

Debunking the Myths of Sacred Namers I

Carl Franklin

This, of course, concerns the myths that have developed since the 1930s through sacred name groups that are now impacting the Church of God groups in a major way concerning the sacred name, as they say, Yahweh and Yahshua. As most of you have experienced, I'm sure, in this fellowship you've come across someone who has used the name 'Yahweh,' either in your presence or on tape sermon, or you've heard it on the radio, read it somewhere or you've heard the name 'Yahshua.'

There are those who have been our Church of God fellowships, but not in our immediate fellowship, that are Sabbath-keepers, Holy Day-keepers, even though they may be keeping the Holy Days on different dates who are going to the use of Yahweh now and the use of Yahshua. One fellow in particular is teaching that we need to be re-baptized in the name of Yahshua, that the name 'Jesus' is a pagan name, and the name 'Lord' is pagan, and 'Jehovah' they say is a 'monstrous hybrid hideous name that has come down to us. That it actually is the name of Satan himself, and if you use the name you're actually praying to Satan.

So, this series is one that I hope will begin to blunt some of the inroad that these people are making with our brethren, and help our brethren a means of defending themselves in a simple way. They can hear what a brother or sister is saying, and retort in a kind way, a Christian way, with an answer that will begin to blunt the thrust of this evangelism that's coming into our midst.

I know of some churches, especially ex-CGI churches, that are splitting right down the middle over sacred name issues. There are older fellowships that have come out of Worldwide Church of God that going independent and are being affected by sacred name groups all over the country. I'm sure there are many that I haven't heard of. There are Canadian churches that are being split, taken over by sacred namers and the doctrines of some of these groups, such as the Kingdom City group—the YMCA group out of southern Missouri are not only on the Internet, but they're very active in evangelizing. There are also Sabbath-keepers, keep the Holy Days—albeit at different times—and these people are very zealous, and I'm sure very sincere.

They have put together quite a body of literature that's now coming into our groups and beginning to circulate.

Some of these people who are pushing this information are doing so through organized committees of Churches of God, especially independent Churches of God that have left the

Church of God International. They're beginning to influence these groups into studying this material from these sacred names groups.

The way that the material is written is in a very intimidating and dogmatic way. It sounds, at first, like they know what they're talking about. They don't know what they're talking about, and as we will see in this series of studies, the basic assumptions that they're making can be rebutted, but you have to have some history and a little help. With that help you can:

- educate yourself
- sharpen your sword
- load your ammunition

and get ready to take care of the false doctrines that are coming into the Church!

This sermon is just part one and it concerns three myths. There are dozens and dozens of myths that these people are involved with. I have written a few basic points down that will deal with three of the basic myths that they will throw at you when they first meet you.

There has to be a way that we can come back with something that's truthful, yet simple, that will throw them off their guard and saddles, and when they pick themselves up and dust themselves off, maybe they'll start to think a little bit. A lot of these people aren't convinced with they first get into this, but it sounds good. So, if we can nip it in bud at that time, we can help them a great deal, because once people are bitten by this spirit it's very hard to get out of it.

I don't know of anyone in my 40-plus years of being involved with the Churches of God, and as active in the ministry for a good part of that time, has ever come out and repented of the sacred names movement. But I have come into contact with youngsters who have grown up in the sacred names movement who are most interested—even though they've grown up in it—in seeking for Truth.

If we can help them and blunt it at that end, there's hope there, we surely can with our own people. They're just like sheep—not that they're dumb—that are like the 'country boy' in the city. You walk in and see the bright lights and everything looks good. This is the way that a lot of our brethren are with these false doctrines. Satan dresses it up to look really good.

The first myth is one that they usually begin their material with. In fact one of their booklets is entitled *The Mistaken 'j'*; they teach that there was

no letter ‘j’ until about 500 years ago. By that they mean there’s no letter ‘j.’ they’re belief is that since there’s no letter ‘j’ the name Jehovah—transliterated out of the Hebrew by William Tyndale in 1530—and therefore the name Jehovah is impossible.

The second myth is tied up with that, and you’ll see that there is no ‘j’ in Hebrew. They make a big ado about this. They’ll get up on their hind feet and dance around and really intimidate you that there’s no ‘j’ in Hebrew.

Some of the arguments that they use have nothing to do with the Hebrew at all, the true Biblical Hebrew, and they try to intimidate us by leading us to believe that the Hebrew of the Bible was Yiddish. *It was not!* And also that the Hebrew of the Bible had something to do with German pronunciation. There’s no ‘j’ sound in German, therefore, there’s none in the Hebrew. That is not true! God did not write the Old Testament in German, and there is a ‘j’ sound in the Hebrew.

The third myth that I will address is the name Jehovah was invented. They will come back and say that the name Jehovah was in the 1520s, and oddly enough—depending on what sacred name group you get involved with—they will say that it was invented in 1516, 1518 or 1520.

I wish they’d make up their minds, because it couldn’t have been invented in all three. It wasn’t anyway, but they can’t agree amongst themselves as to which date it was invented.

- Note the following study papers written by Carl Franklin: *Debunking the Myths of Sacred Namers* (parts 1, 2 & 3).
- Note sermon: *De-Mythologizing the Divine Name* (Carl Franklin)

God willing when this gets out it will help draw the line with those getting into it. Even though it may not help those who are already into it, my purpose for writing it is not to convert sacred namers, it’s to help our brethren. If God adds that as an extra blessing for them, so be it. This is for you who don’t believe in sacred names, and to be able to help those who do.

I hope, in Christian spirit, to have some fun with this. There’s no reason why we can’t have good Christian fun in the process of exposing some of these errors. Even though, this is serious business and God has the best sense of humor in the universe or we He wouldn’t put up with us.

Myth # 1: There was no letter “j” until about five hundred years ago

The letter ‘j’ first appeared about the year 800 A.D.—these are round figures—and invented by French monks to represent a sound.

Sacred namers will argue that without the symbol there is no sound. Well, without the sound to begin with, there was no need for a symbol. So, the sound came first and the symbol came later.

Their argument that because there’s no physical ‘j’—as they see it today—since there was no ‘j’ before the 1500s it was impossible for the name to be Jehovah. That’s one of the arguments they make.

The sound was there, not in English, but close to the island of England for almost 300 years before William the Conqueror set foot in England. The symbol ‘j’ was there, and you can see it in their writings. These were Latin-speaking Catholic monks who invented the character ‘j’ in the 800s. Because they were Latin-speaking Catholic monks, does that mean the letter ‘j’ is pagan? *No!* No language is sacred, no letter of itself or sound of itself is sacred or unsacred.

- it’s what we do with it
- it’s how we use it
- it’s what we teach
- it’s what we believe
- it’s how we put everything together

that makes it good or bad.

But they will argue that because this came out of Catholicism or out of France or early English that, therefore, it’s pagan and not—as they will argue—the sacred language.

The idea that Hebrew is a sacred language was invented by Cabalistic rabbis and first written about in their Targums—their paraphrased comments on the Old Testament—in the 2nd & 3rd centuries A.D. They were the ones to first begin calling Hebrew a sacred language, because they believed that *their God* made the entire universe out of the Hebrew letter characters. That it began with four special characters: JHVH, the letters transliterated Jehovah. That God made the universe and everything out of three Hebrew characters, from this alphabetic soup.

So therefore, if you can get the name just right out the sacred language you can call down the powers of the universe and use them. Brethren, that is magic, the magic of Satan the devil himself. When you have a sacred name of any sort, a sacred language of any sort, you are calling on the higher powers, but they are the *wrong* higher powers, the *wrong god*, calling on the servants of that *wrong god!*

As it has been the experience of some of the rabbis and others—even as it’s recorded in the book of Acts—yes, they’ve called down these powerful demons and the demons just about destroyed them because they didn’t get the name just right.

So, in their incantations—that you can read, they’ve been translated; they have this magical formula—that if you say it just right, in Babylonian tongues just right, dance just right and use the right chemicals and herbs just right, in the right cave with the right lighting and the right time of day or night, you can call down a spirit and it will do your bidding. If not that spirit can come down and destroy you.

Brethren who are getting involved in this do not realize that they’re calling upon Satan himself and his minions. By the time they learn and Satan exposes his fangs to the sacred namers, it’s going to be too late. He’ll devour them totally at that time, because he is ‘the god of this world’ and he’s a vicious god who is out to destroy all of God’s plan if he can.

We have to have ammunition and a sharpened sword so that we can arm ourselves, and therefore, defend ourselves.

The letter ‘j’ itself, as a small character, came into the English-speaking community at the time of William the Conqueror. So, the symbol was there—the lower case—and there was no upper case until the late 1500s or early 1600s.

Does that mean that the sound wasn’t there? *The sound was there in the English since the time of William the Conqueror.* Maybe the sound had been there among Anglo-Saxons before, I don’t know, but we do know that it goes back to the French-speaking peoples of the 800s. So, by the time the capital ‘J’ shows us, it’s already in the early or mid 1600s, and based on that sacred namers will argue that, therefore, the name Jehovah was impossible.

So, what I’ve done—and this is where the fun begins, I believe (in a proper way)—part of Tyndale’s work in Exo. 3:18-23:

from: *Debunking the Myths of Sacred Namers #1* by Carl Franklin

Myth #1: There was no letter “j” until about five hundred years ago

Tyndale published his translation of the Pentateuch in the year 1530_A....

The following example of Tyndale’s translation is taken from Exodus 5:18-6:3 (the first and last verses are not completely quoted).... Notice the use of lowercase “i” before the vowel “u” in Verse 21 below,

and the two uses of uppercase “I” before the vowels “a” and “e” in Verse 3 of the following chapter. In each of these words, “i” or “I” represents the sound of “j”.

So, for hundreds of years, at the beginning of a word followed by a vowel, ‘i’ represented the sound of ‘j’. If ‘i’ were followed by a consonant, it represented the sound of the vowel, like ‘Israel.’ You’ll see this as we go through this material.

“18 sacrifice vnto the Lorde....

unto is translated out of the Masoretic text by Tyndale using the letter ‘v.’ If I were to read this literally, as the sacred namers would have me read it...

...therefore and worke, for [Fo. IX.] there fhall...

They weren’t using the ‘s’ at that time for the leading ‘s’; the lower case ‘s’ had just come into the language because of the printers.

...no ftrawe...

For years the ‘s’ would look like our ‘f’: back in Roman times, hundreds of years back, and it was still in the language.

...be geuen you...

the ‘u’ was given for the ‘v’ sound

Notice *you*; Tyndale in translating this knew of and used ‘y’ with the *ya* sound. So, he wasn’t thinking of Yahovah when he transliterated it. It was purposely transliterated Jehovah. The ‘y’ sound was there; he uses it right here with *you*.

...and yet fee that ye delyuer...

I know that Moses had a lisp, but Tyndale wasn’t going to go that far and transposing Moses’ lisp.

...the hole...

I find it interesting that he didn’t use the ‘w’ at that time

...tale of brycke....

tally of brick

19 when the officers of the childern of Ifrael...

there’s the capital ‘I’ before a consonant

...fawe [saw] them filfe in fhrode cafe (in that he fayde ye fhall minyth nothings of youre dalye makige of...

20 brycke)

very hard to read in the English at this point

...than they mett Mofes [Moses] and Aaro [Aaron] ftondinge in...

I recommend you go through the King James Version with me so you can follow through and figure it out.

21 there waye as they came out fro Pharao, and fayde vnto them: The Lorde loke vnto you and **judge**...

judge—here the lower case ‘i’ is before a vowel, so it’s the ‘j’ sound. Later on in Acts 6:2-3

The .VI. Chapter

2 AND God fpake vnto Mofes fayng vnto him: I am the Lorde,
3 and I appeared vnto Abraham
Ifaac and **Iacob**...

Later on the printers tweaked the bottom and turned it into a ‘j’ so it represented the sound that it had all those centuries. That’s all they were doing; the sound came before the character.

an allmightie God: but in my name **Iehouah** was I not...”

Notice the ‘u’ and the capitalized beginning ‘Iehouah,’ and as we noted before the ‘u’ was used for ‘v’ sounds at that point and shortly after that it was divided up.

Printing came in and because of the necessity to standardize it the printers then added these symbols to represent sounds in their language. Any scholar like Tyndale or Reuchlin, Buechelin, Galatinus—whether they were Catholic, Protestant or neutral—any Hebrew scholar, regardless of his German upbringing, English upbringing or Italian upbringing or wherever they were, when they were taught the Hebrew and how to pronounce it they would imitate the pronunciation of the teacher.

They wouldn’t pronounce the names as the Germans, or the English did necessarily. In other words, they were all imitating the same sounds that they heard from the Hebrew grammarians who came out of Spain.

These were not Yiddish grammarians. The Yiddish community had just begun a few hundred years ago and were Cabalistic and Biblical illiterates. In almost all cases they were Talmudists, and beyond that they were Cabalistic, which is the esoteric part of Judaism. Actually many of the rabbis were teaching their people in the synagogue that it was a sin to read the Hebrew as Scripture.

The Sephardic Rabbinical Jews would preserve the Masoretic text for hundreds of years and were the ones who presented the grammars and gave the grammars to early Protestant and Catholic scholars. So, the sound came out of Spain; it didn’t

come out of Germany, so there was no possibility of the sound being ‘ya’ for Hebrew character ‘jod.’ *Impossible!* That only became a possibility at the turn of the century when Jesuit scholars, posing as Protestant scholars in this country and in Europe—Germany and England in particular—illegally changed the phonics system. When they introduced it to the English-speaking world it was though it had been there for the last 400-500 years. They introduced a modified Yiddish system and dumped the Sephardic system.

This translation by Tyndale shows the double usage of ‘i’ in the centuries before the letter ‘j’ was invented. In those times ‘i’ before a consonant, as in ‘Israel,’ represented the ‘i’ sound, and ‘i’ before a vowel as in *judge, Isaac and Jehovah*, represented the ‘j’ sound.

The ‘j’ sound was represented in the English alphabet from the earliest times. Notice also the use ‘v’ represented the vowel sound ‘u’ as in: *unto, us, deliver and drive*; and the use of ‘u’ to represent the consonant sound of ‘v’: *given, have, favor and Jehovah*.

After Tyndale wrote his translation, the use of ‘u’ and ‘v’ was reversed; ‘u’ came to represent its present vowel sound, and ‘v’ its present consonant sound. They both have the same genealogy and both trace back to symbols through history. Then they begin to break apart and begin to solidified as a vowel sound or as a consonant sound.

Sacred namers use the invention of the letter ‘j’ to argue is Jehovah is an illegitimate spelling of the Hebrew JHVH. What you see there in the Hebrew with its vowel pointings is the name that is in the Hebrew that is actually used this way in more than 6500 cases in the Old Testament.

They view Yahweh, or however they say it, as the only correct way to spell and pronounce the Divine name. They are completely ignoring the fact that the English letter ‘w’ used in the name Yahweh was invented 200 years later than the letter ‘j.’

This the kind of ammunition that we need. Every now and then you’ve got to knock on the head and it set me on the path to write this material so that our brethren can use it.

The same argument that they use against the name Jehovah could be used even more strongly against Yahweh. If we’re armed with that then you can come back and with the touché and they’re left dead in the water.

Let’s take this a little further. The use of ‘y’ was not invented until about 1500. The lower case ‘a’ was not invented until 1500. the lower case ‘h’ was not invented until 1500. In it’s present form, ‘e’ went back to 4-500_{A.D.} and the latter part of the

Roman Empire. The capital ‘Y’ was there from the 300s.

Out of the name Yahweh, only the capital ‘Y’ and ‘e’ are legitimate and you end up with ‘Ye.’ See how we can take an argument, *their argument*, and throw it right back at them, in good Christian humor and maybe a little bit of ‘righteous indignation’ depending on how hot they get, and how hot you get.

I don’t know about you, but I’ve got enough Scotch/Irish in me and tinged with German and Welsh and you put them together and you’ve got a donnybrook sometimes. You get me cranked up and you can tell I’m getting made because my ears start to get red in the lower lobes and it rises to the top. Even though it may not show in my face it will come out in words.

Even if you get to that point in the argument, hold your ground, because you’re right. Linguists will testify and we can argue the name Yahweh was impossible before 1500, it truly was.

Now, we can take that a step further. I was thinking that wouldn’t it be fun to have a ‘Wheel of Fortune’ game on this or Jeopardy. Wheel of Fortune seemed to fit; you spin the wheel and it comes on a certain amount of money and you ask for a vowel or consonant and you buy it.

Let’s take the word ‘Yahshua’ that they’re throwing at all the time in the context of the capital ‘Y’ and the rest of the characters. What are the consonants and vowels in the name in the context of the capital ‘Y’ and the rest of the characters. What are the consonants and vowels in the name *Yahshua*. It begins with a capital ‘Y’ and that can be traced back to 114_{A.D.}

The Romans only used that character when they took a word out of the Greek language and used it in Latin. They would use the ‘Y’ to represent the capital letter of that Greek words, which goes against sacred name argument even there.

The next character in the word ‘Yahshua’ is ‘a’ and came into use in 1500. So, if you were asking when the name Yahshua legitimate, you would say, ‘give me a ‘Y’ and a lower case ‘a.’ You’d be bankrupt.

What did we just read about the ‘u’ being used as a vowel? *It wasn’t used that way until after the 1500s!* It was still used un 1530 for the ‘v’ sound. So, there’s only one sound and all you end up with is a ‘Y.’ The ‘u’ in the middle of the word was still a ‘v’ at this particular time.

You can make up all kinds of names in this; we’ve got them. We don’t have to be afraid or wonder about this term Yahshua. Mary never heard

the word Yahshua. She never heard the name Yahweh. Gabriel didn’t speak to her in that language. By the way, they were using Greek, not Hebrew, which had not been used for 300-400 years. In fact, it was more than that, because Ezra had to translate in the 500s—when he started translating and formalizing the Old Testament—out of the Hebrew into the Aramaic dialect for the so-called Hebrew-speaking people in the 500s_{B.C.}

They began to use Greek in the 300s after the time of Alexander the Great, and were using it at the time of Christ in Galilee especially. They were all raised with Greek—Peter and all he disciples and Christ—it was the most Greek-speaking part of Palestine. It was the commercial center. The temple was the bank. But there was a commercial area where Matthew was sitting, on the commercial routes and taxing people coming and going. All those records had to be written in Greek. They were filed that way in Greek.

We don’t have run in terror and we can tell our people a few simple ways to defend themselves. It’s where you’re using their speed and their force, that momentum for your advantage. The next thing you know they’re lying on their verbal back. One minute it’s Yahweh, the next it’s Ya, and now it’s Yahshua.

Myth #2—There is no ‘J’ in Hebrew

Unlike Yiddish, which modern Jews speak, the Hebrew language that was spoken by Abraham and Moses...

I say this sincerely because this is what all the scholarship going back for a hundred years verifies.

...and that is preserved in the Scriptures does have the “j” sound.

So, there is a ‘j’ as a sound in the Sephardic phonetic system, in Biblical Hebrew, not Yiddish Hebrew, not Ashkenazic Hebrew. There is no physical character ‘j’ in the Hebrew, but there is a character representing the ‘j’ sound, and that’s *jod*.

The reference for this about Abraham and Moses is from a Baptist scholar. He published *Introduction to the Biblical Hebrew Syntax* in 1990. He informs us that tracing the Masoretic text and how it’s preserved: it’s consonants and then marked with the vowel sounds in the Semitic languages—we have records going back to the time of the Tower of Babel, shortly before Abraham—the best way to preserve a language is to have consonants without vowel symbols. That preserves better than having the symbols. When you do tack on the symbols then it’s like tacking on a Morse Code, where they’re set in cement forever.

Those symbols can fit everything about the language, the Semitic languages, and shows that the sounds cannot have been faked. No one could have come in at any time in history and stuck the wrong vowel points on their Jehovah and give it what they call ‘a bastard sound.’ It would be impossible because it wouldn’t fit with the language itself. It’s an impossibility to fake it and not have it obvious.

In fact, where they did fake it, God made them leave a little note out to side: *Kilroy was here!* You know what I mean; doesn’t add up and fit the language, and anyone knowing the language would know that. So, God made them leave a little note to tell on themselves and they changed Jehovah to Adonai, literally taking the character out and switching them around

Yes, they’re called emendations of the sopherim. They were done in the second century B.C. by the Levites who had begun to devalue or defame God’s name (read Malachi). They’re the ones whom God forced to leave a note for generations to come what their sin would be, right there in the margins of the Masoretic text.

From ancient times, the “j” sound has been represented by the letter *jod* (in ancient Hebrew a backward ‘f’ and in Biblical Hebrew ‘).

That ancient character, by the way, goes clear back to the time of David. There are records that go back to David’s time, so when you’re reading in Samuel about Jonathan and David, this was the Hebrew that they were using; it had the same sound.

Many of the characters, by the way, in ancient Hebrew look very much like modern English, with just a tilt up or turn them around a little bit and they look very much like modern English characters.

Although Ashkenazi Jews...

German Jews who came out of Slavic countries, and that’s the basis of their language.

...have changed the pronunciation of *jod* to the “y” sound, the Sephardic Jews have retained the original pronunciation of *jod* as “j”. The Sephardic phonetic system is acknowledged by scholars as the most accurate representation of the ancient Hebrew.

Biblical Hebrew!

I’m not referring to synagogue Hebrew, Yiddish Hebrew—whether just common on the street or used in the synagogue for liturgical purposes—this was Biblical Hebrew that you would see when you would look at a manuscript from

which Tyndale translated and the other early scholars.

The grammar that was written concerning that Hebrew is totally different and the phonic system is totally different. They give a representation of it {see *Debunking the Myths of Sacred Namers #1* at truthofgod.org}

As are all languages, Hebrew letters are classified according to the organs of speech by which they are sounded.

Your tongue, your teeth, your lips. And the passages start and stop as you go through and goes through the mouth.

Sephardic grammarians have divided the Hebrew letters... [Biblical Hebrew] ...into five classes of sound: *gutturals, labials, palatals, linguals, and dentals.*

The one we’re concerned with here is the palatals. That’s where jot fits; in this session we’re not talking about the ‘w’ sound. The ‘w’ sound changed the ‘va’ to a ‘wa’ and they changed ‘jot’ to a ‘ya.’

When they moved the Hebrew character like ‘jot’ out of the classification palatal, they moved it to a new classification for the English called a sonant. That’s where the ‘ya’ sound is in the English language.

They moved the Hebrew character ‘va’ out of its classification call a labial. In the Sephardic system they moved that symbol down to the new sonant system and it became ‘wa.’

So, they changed from a labial—‘va’—to an English sonant ‘wa’ where you don’t bring your lips together you just sort of purse them.

So, they moved those two characters down to justify the illegitimate name ‘Yahweh.’ Always before the scholars pronounced it ‘Javeh’ or ‘Java.’

I think you get the point about the language. Any Hebrew grammarian and Hebraist worth his salt always pronounced the ‘j’ sound and the ‘v’ sound. You find it that way in the ancient literature going back hundreds of years. You don’t find ‘y’ and ‘w’ until very recent times.

That was a culmination of 300 years of work of Jesuits trying to take over and ruin the English Bible. They have to destroy the veracity of the English Bible before they can bring their own Bible in. All the Catholic Bibles now have ‘Yahweh’; all of them starting in 1966, published from Jerusalem. They’re the Yahwehists, and you know where they were going from the very beginning.

By the way, the so called scholars promoted these changes. They have direct links not only to the

Catholic Church and Jesuits, but have links to Cabalists as well, going back into the occult, calling down demons and taking the doctrines of demons and bringing them into English-speaking fellowships and services.

They had destroyed the Anglican Church over a hundred years ago. So, when it was written in the book *Lord, What Should I Do?* by Fred R. Coulter, about the destruction of Protestantism, the Jesuits all but destroyed Anglicanism over a hundred and thirty years ago.

Now they had to set out to destroy American Protestantism, so they shifted everything at the turn of the century and published the material in English and began to hit the American English-speaking peoples with full violence and came down through Princeton and Harvard. They were the main conduits to come into this country from Oxford.

They had taken over Oxford a long time ago! So, through these so-called scholars, this new phonics system came in, the new push for ‘Yahweh’ came in—not Yahshua at this time. They hadn’t resurrected that, yet.

The name was invented back in the 1500s by a fellow names John Reuchlin. That’s a different myth, different story.

But we know that it came out of Egyptian, Cabalistic... It’s like soup, a terrible soup. You take all the evil of the past and throw it together in one witches brew and these characters were it. They mesmerized the world and started changing everything to the point where now most Americans, even though they might be small, little fellowships, are using the wrong Bibles and they have the wrong scholarship, wrong commentaries, a wrong Biblical dictionaries. Everything supports this evil. None of them have stood up to the material that has come down to us. If they did, it’s been destroyed!

So, if God let’s them, this will be destroyed, too. It either gets around and people begin to see it, and it gains currency among out peoples and begins to help. Or if God allows it, because they don’t want it to get around, exposing the king without his clothes. They’re naked, they have no clothes.

But they argue as though they have the pomp and ceremony and the dress of King Henry VIII. But they’re standing there naked before God! But they’re argument is—the clothes, to use that metaphor—empty and hollow.

They have all these idols of literature that’s around there and they have oppressed the history, so our people—or anybody—goes to a library and they have none of this. It took me four years to dig this out and get to this point.

You’ll notice the ‘jod’ under palatals to begin the second character, the smallest of characters, so it’s like a coma.

Palatals are consonants voiced with the aid of the palate. There are three different types of palatals: The first type is made when the part of the tongue just behind the tip is raised against or near the hard palate. The English *y* in “yes” or the German *ich* are made in this manner.

A second classification of palatal is the *fricative* sound, which is made on or near either the hard or soft palate. Fricative palatals produce the sounds *sh* and *zh*.

The third type of palatals is the *affricative* sound. The English *j* and *ch* are affricative palatals. Affricative palatals produce a sound by the slow release of a consonant followed immediately by a *fricative*. Examples are the sound of *ch* in *batch* and the *j* sound in *badge*.

(go to the next track)

The third type of palatals is the *affricative* sound. The English *j* and *ch* are affricative palatals. Affricative palatals produce a sound by the slow release of a consonant followed immediately by a *fricative*. Examples are the sound of *ch* in *batch*...

We use these terms all the time and never think about it. Why should we? We drive cars and are not mechanics. We have wire in our houses but at not electricians. We run water but are not plumbers.

This is our language that we mimic as youngsters. We hear the sound as tots and begin to form the sounds imitating our parents and those around us. We don’t think anything of us.

Sounds developed in a few places in colonial days and spread out westward across the country. You can trace them; linguists trace them.

We imitate the sound and the physical character is just as symbolic of that imitated sound. All Hebrew grammarists in Tyndale’s day from 1522 to about 1534, before he was imprisoned. He never completed his work. His translation was completed by his friend Coverdale.

All Hebrew grammarists in Tyndale’s day used the Sephardic phonics system where the ‘jod’ was classified as a palatal. That’s why Tyndale gave the ‘jod’ sound the letter ‘j.’

It was no great conspiracy. All Hebraists at that time used the same sound, especially when we

get into the interesting history of who was Galatinus? Then the real detective work begins and I'll show you how all of this was covered up. We can trace the sorted history of the lies that were just passed on from generation to generation of so-called scholars that were Catholic. So, you know who they loved and hated. Jesuit Catholics who are out to destroy English Protestantism and the English language in particular.

I truly believe that the main reason God gave us America was to keep His promise to Israel, but in particular his special promise to Joseph. I believe that God preserved His Word through Joseph and passed it on and amplified it, published it and sent it around the world through Joseph—Ephraim and Manasseh: Great Britain and the United States of America. This they have to destroy.

By the way, since the 20s or 30s, perhaps earlier, more Jesuits are produced out of American than any other country in the world.

Most Jews today have been taught that the Hebrew alphabet has no letter for the “j” sound....

They'll argue: 'I go to synagogue, I've studied the Hebrew a bit and I see the characters here and they don't have that sound.'

They don't realize the history that goes back just a few years before this, and back into the Sephardic history. Ashkenazi leaders have passed on the myth for a long time that the Sephardic Jews were the 'hillbillies' of Judaism.

They were the main scholars, the main preservers of God's Word, those who loved the Hebrew and preserved it.

So, when God transferred the Hebrew and the Greek over to the Protestant community, the Jewish community felt that Christianity was being destroyed and willingly participated with Catholics hoping that they would destroy Christianity, that is Catholicism—the only Christianity that they knew.

What happens 10-30 years down the road? All Germany is converted to Lutherism. France is converted... All the way up into Poland, Hungry and Czechoslovakia, over toward Russia into the Scandinavian countries and over into England. All that's left is a part of Italy and Spain. So, the Jews and the Catholics are both horrified. They joined in the effort now to destroy Protestantism. But the Protestants now have the grammars:

- they've inherited the truth of hundreds of years
- they've inherited the Hebrew Scripture, or it's guardian
- they inherited the literal Greek

- they have it in English and German

So, overnight tens of millions of people out of their control suddenly have the Word in their laps. Lo and behold some of these fools get on these little ships and go to America, then it really gets out of hand! These people read the Bible and take it seriously and found a new country. They kicked out the Brits and became a new country. And here comes the bashing of Protestantism and then, and only then, do you have Sabbatarianism beginning to flourish, and it started in Michigan. That's where it took root and it started to spread.

The Jesuits are going to retrace their tracks and bring it back through Andrews University and destroy the remaining elements of Sabbatarianism.

What has God done to Sabbatarian groups? We're one of them. He brought His wonderful hand down and scattered us. What's happening? *They have no idea who we are, or where we are!* Literature is popping up all over the place. There are groups that are independent fellowships that they can't possibly get control of. We know and love each other, and we're a Christian cell:

- we know our fruits
- we know it when we get up and go to bed
- we know each other as people

That's the hardest group to break into on the face of the earth. This is what God is doing to preserve His Word.

I know that we get very discourage, all of us do. I have to remind myself that in God's hand on the other side is great blessing. His Word will be preached regardless of what these other fools do.

Every time they think they've 'got them by the throat' they can't. God's Word and His work just slips out and just spreads all over the place like some kind of spiritual virus.

This Ashkenazic pronunciation of 'jod' used by all Jews of German and Polish descent is not the original pronunciation of this Hebrew letter.

As Gesenius attests, "The pronunciation of Hebrew by the modern German Jews [Ashkenazi]..."

A great German Hebraists if Jewish background, a Talmudist, probably a Cabalist. He wrote the Greek theological works that became the essence of the grammars that we have inherited today in Lexicons

...which partly resembles the Syriac and is generally called 'Polish', differs considerably from that of the Spanish and Portuguese Jews [Sephardic], which approaches nearer to the Arabic. **The**

pronunciation of Hebrew by Christians follows the latter [Sephardic] (after the example of Reuchlin), in almost all cases” (*Gesenius’ Hebrew Grammar*).

The was first written at the turn of the 1800s—1812-14—by Gesenius, whose teacher was in a university town called Halle, Germany. This teacher defended to his death that the vowel markings under Jehovah are the accurate markings.

Gesenius picked up on Judaism and began to write against the vowel markings. Not against the consonants; there was no evidence given against the consonants until the 1980s-90s. That began to be published out of Germany, just before they transferred that over here in America.

...(after the example of Reuchlin), in almost all cases.”

Reuchlin was the father of Christian grammars. He wrote the first Christian grammar in German, from the Hebrew. He lived at the time of Tyndale, Reuchlin, Galatinus, and others who were the scholars—Protestant or Catholic.

We have to remember that up until a good part of that century the Catholics never really viewed Protestants as Protestants, and Protestants didn’t view themselves as Protestants. Catholics thought the Protestants were Catholics and many Protestants thought they were still part of the Catholics experience. They hadn’t defined it that well. They knew they were split and there were major differences and going away from the pope, but they had not yet defined it as we think of Protestants and Catholics.

As we look back on history, it was a great period. All these people knew each other and they all recognized and used the term Jehovah at that time. Even though some grew up as Italians, some as Germans, some as English, some as Spanish. It was Jehovah to all of them, because that’s the way it marked in the Hebrew.

In the days of Gesenius, no reputable scholar challenged the authenticity of the Sephardic pronunciation of *jod* as “j”. Reuchlin, recognized as the leading authority of that era, followed the Sephardic pronunciation of this Hebrew letter. When Tyndale transliterated the *jod* in *jvh* with the “j” sound, to be read as Jehovah, he did so after the example of Reuchlin.

Myth # 3: The name Jehovah was invented

This the sacred namers really crow about. I

think they do themselves a great disfavor by crowing ‘sold out’ as to quote the occult scholars at the turn of the century, who write that the name of Jehovah is monstrous, is a hybrid name, is hideous, everything except beastie; although someone has probably written about that.

That is not God’s mind! His name was marked from the very beginning of the pointings pronounced as Jehovah. Does that make Jehovah a sacred name? *No!* So, why aren’t they arguing on our side for simply arguing for the name of the God of the Old Testament? It’s not sacred, but there’s nothing wrong with the term Jehovah. Nothing sacred about the ‘ya’ sound, and nothing sinful about the ‘j’ sound.

But that’s not the point. When we write about the God of the Old Testament, we have the responsibility of using God’s name properly. At that time the transliteration out of the Hebrew into English is Jehovah. Nothing wrong with that at all.

On the other side of the coin, Yahweh is an imposter. It truly is a monstrous name, truly is hybrid and hideous and should not be used by us, because I have traced it back through Gnostic records to the time of Christ.

Gnostic Jews and Gentiles alike who claim to be of ‘the way of Cain’; remember Jude writing about the ‘way of Cain’? *They used the name ‘Yahveh.’* They didn’t use the name Jehovah. The Christians were using the name Jehovah when they referred to the God of the Old Testament.

So, on the one hand Jehovah is not a sacred name, it’s a Divine name. We can use it and we should. Yahweh, on the other hand, should not be used for the God of the Old Testament, or Yahshua for the God of the New Testament.

This is what exposing these myths is all about. So, in an argument against the use of Jehovah, sacred namers claim that this name was unknown in Biblical times. They insist that the name of Jehovah is a recent invention, concocted in the 1500s by a Catholic priest.

Pray tell, how did Tyndale—who came out of England as a young man in his 20s and was on fire for God and he’s translating—in Germany, running for his life because Martin Luther had just nailed his 95 Theses to the doors of Wittenberg.

Tyndale spent a year with Luther at Wittenberg was a hunted man by the Crown of England and now by the Catholic Church. So, they write that the name Jehovah was invented by a Catholic priest.

How in the world did this poor man Tyndale, before he died, running through Europe,

being driven from pillar to post in Germany had to flee out of the printers of Germany as the Crown was coming in the front door they were going out the back with their materials, getting on a ship, quickly paying for passage and going up the Rhine to a main Jewish area for the Sephardic Jews where he studied a bit of Hebrew and continuing his work in other places. Mainly in the city of Marburg where the Saxon Duke was protecting him.

One of the interesting stories there is that many of dukes, after the Bible was translated and printed, lost their power, money and their little kingdoms. They were just there to transmit God's Word 'through the pass before the Indians cut everything off.'

How he could have gotten in touch with any Catholic on to pass the word 'Jehovah' on to him when it wasn't even an issue at that time.

Why would Tyndale accept this mess from any Catholic at this point, especially an agent of the pope. Galatinus was the pope's confessor, meaning they would get in a little box and the pope told Galatinus how his golf game was going. I mean that seriously in one sense, because the pope at that time was Giovanni DeMachi. The most liberal folks of the era would walk down the streets with their mistresses and sometimes their misters, they had both, and openly flaunting all this sin before the people of Rome, their own people. Of course, this pope was one of the main leverages for the Reformation.

They quote well-known Biblical writers and editors who support this view. These were Catholic Jesuits who were professing to be Protestants. Remember, *the Jesuits will lie and pretend to be anything and do anything, and will commit any sin to do the will of their god!* This is the vow that they take.

In the introduction to *The Emphasized Bible*, editor Joseph Rotherham writes:

"The pronunciation *Jehovah* was unknown until 1520, when it was introduced by Galatinus; but was contested by Le Mercier, J. Drusius, and L. Capellus, as against grammatical and historical propriety' (pp. 24-25)" (*The Mistaken J*, p. 17).

I brought the *Rotherham Bible* with me; this is a sacred name Bible. This is what they use. It was Rotherham that first wrote that God's name in the Old Testament—the Divine name—was sacred. It had been oppressed and was finally liberated and His name was Yahweh, and that we must correct hundreds of years of defiling God's name. He went

to the Greet text of Westcott and Hort who were occultists, Jesuits and Protestant professing scholars who led the scholarly world away from the Greek of the *King James Version*.

They also professed the perverted Hebrew of the synagogue of the rabbinic Hebrew and began to rewrite the Masoretic text. He does it in this Bible. So, this is truly monstrous as a Bible, truly a hybrid version. This is where they get it and it's the main Bible of the sacred namers. They quote him over and over again. They started their work in 1930 in Detroit and the sacred name movement has spread and spread and is now affecting our people in a major way.

Sacred namers believe that they have the real facts concerning the name Jehovah because a number of sources support this view. Among these sources is the Jewish Encyclopedia, which states, "The reading Jehovah is a comparatively recent invention. Jehovah is generally held to have been the invention of Pope Leo the 10th's confessor, **Peter Galatin...**" (De Arcanis Catholic Veritates 1518, Folio XLIII)...

He's defending the truth of the ancient Catholic Church—that's simply what it means. It was actually published in 1816 and the Jewish Encyclopedia has it around 1518 and later they say 1520. So, they can't make up their mind.

...who was followed in the use of this hybrid form by Fagius Drusius. **Van de Driesche**, who lived between 1550 and 1616, **was the first to ascribe to Peter Galatin the use of Jehovah**, and this view has been taken since his days" (vol. 7, s.v. "Jehovah").

Is it true that the name Jehovah was invented by a Catholic priest named Galatin or Galatinus? Or is this view of scholars itself an invention? Let us examine other historical and Biblical sources to shed more light on the subject.

This is where it really gets interesting. Believe me, this has been an incredible detective story and as this thing unfolded I couldn't believe my eyes. The hypocrisy, deception and the lies that have been passed down. How easy it is to deceive people who don't check the records. How easy it is to bury the records to the point where they're almost lost.

I believe that the remaining records that we have in the Protestant world will be allowed to disintegrate into dust, burned or destroyed, and just taken out of the libraries in the next few years.

For several years I researched it at the library at Andrews University. I've notice that the main library is going down hill, falling apart. They're not keeping the books up, and these are books from which I got this information, among others. The Encyclopedic works that were written at the end of the 1800s and the beginning of the 1900s that go back into the German and English literature and verify these things, when those works go we will have none of this.

We're in a 'gnat's blinking of an eye' to those works being destroyed, unless somebody preserves them on disc or copies them.

Debunking the Myths of Sacred Namers
Part 1 by Carl Franklin

Who was Galatinus?

I had a little fun with the pronunciation of the name Galatinus. And someone wrote me and totally misunderstood and thought I had not seen the quote. I had seen the quote and I know that the invention of the name is attributed to Galatinus. I wanted to know who he was; no sacred namer had ever told me or gave me any source to which I could go, other than that this man had invented the name. I wanted to know more about him and I did; what a story!

The real name of Peter Galatin, or Petrus Galatinus, was Pietro Colonna Galatino.

The Colonna family—you can go to the Catholic Encyclopedia 1912 edition, and under the name Colonna you will find they were a very wealthy merchant family, very powerful politically and religiously, and there was no difference at that time. Here's a very powerful man, not a backwoodser; he's at the top of the heap of the hierarchy of the world at this time and even becomes the confessor to Pope Leo X.

Here is a brief summary of his life and work as stated in the Catholic Encyclopaedia: "Galatino, Pietro Colonna [alias Petrus Galatinus]...

These people go by Italian names, Greek names, Latin and German names. They had four or five aliases. It was common at this time.

This is not one of the myths that I'm attacking or exposing, but sacred namers will tell you that God's name is a personal name and all names, when they're transliterated into another language they remain the same and never change. If it's Joe in one language, it's Joe in all languages. They use this same argument for Yahweh, and that God's name is personal, which it isn't, and it's transliterated literally.

If that would be so, why can't you find anybody in history that did that? So, it's another myth and this is another way of exposing it.

...Friar Minor, philosopher, theologian, Orientalist...

This man was a well-educated person; he had been schooled. He did not just walk out of the barn the day before.

...b. at Galatia (now Cajazzo) in Aplya; d. at Rome, soon after 1539; received the habit as early as 1480, studied Oriental languages in Rome and was appointed lector at the convent of Ara Coelie; he also held the office of provincial in the province of Bari, and that of penitentiary under Leo X. Galatino wrote his chief work 'De Arcanis Catholicae Veritatis'...

Catholic teaching!

...at the request of the pope, the emperor...

Maxmillian of Germany

...and other dignitaries, in 1516, at which time, owing mainly to John Reuchlin's...

Remember we mentioned the fellow who was the first Christian grammarian? This is the father of Christian grammatics and he received this information from Sephardism.

'Augenspiegel', the famous controversy on the authority of the Jewish writings was assuming a very menacing aspect. **Galatino took up Reuchlin's defence. Resolved to combat the Jews on their own ground, he turned the Cabbala against them, and sought to convince them that their own books yielded ample proof of the truth of the Christian religion, hence their opposition to it should be branded as obstinacy.** He gave his work the form of a dialogue....

Based on the style of Plato and Aristotle and the other Greek writers.

...The two conflicting Christian parties were represented by Capnio (Reuchlin) and the Inquisitor Hochstraten, O.P....

Out of Germany. He was the inquisitor for the Inquisition out of Spain.

...In conciliatory terms, Galatino responded to the queries and suggestions of the former, and refuted the objection of the latter....

He was on Reuchlin's side and refuted the work of the Inquisition.

...He had borrowed largely from the ‘Pugio Fidei’ of the Dominican Raymond Martini, remodelling, however, the material and supplementing it with copious quotations from the ‘Zohar’ and the ‘Gale Razayya’ “(1912 ed., s.v. “Galatino”).

So, these men were familiar with the Catechism, with the Talmud and with the writings of the Catholic Church.

In ‘Pugio Fidei’ written in the 1200s out of Spain, the word *Jehovah* as it appears—all by the ending ‘h’ in Tyndale’s transliteration is in those writings. The point is that Galatino himself uses the word *Jehovah* that he copied from ‘Pugio Fidei,’ Martini’s work of 1280-something.

How could he have invented the word? It’s as simple as that. Now that we have learned more about Galatinus, let us look at the name Jehovah.

Now that we have learned more about Galatinus, let us look at the assertion that he invented the name Jehovah. If Galatinus had invented the name, Jehovah would not have been known before his time. Yet it is a historical fact that the name Jehovah was known and used centuries before Galatinus finished his *De Arcanis Catholicae Veritatis*. Notice:

What they’re saying here is that this man also knew of the form Jehovah. So, from the top of the Catholic, Protestant, Jewish—the Sephardic—the form Jehovah was being used.

“But the writers of the sixteenth century, Catholic and Protestant (e.g. Cajetan [Tommaso de Vio Gaetani, died August 7, 1547, alias Cajetan Toledo...

Not only a great Reformation scholar, but the leading toward the end of the time period of the end of the 1500s as they finalized the *King James Bible* of 1611. It was his work that was most influential in deciding on the Greek and the Hebrew and the various touchy places where the translation was to be used.

This was known all over Europe; they knew the Scripture and the Hebrew and Greek. This man had written earlier, but his work was used later. In other words, at the time of Galatino this man was known as a Protestant out of Switzerland, I believe, and was a scholar of the highest repute. So, the:

—best known for his dealings with Luther; see Kingdon, *Execution of Justice in England and Defense of English Catholics*,

p. 144] and Theodore de Beze [a great Reformation scholar], **are perfectly familiar with the word [Jehovah]. Galatinus himself** (‘Arcana cathol. veritatis’, I, Bari, 1516, a, p. 77) **represents the form as known and received in his time. Besides, Drusius (loc. cit., 351) discovered it in Porchetus...**

The man Drusius is extremely interesting in the Jesuit connections later on.

...a theologian of the fourteenth century. Finally, the word is found even in the ‘Pugio fidei’ [Dagger of Faith] of Raymund Martin, a work written about 1270 (ed. Paris, 1651, pt. III, dist. ii, cap. iii, p. 448, and Note, p. 745). Probably the introduction of the name Jehovah antedates even R. Martin” (Catholic Encyclopaedia, 1912 ed., s.v. “Jehovah”).

I have references of scholars today who say it probably goes back to the 900s. that fits perfectly with the Masoretes coming out of Palestine at the time of the first Crusade across North Africa by ship, showing up in Spain and setting up shop; bringing with them the already pointed Hebrew text, preserving it, letting the grammars. All that was inherited by the time of Tyndale into the Protestant world.

Historical records clearly demonstrate that the name Jehovah was known centuries before the time of Galatinus. How, then, did the myth develop that Galatinus invented the name? Let’s take a closer look at this claim as presented in the Jewish Encyclopedia: “The reading Jehovah is a comparatively recent invention. Jehovah is generally held to have been the invention of Pope Leo the 10th’s confessor, **Peter Galatin** (De Arcanis Catholicae Veritates 1518, Folio XLIII) who was followed in the use of this hybrid form by Fagius Drusius. **Van de Driesche**, who lived between 1550 and 1616, **was the first to ascribe to Peter Galatin the use of Jehovah**, and this view has been taken since his days” (vol. 7, s.v. “Jehovah”).

Yes, it has, because the Catholic and Jesuit and the Protestant Jesuits have perpetrated and resurrected these quotes and hidden the truth.

In this article, the Jewish Encyclopedia states that a man named Van de Driesche was the first to link the name Jehovah to the works of Galatinus. But at the same time, the use of Jehovah was supported by a man named “Fagius Drusius.” Who were these men, and what shaped their views?

When we delve into historical records of the time, we find that the Jewish Encyclopedia has mistakenly combined the names “Fagius” and “Drusius,” and that these names actually belong to two different men.

So much for the scholarship! We need to read these things with open eyes and a little bit of concern, because they pass these things onto us and we just believe it’s true that they’ve done their scholarship, and indeed, *they’ve given us a snow job!*

The man who was known by the Latin name Paulus Fagius was the German scholar Paul Buechelin. The man known as Drusius, also known as Van Der Driesche, was the Dutch theologian Johann Clemens. Both men lived in the 1500’s, but Fagius died a year before the birth of Drusius....

Reincarnation? *Yes!*

...Let us examine the lives of these two men to learn the circumstances that shaped their opposing views of the name Jehovah.

Fagius—Paulus Fagius Paul Buechelin (1504-1549)

As you can see, he didn’t live very long, but he was a personal friend of Reuchlin and Luther and was a famous German scholar. He was raised a German but supported the pronunciation of Jehovah, although the ‘J’ sound is not in his native language.

As the Encyclopaedia Judaica relates, Fagius, whose real name was Paul Buechelin, was a professor of Hebrew who had studied under the great Elijah Levita. Notice:

Levita was the last and the greatest of all the Sephardic grammarians. He took all of the work of the previous 500 years and passed it onto the Protestants. He was from Spain. He worked with Buechelin in Buechelin’s printing shop in Germany.

“Fagius, Paulus (Paul Buechelin; 1504-1549), Hebraist. Born at Rheinzabern, in the Palatinate, Germany, he was professor of Hebrew first at Strasbourg and later at Cambridge. **He learned Hebrew from Elijah Levita...**

I believe Levita really means Levite.

...whom he invited to supervise the Hebrew press he established in Isny (Bavaria). He translated the following Hebrew books into Latin: Elijah Levita’s *Tishbi* (Isny, 1541; Basle, 1557) and *Meturgeman* (Isny, 1542); the Talmud

tractate *Avot* (Isny, 1541). He edited a Hebrew version of the book of Tobit with a Latin translation (Isny, 1542); the *Alphabet of Ben Sira* (Isny, 1542), and David Kimhi’s commentary to Psalms 110 (Constance, 1544). He edited several chapters of Targum Onkelos (Strasbourg, 1546)...

These are written in Aramaic and there are paraphrases. In other words, expressing their opinion of what the Hebrew means in the Jewish community at any given time.

...and wrote an exegetic treatise on the first four chapters of Genesis, (*‘Exegesis sive expositio dictionum hebraicarum literalis in quatuor captiula Geneseos,’* Isny, 1542). He was the author of an elementary Hebrew grammar (Constance, 1543) and of two books, *Liber Fidei seu Veritatis* and *Parvus Tractulus*, in which he endeavored, with reference to Jewish sources, to prove the truth of Christianity....

Mistake! You go to the Hebrew and Greek and the English from those to do that.

...He began the republication of a revised edition of the concordance *Me’ir Nativ*. After his migration to England, where he died, this work was completed by Reuchlin (Basle, 1556)” (vol. 6, s.v. “Fagius”).

We find additional information about the life and work of Fagius, or Beuchelin, in The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, which states that he also studied under the renowned Reuchlin. Fagius was a “German theologian; b. at Rheinzabern (9 m. s.e. of Landau), Rhenish Bavaria, 1504; d. at Cambridge, England. Nov. 13, 1549. He studied at Heidelberg (1515) and at Strasburg (1522), **where Capito [Johann Reuchlin] taught him Hebrew...**

So, he studied under Capito and Reuchlin, the two greatest scholars of the time.

...he became rector of the school at Isny, 1527...

Ten years after the Reformation began. This was in Germany, a Protestant theologian, a native German.

...was a student of theology at Strasburg, 1535; returned as Evangelical pastor to Isny, 1537; and became pupil in Hebrew of Elias Levita; **he succeeded Capito as pastor and theological professor in Strasburg, 1542.** Violently opposed to the Interim...

a tract that was written

...when it was introduced (1549), he accepted Cranmer's invitation to come to England and **became professor of Hebrew at Cambridge** and soon died of a fever. Under Queen Mary...

A Catholic English queen of Scotland

...his and Butzer's bones were exhumed and burned (Feb. 6, 1557) and their university honors were taken from them; but Queen Elizabeth ordered that the university formally restore to them their honors (July 22, 1560)" (vol. IV, s.v. "Fagius").

The Fagius of history was the German Hebraist Paul Buechelin, a Reformation scholar and a Protestant theologian! Buechelin was one of the leading Hebrew scholars of his generation, having studied under the greatest Christian Hebraist of all, Johann Reuchlin. He had also studied Hebrew under the greatest of all the Sephardic Hebraists, Elias or Elijah Levita. Beuchelin's expertise in Biblical Hebrew was acknowledged by all Protestant scholars of his day, and his qualifications are still unquestioned by the scholarly community today.

We don't know who Faguis is, yet. But for this fellow to say that this man just came along and was willy-nilly in favor of Jehovah, a hybrid name invented by Galatinus, is really quite something to say. Besides being a lie, it's quite a bold lie. It was picked up by Catholic scholars and passed on, even though Drusius, supposedly a Protestant.

We haven't gotten to Drusius, yet; but Drusius was of the area of Flanders. That's the kind of Dutch he was. At the time Drusius lived, King Philip II of Spain controlled the Netherlands.

Under William LaVorgna in the late 1500s they began to revolt and break away, but that took a good many years before that was fully complete. Some of the main ports broke away, but the lower part of Holland, that is today Holland, was made up of a section that is know in France today as Belgium. And part of that came modern Netherlands.

That part was still controlled by Philip of Spain, and by the Spanish Crown until way late in the 1600s. Some of the greatest brutality was in this area, and this was where the Jesuits were working the most feverishly.

The Jesuits of this area were writing the Douay-Rheim version of the Bible. They were also masterminding the planning for the Spanish Armada.

So, the pope—through the Jesuits of this region, right across from Britain—were masterminding a twofold attack through a new Bible and through the Spanish Navy coming up and recapturing England, coming in with a new Bible and taking everything back.

Based on the teaching he had received from the learned Reuchlin and the great Elias Levita, Buechelin--or Fagius--supported the use of Jehovah as the true pronunciation of the Hebrew name *jvhv*. No one could convince this leading Protestant scholar that the name Jehovah was invented, because he had been taught by the most knowledgeable Hebrew scholars of his day. He was thoroughly familiar with the letters of the Hebrew alphabet and the pronunciation of every consonant and vowel marking. His expert knowledge of the Hebrew language formed a solid basis for his use of the name Jehovah as a legitimate pronunciation of the divine name.

No invention here!

Historical records confirm that the man known as Fagius--in reality, Paul Buechelin, leading German scholar and professor of Hebrew—was eminently qualified to evaluate the legitimacy of the name Jehovah. However, soon after the death of Fagius, another man came on the scene, promoting a very different view of Jehovah. This man, known by the Latin name Drusius, was none other than the Dutch theologian Johann Clemens—also known as Van Der Driesche. As quoted earlier in an article from The Jewish Encyclopedia, it was Van Der Driesche who first claimed that the name Jehovah was invented by Galatinus.

Was this view of the name Jehovah based on unbiased scholarship and careful consideration of the historical facts, or was it the result of outside influences and glossing over the records of history? Let us investigate the life of Van Der Driesche, or Drusius, to find the answer.

**Drusius: Van Der Driesche
Johann Clemens (1550-1616)**

Jesuits were picking up steam from 1534—that's when they were chartered—and they were gaining pockets of great influence in certain areas, from with Drusius came.

The Encyclopaedia Judaica states the following: "Drusius (Van Der Driesche),

Johann Clemens (1550-1616). Dutch theologian, Hebraist, and Bible scholar....

I think they're being generous here. How are we going to find out how good these people are? All they have to do is state that these are great men and pass it on through history and bite that hook, line and sinker and we're dead. They've setup a 'straw man,' an artificial scholar.

...A native of Oudenarde (East Flanders), he was professor of oriental languages at Oxford (from 1572) and later in Leiden, Ghent, and Francker. Drusius wrote...

He was the present theologian. But that means nothing at this time, because the Jesuits would willingly come in and lie, claiming to be Protestants, work their way in and then take over the institution and being to influence the writing and all the literature that came out.

...several books on Hebrew grammar, including *Alphabetum ebraicum vetus* (1587) and *Grammatica linguae sanctae nova* (1612). *Nomenclator Eliae Levitae*, a book on Elijah Levita's works (1652), was written in collaboration with his son Johann and many other scholars. He wrote several works on biblical exegesis" (vol. 6, s.v. "Drusius"). Note: Either the editors of the *Encyclopaedia Judaica* erred in their dates, or Drusius worked on his book on Elijah Levita's works posthumously. Drusius died in 1616.

Referenced:

- Study Papers: *Debunking the Myths of Sacred Namers* (parts 1, 2 & 3) by Carl Franklin
- Sermon: *De-Mythologizing the Divine Name* (Carl Franklin)
- Books:
 - ✓ *Introduction to the Biblical Hebrew Syntax* by Bruce Waltke and Michael O'Connor
 - ✓ *Lord, What Should I Do?* by Fred R. Coulter
 - ✓ *Emphasized Bible*, editor Joseph Rotherham

CF: bo
Transcribed: 9/17/17