lucifer"! Satan clearly has deceived many people even in God's Church.

Can we not understand that Satan has NEVER AT ANY TIME brought any "light" to any place anywhere in this universe? He has NEVER been "a light bringer". He has simply deceived humanity into falsely believing that he did at some point have some light to bring. But the truth is that all Satan ever brought was DARKNESS. That's what Genesis 1:2 tells us.

Never forget that it is Satan's proxy church that has told us how Satan wants us to think of him ... as supposedly having been in the position that is held by Jesus Christ, that of "Light Bringer" or "Lucifer". And that's precisely what Isaiah 14:13-14 tells us ... that Satan WANTED TO BE in God's position, he wanted to be "the light bringer", he coveted Christ's position. And laying claim to the name "Lucifer" is simply a continuation of that coveting.

When it comes to the names of blasphemy (i.e. names that HARM God's reputation), then "Lucifer" as applied to Satan is a big, big one! This one is written all over that scarlet coloured beast!

Let's move on to the next one.

THE NAME "JEHOVAH"

This name is also very clearly an invention of the Catholic Church.

The article "Jehovah" on page 88 of volume VII of the JEWISH ENCYCLOPEDIA states the following:

"'Jehovah' is generally held to have been the invention of Pope Leo X's Confessor, Peter Galatin ... who was followed in the use of this hybrid form by Fagius ... But it seems that even before Galatin, the name 'Jehovah' had been in common use ... It is found in Raymond Martin's 'Pugio Fidei,' written in 1270."

The Jews recognize that this pronunciation for YHWH DID NOT COME FROM THEM; it came from the Catholic Church. Using the name "Jehovah" links the user to the Catholic Church, as it has come down to our times through the Catholic Church. Even the JEHOVAH'S WITNESSES used to acknowledge in

the Preface to their translation of the Bible the following:

"While inclining to view the pronunciation 'Yahweh' as the more correct way, WE HAVE RETAINED THE FORM 'JEHOVAH' BECAUSE OF PEOPLE'S FAMILIARITY WITH IT SINCE THE 14TH CENTURY". (page 25, my emphasis)

Note that this candid admission has been removed from the Preface of the more recent editions of their Bibles, because they found that people used their edition of the Bible to show up the incorrectness of the pronunciation "Jehovah". It also clearly revealed their link to the Catholic Church, by holding fast to this Catholic tradition. So this statement is not found in more recent editions. The name "Jehovah" very clearly links the Jehovah's Witnesses to the Catholic Church, as do also other characteristics in the "genetic makeup" of that church.

Pope Leo X was pope from March 1513 until December 1521, during the time of Martin Luther. That was about 250 years after Martin's work "Pugio Fidei". The Jehovah's Witnesses themselves lead the name "Jehovah" back into the 1300's ... to somewhere between Martin's book and Pope Leo X.

The UNIVERSAL JEWISH ENCYCLOPEDIA, published in New York in 1941, states in volume 6, on pages 54-55 in the article "JEHOVAH":

"JEHOVAH, AN ERRONEOUS PRONUNCIATION OF THE TETRAGRAMMATON, or four-lettered name of God, made up of the Hebrew letters Yod He Vav He. According to Bible scholars, the proper pronunciation of this name was Jahveh. As early as Bible times, however, in obedience to the provision of the Third Commandment that forbids taking the name of God in vain, this name was never pronounced except once a year by the high priest on the Day of Atonement in the Temple at Jerusalem. ... When vowels were later added to the Hebrew consonants in order to facilitate reading by the masses, the pronunciation of the letters Yod He Vav He was indicated by adding the vowels of the word Adonai to the four letters of the Tetragrammaton . JEWS UNDERSTOOD THIS INDICATED PRONUNCIATION 'Yod He Vav He' was, and IS, ALWAYS PRONOUNCED ADONAI. But in the Middle Ages certain Christian theologians (the first known is Raymond Martin in 1270) copying the voweled tetragrammaton in transliteration, spelled it out to read JeHoVaH. The word "Jehovah", therefore, is a misreading for which there is no warrant and which MAKES NO SENSE IN HEBREW." (article was written by Isaac Landman, my emphasis)

The ENCYCLOPEDIA JUDAICA article "God, Names of" (volume 7, page 680) adds:

"At least until the destruction of the First Temple in 586 B.C.E. this name was regularly pronounced with its proper vowels, as is clear from the Lachish Letters, written shortly before that date."

Later the same article points out:

"In the early middle ages ... the vowel points for 'Adonai' with one variation ... were used for YHWH, thus producing the form YeHoWaH. WHEN CHRISTIAN SCHOLARS OF EUROPE FIRST BEGAN TO STUDY HEBREW, THEY DID NOT UNDERSTAND WHAT THIS REALLY MEANT, AND THEY INTRODUCED THE HYBRID NAME "JEHOVAH"." (my emphasis)

So we have seen statements from the Jewish Encyclopedia, the Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, the Encyclopedia Judaica and from the Preface of older versions of the Jehovah's Witnesses Bible translation. The evidence is very clear.

The evidence shows that "Jehovah" is nothing but A HYBRID INVENTION OF CATHOLIC THEOLOGIANS in the Middle Ages who did not realize that the Jews had added totally artificial vowels to the Tetragrammaton with the clear intention that they would never pronounce that word correctly. When they saw the word YHWH with the vowel points for Adonai, then they would always read "Adonai".

Would YOU feel flattered or honoured if people deliberately altered your name into some HYBRID CORRUPTION? That would be a real compliment to you, right? I speak as a fool. It should be clear that such a hybrid word is AN INSULT TO GOD, which detracts from God's reputation. It also totally obscures what that name actually means, by focussing on some phonetic pronunciation. That's what we should EXPECT Satan to do with a name of God, deliberately corrupt it to express derision.

So the name "Jehovah" is another big, big name of blasphemy written all over that "beast".

Let's now look at the next name.

THE NAME "YAHWEH"

The evidence is very clear that the pronunciation of the HEBREW word "YHWH" was indeed lost! Even the wrong vowel pointings applied to this word made sure of that.

To illustrate this point:

Suppose we didn't have vowels in the written form of the English language. So you have the word "bg", which is the written form for the word "bug". We then invent a system of pointings to display the correct vowels for all words. Now suppose the word "bug" is something we don't ever want anyone to pronounce correctly. Now we COULD add the vowel pointing for a "u" to indicate that this "bg" word is really pronounced "bug". But that might entail the danger of someone inadvertently actually pronouncing this word correctly as "bug". So to make really sure that no one will even accidentally do that, we add the vowel pointings for a different word to this word "bg", with the result that the word is now pronounced as "beige". So all of us know that we mean the word "bug" when we say "beige" ... except that "bug" is never pronounced by anyone. So for centuries we just pronounce the word "bg" as "beige", but know that it has the meaning "bg" (i.e. bug). However, we don't really know whether "bg" should CORRECTLY be pronounced as "bag" or as "big" or as "bog" or as "bug" or "beg", because for centuries we have only pronounced it as "beige". Now even if centuries later someone DOES state the opinion that "bg" should really be pronounced as "beg" or "bag", does that mean this opinion is right? No, it isn't right, because in this case WE KNOW that it should really be pronounced as "bug". But if we didn't know that, what would stop someone from presenting us with "convincing arguments" that it really should be "beg" or "bag"? It would be very easy for us to be convinced that "bag" or "beg" is really the correct pronunciation.

Whether or not any ARAMAIC pronunciation was more or less "preserved" has nothing to do with the fact that the HEBREW pronunciation was lost! Hebrew and Aramaic are two distinct languages, even as Spanish and Portuguese are two distinct languages.

The Encyclopedia Judaica claims that the true pronunciation of YHWH was never lost, but this claim is easily disproved when we examine THE EVIDENCE that is actually presented. So notice this quotation from the ENCYCLOPEDIA JUDAICA, volume 7, from the article "GOD, NAMES OF" on page 680.

"The true pronunciation of the name YHWH was never lost. Several early Greek writers of the Christian Church testify that the name was pronounced "Yahweh". This is confirmed, at least for the vowel of the first syllable of the name, by the shorter form Yah, which is sometimes used in poetry (e.g., Ex. 15:2) and the -yahu or -yah that serves as the final syllable of very many Hebrew names."

Right, let's examine this evidence.

Here we have a JEWISH encyclopedia and they assert that the pronunciation of the word YHWH in THEIR language of Hebrew was never lost. And what do they offer as proof to substantiate this claim?

Do they tell us that they, THE JEWS, preserved this pronunciation?

NO, THEY DO NOT!

Their only supposed "proof" is an appeal to the CATHOLIC "church fathers". That should immediately set alarm bells ringing in our heads!

So here we have JEWS looking to THE CATHOLIC CHURCH to tell them how a word in the HEBREW language should supposedly be pronounced! So the Jews are looking to the organization that GOD describes as "THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH" in Revelation 17:5 to tell them how one of GOD'S NAMES IN THE HEBREW LANGUAGE should be pronounced! Do you really think there is any love lost between God and the organization HE calls "the mother of harlots and abominations"? Do you really think that God would use THAT ORGANIZATION to be the sole source for preserving the correct pronunciation for HIS, God's, true name?

We are supposed to believe that THE CATHOLIC CHURCH has been the custodian to preserve the pronunciation of words in the Hebrew language? As the modern saying goes ... "gimme a break"!! Statistically you have a greater chance of the wicked queen being genuinely concerned for Snow White's welfare than the Catholic Church being used by God to preserve the correct pronunciation of one of God's names in the Hebrew language.

And as we will see, they didn't really preserve any correct Hebrew pronunciation at all.

And so this statement in the Encyclopedia Judaica is actually a candid admission that THEY THEMSELVES (i.e. the Jewish community) do not have ANY EVIDENCE that the correct pronunciation of a specific word in THEIR OWN LANGUAGE was actually preserved!

So which group of people was THE SOURCE of this information recorded by these Catholic "church fathers"? Did they get this information from the main Jewish community or did they get it from some extreme fanatical group like the Essenes or did they get it from NON-JEWISH people like the Samaritans? Or did they perhaps get this information "straight from the horse's mouth" ... directly from a Jewish High Priest?

In a moment we'll see the answer to this question.

Next, THE NEW BIBLE DICTIONARY, published in 1972 by Inter-Varsity Press in London, states the following on page 478 in the article "GOD, NAMES OF":

"The pronunciation of Yahweh is indicated by transliterations of the name into Greek in early Christian literature, in the form 'iaoue' (Clement of Alexandria) or 'iabe' (Theodoret; by this time

Gk. b had the pronunciation of v)."

So Clement of Alexandria (he lived approximately from 150 - 215 AD) claims that YHWH was pronounced as "iaoue". About 200 years later Theodoret (he lived approximately from 390 - 458 AD) claims the pronunciation was "iabe" or "iave" (as the Greek "b" was by then pronounced like a "v"). Now we need to recognize that THERE IS A DIFFERENCE between "iaoue" and "iave" ... they are NOT IDENTICAL! Even when we make allowance for there being no letter "j" in the biblical Greek alphabet, and therefore assign the pronunciation of "j" to the letter "i" we still have a difference between "jaoue" and "jave". They are not identical, just like "bag" and "big" and "bog" and "bug" are not really identical in their pronunciation.

It is only in the 400's AD that we have the record for "iave" or "jave" ... that is more than 300 years after the Temple was destroyed and there had been no High Priests for many years.

Now where did Clement of Alexandria and Theodoret get this inside information?

THEY DIDN'T GET IT FROM ANY HEBREW SPEAKING JEWS!

Let's see what the Jewish historian Josephus has to say about the pronunciation of YHWH. Recall that Josephus himself had done a spell of duty as High Priest, and so he was familiar with everything about the Hebrew language that any other Jew could possibly have known.

So notice what JOSEPHUS had to say about 100 years BEFORE Clement of Alexandria. This is from "Antiquities of the Jews", Book 2, Chapter 12, section 4:

4. Moses having now seen and heard these wonders that assured him of the truth of these promises of God, had no room left him to disbelieve them: he entreated him to grant him that power when he should be in Egypt; and besought him to vouchsafe him the knowledge of his own name; and since he had heard and seen him, that he would also tell him his name, that when he offered sacrifice he might invoke him by such his name in his oblations. Whereupon God declared to him HIS HOLY NAME, which had never been discovered to men before; CONCERNING WHICH IT IS NOT LAWFUL FOR ME TO SAY ANY MORE. (my emphasis)

Josephus very clearly was not going to divulge the correct pronunciation of the word YHWH. And WHY was Josephus not going to tell anyone this correct pronunciation? Because Josephus firmly believed that IT WAS NOT LAWFUL FOR HIM TO DO SO! Do you grasp the ramifications of this statement by Josephus? The Jewish population as a whole in the 70's AD did not know how to pronounce this word, BECAUSE the High Priests, the only ones who could POSSIBLY have still known this pronunciation, were convinced that it would be against the law for them to divulge this information.

So if ordinary Jews didn't have this information, and if High Priests were not about to divulge this to anyone, then WHO would have been able to tell Clement or Theodoret or Origen this supposed "correct" pronunciation 100 or more years later? We'll see the answer in a little while.

Now here is what is recorded by Clement of Alexandria in Book 5, Chapter 6 (on page 906 of Volume 2 of the Ante-Nicene Fathers collection in the Ages Software Collection):

Again, there is the veil of the entrance into the holy of holies. Four pillars there are, the sign of the sacred tetrad of the ancient covenants. Further, the mystic name of four letters which was affixed to those alone to whom the adytum was accessible, is called Jave, which is interpreted,

“Who is and shall be.” The name of God, too, among the Greeks contains four letters.

[Comment: The author of this written text has here simply rendered Clement's rendering of "iaoue" as "jave", basically to bring it into line with Theodoret's better-known version. This somewhat obscures differences in the two versions of this word.]

By "adytum" Clement is referring to "the Holy of Holies" in the Temple. This was accessible only to the High Priest once a year. So Clement in effect says: "... the mystic name of four letters, which was available only to the High Priest, is called JAVE". The letter J was the same as the letter I, and could be pronounced either way (pronouncing the "J" like the English "Y"). So Clement said (ignoring his actual rendering as "iaoue" for the sake of the argument) that "the mystic name" (meaning YHWH) was "IAVE" or "YAVE". Note that Clement is referring specifically to the High Priest, and there had not been any High Priests for the 100 years preceding his writing of this statement.

Next, here is a quotation from THE UNIVERSAL JEWISH ENCYCLOPEDIA, published in New York in 1941, volume 5, page 6, article "GOD, NAMES OF":

"The Tetragrammaton or Four-Lettered Name (YHWH), which occurs 6,823 times, is by far the most frequent name of God in the Bible. It is now pronounced 'adonai'; but the church father Theodoret records that THE SAMARITANS pronounced it as 'labe', and Origen transcribes it as 'lae', both pointing to an original vocalization 'yahveh'." (my emphasis)

Note again that this JEWISH reference work also relies totally on what the Catholic "church fathers" have recorded. The Jews themselves have no records of any kind that the correct pronunciation was preserved.

It should be clear that this claim that the pronunciation was never lost is not based on anyone ever hearing anyone else actually SPEAK the word out loud and distinctly. There is no record from anyone who ever heard the word YHWH. Note also the statement that these records from Theodoret and Origen "POINT TO" a vocalization of "yahveh". "Pointing to" something is not really the same as CLEARLY SPELLING OUT THE CORRECT VOCALIZATION.

So note carefully!

The claim that the true pronunciation of YHWH was never lost is based on two things:

1) A reasoning out process for the first syllable "Yah", because this has been preserved as a part of other words. "Yah" is also a form of God's name that is used in some places in the Old Testament. So that seems plausible enough.

2) The evidence of the Catholic so-called "church fathers" CLEMENT of Alexandria and ORIGEN (he lived from about 185 - 254 A.D) and THEODORET.

Thus:

There is no evidence that the pronunciation was actually preserved in spoken form! No one who was prepared to write down what is supposedly the exact pronunciation (i.e. Clement of Alexandria, Theodoret and Origen) actually ever heard someone SAY this word in their presence. The only one who COULD have heard the word spoken or even said the word himself is Josephus, who had been a High Priest ... and Josephus was not about to reveal the correct pronunciation, as is evident from the quotation we have looked at.

So we only have the statements of CATHOLIC (not Jewish!) authors, who themselves did not really agree with one another and none of whom actually ever heard a Hebrew speaking Jew utter this word YHWH with its correct pronunciation!

So here is a historical approach to this question:

1) JOSEPHUS (around 80 A.D.) makes clear that he, having been a High Priest, was not about to divulge the correct pronunciation to anyone.

2) CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA (around 200 A.D.) is reputed to have stated it is "IAOUE" or perhaps even "YAVE".

3) ORIGEN (around 230 A.D.) is reputed to have stated the name as "IAE".

4) THEODORET (around 430 A.D.) is shown as stating that THE SAMARITANS used the name "IAVE" or "YAVE".

5) These three "church fathers" got their information from different sources. None of their sources had ever really HEARD an informed person pronounce the Hebrew word YHWH, and they were simply going on reports from others who also had never heard an informed person pronounce this word.

6) However, Theodoret reveals something the other writers did not mention. This so-called "preserved" pronunciation came from THE SAMARITANS! This means that the so-called "preserved" pronunciation comes from THE ARAMAIC LANGUAGE AND NOT FROM THE HEBREW LANGUAGE!

And once you think about it, that really should have been obvious all along, right?

Here is the situation:

Few Jews in the first century AD, if any at all apart from the High Priests, would ever in their lives have heard the word YHWH pronounced. The pronunciation as "Adonai" was fully entrenched. The High Priests saw themselves as the custodians of God's name, and they were not about to ever reveal the true pronunciation to anyone ... as the quotation from Josephus makes quite clear. The Temple was destroyed in 70 AD, a good 100 years before Clement of Alexandria ever wrote his books. And after the destruction of the Temple there was no occasion in the year when anyone in Jewish society, from the High Priest on down, would ever have had a reason for pronouncing YHWH correctly ... IF he had in fact still had a knowledge of that correct pronunciation. And certainly, no Jew who had that kind of esoteric information was about to divulge it to some non-Jew.

The Temple was destroyed during the time Josephus lived. And it is VERY LIKELY that the knowledge of the correct HEBREW pronunciation of YHWH died with Josephus. If Josephus was not going to pass that knowledge on to the next High Priest to use in the Temple service on the Day of Atonement, then that knowledge would be lost.

So exactly where would men like Clement and Origen have come across this information? Why, FROM THE SAMARITANS up north of the Jews. Theodoret then also acknowledges the Samaritans as the source of this pronunciation.

Now never forget that Hebrew and Aramaic are two different languages, which in their SPELLING have a large number of words in common, but they may even then still differ in their pronunciations ... like some words that have the same spelling in Spanish and in Portuguese (or in English and in Dutch, or in Dutch and in German, etc.) but still have a different way of pronouncing these words that are spelled identically.

For example, the word "God" is spelled identically in English and in Dutch and in Afrikaans (a language spoken in South Africa). However, this identical spelling results in three different pronunciations in these three languages. The same is true for Hebrew and Aramaic.

So we should keep two facts in mind:

1) The pronunciations preserved by the Catholic "church fathers" show some variations amongst themselves.

2) ANY preserved pronunciation of YHWH MUST have come from the Aramaic speaking SAMARITANS up north. Even if it is an "accurate" preservation of the word in the Aramaic language, that still is no guarantee that it is also a correct version of the original HEBREW word.

What this means is that THE HEBREW LANGUAGE pronunciation of the word YHWH was not preserved! No JEWS ever contributed to the supposed preservation of the Hebrew word YHWH. It was supposedly preserved by the Samaritans, a people who did not speak Hebrew themselves, and who had no interest in the Hebrew language.

To give you a realistic parallel:

Expecting the Aramaic-speaking Samaritans to have correctly preserved the pronunciation of the Hebrew word "YHWH" is like relying on some Germans or some Hollanders, who have never in their lives heard the English word "ewe" spoken by anyone, and who are not even fluent in English, to tell us with absolute certainty how the English word "ewe" should be correctly pronounced in English. What are the chances of them coming up with a pronunciation like "ee-wee"?

The Samaritans didn't speak Hebrew; they spoke Aramaic. The Jews in the 1st century AD likewise also didn't speak Hebrew; they too spoke Aramaic. It was only the religious leaders, like the priests and the Pharisees, who actually engaged in the study of Hebrew. And Josephus makes no bones about the fact that such a study was difficult, and that few men attained as much competency in Hebrew as he had attained (Antiquities of the Jews, Book XX, Chapter XI, Section 2).

Next, as far as getting ANY religious information from the Samaritans is concerned, we should always keep the words of Jesus Christ to the Samaritan woman in mind ...

YE WORSHIP YE KNOW NOT WHAT: we know what we worship: for salvation is of the Jews.
(John 4:22 AV)

So the CATHOLIC "CHURCH FATHERS" got their information regarding the pronunciation of YHWH from the Samaritans, concerning whom Jesus Christ said "YOU WORSHIP YOU KNOW NOT WHAT"! So the people, who according to Jesus Christ didn't even know what they worshipped are supposedly THE ONLY AUTHORITY for how the word YHWH should be pronounced correctly.

Can you see GOD'S HAND in such a scenario, because I can't?!?

The "evidence" preserved by the so-called Catholic "church fathers" does not really prove a correct and accurate HEBREW LANGUAGE PRONUNCIATION of the word YHWH! Unless some REAL evidence is available, we must conclude that the Hebrew language pronunciation of YHWH has indeed been lost, even if an Aramaic language pronunciation has perhaps been preserved.

Consider one other thought in this regard.

While the correct pronunciation of the Hebrew word YHWH has been lost, THE MEANING of that word has been very clearly preserved. The word means: "the One who is and was and shall be". Thus it is correct to translate this word into English as "the Existing One" or as "the Eternal". The word YHWH does not really mean "Lord" ... it is the Hebrew word "Adonai" that means "Lord".

Now while there is absolutely no clear proof as to what the original vowels for the Hebrew word YHWH should be, there is the possibility that the word did in fact have THREE SYLLABLES, because there are THREE components to the name ... "was ... is ... and shall be". With the arrangement of the four letters "Yod He Vav He" (i.e. YHWH) in this name, it is grammatically expected that the final "He" (i.e. H) would be a silent letter. But the first three letters "Yod He Vav" (i.e. YHW) could have had a vowel each attached to them. That is how the name "Jehovah" was made up, by attaching a vowel to each of the first three letters in that word. Now while the vowels in the word "Jehovah" were clearly TOTALLY UNRELATED to the correct pronunciation, THE CONCEPT of the word actually consisting of THREE syllables is a distinct possibility.

I say this not to try to PROVE that there should be three syllables, because I obviously don't know whether there should be two or three syllables. I say this simply to further illustrate that it is not really all that clear-cut that the Catholic-preserved two syllable version of the word has to be correct. It COULD have been a three syllable word, with different vowels from the vowels in the word "Jehovah". So we should never assume that the word YHWH simply "had to" consist of only two syllables.

The point is: the true pronunciation of the Hebrew word YHWH has been LOST! And it is POINTLESS for us to try to reconstruct the original pronunciation from any number of different lines of reasoning. God saw to it that the knowledge of when the Sabbath is was clearly preserved, but God did NOT see to it that the correct pronunciation of YHWH was preserved.

But consider the following:

Is it just a coincidence that BOTH forms of transliterating the name YHWH are led back to THE CATHOLIC CHURCH? Neither form is actually led back to the Jews, whose language Hebrew had been. It was CATHOLIC theologians who came up with the name "Jehovah", and it was CATHOLIC theologians who recorded the words on which the vocalization "Yahweh" is based. It was CATHOLIC theologians who gave the world a choice ... would you like a TWO syllable version of YHWH or would you prefer a THREE syllable version of YHWH?

If someone is going to appeal to historical evidence, then the only option for in some way transliterating and vocalizing the Hebrew name YHWH is to accept one of the options the Catholic Church has made available. NO OPTION was actually made available by the Jews themselves. Jewish opinions in this regard rely on Catholic records.

Worldwide "Jehovah" has found the greater acceptance of the two options. But for those who object to "Jehovah", the Catholic Church (or should I say Satan?) has conveniently provided the alternative of "Yahweh" through Clement and Theodoret and Origen recording a Samaritan pronunciation.

I see no alternative but to conclude that the correct HEBREW pronunciation of YHWH has indeed been lost. I see no alternative but to also conclude that the pronunciation "Yahweh" is another of the names of blasphemy on the "beast" of Revelation 17:3. The trail that leads to Catholic theologians is just so glaringly obvious, and there is no way that GOD has used the Catholic Church to preserve this information, information that neither the Jews nor the early true Church of God was aware of. "Yahweh" is a name that the Catholic Church is also riding on. When it comes to "Hebrew names for God", then the Catholic Church is clearly running the show.

And without the Catholic Church the world today would not have the names "Lucifer" and "Jehovah" and "Yahweh".

Now consider the following things:

1) In Revelation 17 God WARNS us about the multitude of BLASPHEMOUS names that can be led back to the Catholic Church.

2) The evidence for this is super-abundant all around us. Look at all the blasphemous names that incorporate words like "reverend" and "holy" and "father" and "saint". Look at how many streets and towns all over the world have names that start with "Saint" or "San", etc.! These names of blasphemy are everywhere.

[Comment: While we cannot get around using names like "St. Albans, St. Moritz, St. Louis", etc. any more than a New Testament minister could get around having the name of a pagan god (i.e. Apollos), we should nevertheless recognize these names for what they are. There is NOTHING AT ALL that God has sanctified in the towns called "St. Moritz, St. Albans", etc..]

3) THREE NAMES based on THREE HEBREW WORDS are led back directly to the Catholic Church. There is NO JEWISH EVIDENCE anywhere to support these three names as being correct. There is, however, some evidence that they are not correct.

A) The Hebrew word "heylel" absolutely does NOT mean "lucifer" or "light bringer". Nor does it mean "day-star", as it is translated in the Jewish Publication Society Translation of the Old Testament. The Apostle Peter, however, clearly referred to Jesus Christ as the "Light Bringer", and thus as "Lucifer", in 2.Peter 1:19. This means that it is AN INSULT TO JESUS CHRIST to apply this same name to Satan.

B) The Hebrew word "YHWH" absolutely was not pronounced as "Jehovah". This word "Jehovah" is clearly a Catholic invention. This corrupted version of the name YHWH is likewise clearly an insult to God.

C) The Hebrew word "YHWH" is not the same as the word "YHWH" in the Aramaic language. The Catholics may have preserved a Samaritan pronunciation in the Aramaic language for this word. There is no guarantee of any kind that this Samaritan Aramaic pronunciation is correct. Nor is there any guarantee that the Hebrew word should not in fact have three syllables. But it IS true that without the Catholic Church providing this pronunciation, people would not have the word "Yahweh".

Understand that the way Satan has palmed off the word "Yahweh" on an unsuspecting world as being supposedly "the correct pronunciation of God's name" is JUST AS SNEAKY AND DECEPTIVE as the way he twisted a descriptive term that refers to himself (i.e. to Satan, the Hebrew word "heylel") into A NAME that really applies to Jesus Christ in 2.Peter 1:19 (i.e. the Greek "Phosphoros" which is "Lucifer" in Latin).

Can we not see the same modus operandi in all three of these names, the same deceptive and perverse mind scheming out these things?

4) After God has specifically WARNED us about the abundance of blasphemous names coming from the Catholic Church system, it is totally inconceivable that God would use that same Catholic Church as the only source to have "CORRECTLY" preserved the pronunciation of God's name in the Hebrew language. The "beast" and the "woman" who is riding that "beast", and the power that controls both of them (i.e. Satan), would NEVER FAITHFULLY PRESERVE some knowledge or information about God that is absolutely vital for true Christians to have. Satan is a destroyer and not a preserver!

5) A final thought: The Catholic Church has given names and titles to human beings that are blasphemous (father, reverend, etc.), and it has also given names to spirit beings (to God and to Satan) that are blasphemous (elevating Satan with the name "Lucifer" and debasing God with the corrupt hybrid terms "Jehovah" and "Yahweh"). When it is SO CLEAR that all the titles and names the Catholic Church has provided for human religious leaders are blasphemous, can we not see that the names the Catholic Church has provided for spirit beings are EQUALLY BLASPHEMOUS? Surely we can see that it is impossible for the Catholic Church to "get it right" when devising terms for spirit beings, when at the same time the evidence is so overwhelming that every title or name the same church has given to human beings is blasphemous? That is what "FULL OF the names of blasphemy" should tell us.

So these names can also be added to the list of blasphemous names we compiled earlier. And we in God's Church need to be on our guard against ANY "names of blasphemy" with which Satan would want to deceive us. And we are far more likely to be deceived by these last three names of blasphemy than by any of the others.

Frank W. Nelte