

The Name Above All Names

What is the Name Above All Names? Is it the Greek name, *Jesus*, or is it a Jewish name? A disciple of Him has the right to know the very *name* and the pronunciation that not only did Gabriel the angel call Him, but also the name He called Himself, speaking in the Hebrew language as recorded in Acts 26:14-15.

Acts 22:14 tells us that Paul heard an utterance from His mouth. What then was that utterance of His name, since He spoke in *Hebrew*? Was it *Yahoshua* as some Christians now say? Many names are used: *Yeshua*, *Yahshua*, *Yashua*, *Joshua*, *Y'shua*. Shouldn't we be able to know His name? Shouldn't all believers agree about the essential doctrines of the faith?

And there is salvation in no one else; for there is no other name under heaven that has been given among men, by which we must be saved (Acts 4:12). Should not a man be called by the same name all over the world? In Acts 7:45 of the older King James Bibles, Stephen calls Joshua of the Old Testament *Jesus*.

Why did he call him *Jesus*? Did Stephen make a mistake or was it the translators? Was that a mistake in the Scriptures or just a human error in the translation? Did the translator just happen to insist on *Jesus* here by mistake? In the newer King James Version that they changed this *Jesus* to *Joshua* (as do the rest of the translations). Where did they get their authority to change the Scriptures?

The very same thing happened in Heb 4:8, For if *Jesus* had given them rest, then would he not afterward have spoken of another day (Heb 4:8, KJV)

In the older translation it is *Jesus*, but in the newer, *Joshua*. Who was it, *Jesus* or *Joshua*? But what is really confusing about all of this is, if the new translations changed *Jesus* to *Joshua* in Acts 7:45 and Heb 4:8, why didn't they also change *Jesus* to *Joshua* in Mt 1:21, Lk 1:31, and all the other places where the Scriptures say *Jesus*? Isn't His name *Joshua* instead of *Jesus*? If it would be tampering with the Scriptures to change *Jesus* the Savior's name back to *Joshua*, would it not also be tampering with the Scriptures to change *Jesus* back to *Joshua* in Acts 7:45 and Heb 4:8? We want to *know* God's mind about these things because it doesn't make sense that the translators would change the Holy Scriptures in one place and not the other.

It is certain that Mirriam and Yoceph named the child just as the angel commanded them in Lk 1:31 and Mt 1:21.

Would the angel speak to them in Hebrew or did he speak Greek? Everything would be more understandable if he spoke Greek to them. Then *Jesus* was exactly what came out of his mouth and we today pronounce His name exactly as the angel did. However, there seems to be a mix-up somewhere along the line. Why is there a mix-up? Should not God reveal to His followers the name above all names to whom every knee shall bow and every tongue shall confess? Will everyone call Him a different name or will they say it right? Will it be revealed to them at the last moment? That is, His true name, the one Gabriel spoke. The same name Paul heard when the Savior spoke to him in Hebrew (Acts 26:14-15). Will His name suddenly be revealed to everyone when they confess His name or will everyone just utter some distortion of it? Will Phil 2:10 be in every language or in Hebrew, or is it not important that we should know His name today? Many different countries do not know the name *Jesus*. They call Him by another name. Why doesn't everyone in the world who trusts in His name call Him by His Hebrew name? They could learn to pronounce it by a little discipline of their tongues. That would solve the problem, which is a great problem. Should not all who believe in Him be *one*, without any divisions, if we have all believed through the *apostle's* word? (1 Cor 1:10; Jn 17:11-23).

What about the voice some people, or at least Paul, heard from heaven speaking in the Hebrew language in Acts 26:14-15 (Acts 9:7, 22:9 NRSV). We want to call Him who spoke here in Hebrew exactly what He called Himself. We want to use the exact pronunciation of the utterance of His mouth; the same name Saul called upon when he was saved, when his sins were washed away. We want to be able to call upon this name myself and tell others to call upon this very same name that Saul called upon in Acts 22:13-16. That was where Ananias, a Greek brother (or was he Hebrew with a Greek name?) commanded Paul to not delay but to arise and be

baptized and wash his sins away, calling on His name (Acts 22:13-16).

Paul must have called on the same name that he heard the Sovereign call himself in Acts 26:14-15 in the Hebrew language. Acts 4:12 says that there is no other name under heaven by which we must be saved. It is more than just semantics here, but something fundamental. Our God is just, loving, kind and understanding also in our ignorance. He is patient and slow to anger. But still we want to know His name as He pronounced it.

What about Acts 13:6? *Bar-Jesus* is clearly footnoted to explain that the translators were faithful to call Joshua's name *Jesus* every time they saw it. Yet many translators change it back to *Joshua* here but not in the case of the Son of God. They hang on to *Jesus* for the sake of the sale of a Bible. Is this true or untrue?

In Jn 17:11-12, our Master prayed that His Father would keep the disciples in the name of the Father the name He gave Him. In 2 Cor 11:4, Paul mentions *another Jesus*. Is this the cause of all the different sects and divisions that have been the result of different preachers in Christianity? According to Jn 17:21-23 how could the world believe that God sent the Son if we are not one, having the very same unity as the Son has with the Father? Isn't this the fellowship or common life the apostle John is speaking of in 1 Jn 1:3,6,7 or was John speaking of unity in his own little group he was writing to — being divided from Peter, Paul, etc.?

How will these things come about so that the world might believe in this age? We want to understand these things according to God's word. In Jn 13:34-35 our Master said men will know who His disciples are because they will love one another as He has loved them. Such men must have the love of God in them as defined by 1 Jn 3:14,16,17, capable of judging every form of greed, having sold all to make treasures for themselves in heaven (Lk 12:15,33). Apart from this how will anyone ever know who His disciples are or if He even has any? (Jn 13:35).

Is His name *Yehoshua* or *Yahoshua*? This is important because it has to do with what God's name is. First of all, is God's name *Jehovah* or *Yahweh*, there being no *J* sound in Hebrew? We can see *Yehoshua* being the Son's name if God's name is *Jehovah*. But if it is *Yahweh*, then it would indicate *Yahoshua*, since the Son came in His Father's name (Jn 17:6,12), and *Yah* is the Father's name. This is obvious from Rev 19, where *Halleluyah* means *praise to Yah* (and so the Psalms). *Yah* is the universal name of God (Jn 5:43).

There is a Bible called the *Rotherham Emphasized Bible* by Joseph Bryant Rotherham. He uses *Yahweh* in place of *the Lord*. Most Bibles translate Hos 12:5 as *The Lord is His name*. But how could *the Lord* be His name? This is not what Pr 30:4 is talking about.

Are translators tampering with the Scriptures when they change *the Lord* to *Yahweh*? Is not this the same as changing *Jesus* to *Joshua* in Acts 7:45 and Heb 4:8? Now if the Scriptures are God-breathed and considering that most Christian teachers say that the writers of the Scriptures actually wrote *Jesus* down, in light of Rev 22:19 (which many apply to all the books of the Bible) are they not accursed? Does this mean that the translators of the New American Standard Bible are cursed for changing *Jesus* to *Joshua* in Acts and Hebrews? It seems to me that if the translators were to be cursed for anything, it would be for not also changing *Jesus* to *Joshua* in the places where His name appears elsewhere in the New Testament Scriptures, if His name is *Joshua*.

In the introduction of the Emphasized Bible, Mr. Rotherham sets out the rationale for suppressing the name of God, YHWH, beginning on page 22. On page 25 he concludes, "the name YHWH should be restored." Why? Because its suppression was a mistake. So grave a mistake cannot be corrected too soon.

All believers everywhere should call Him by His real name in due respect for Him. Likewise His Son should be called by His real name in all due respect for Him. If *Yah* is the universal name of God and Jn 17:6,11,12, 26 is true, then we know His Son's name — YAH SHUA.

But as Mr. Rotherham points out, the Messiah used the tetragrammaton in the common title *Lord*. He used that version as it stood in the Ps 110:1 in Mt 22:44. It is a declaration of YHWH to my Lord, *The Lord said to my God*, which does not make much sense. Evidently by Heb 1:13 and 10:13, *The Lord is Yahweh* and *my Lord is Yahshua* (Ps 110:1; Heb 1:13; 10:12-13).

Mr. Rotherham said that Jesus Christ was not a scribe or literary critic; His mission was much higher. But He had to please His Messiahship at the bar of the Scriptures then current, and any criticism by Him of the nation's sacred documents might have placed a needless obstacle in the people's path. He used this as a plausible argument for having the Name veiled as it is now. The use of *Jesus* would also have presented an obstacle, for the Jews detested Greek as much as they did swine's flesh (at least that is what Earnest Renan said in his *Messiah, not Christ* pamphlet, page 324 of his *Life of Jesus*).

Yet so great is the weight of tradition that if we or any other group uses the name *Yahshua*, we would automatically be regarded as way out of the mainstream of Christianity, even a cult. Yet isn't His true name in need of restoration based on scholarship and historical evidence. Since our Lord said all things must be restored and made ready for His second coming, this must surely include His name. It must include as well everything else that has fallen into obscurity, such as the word *unity*. The meaning of unity or oneness between all who believe in Him through the apostles' word has fallen into obscurity (Jn 17:20). Jn 14:26 is important to note as well, since the word of God, Himself, said it.

Unity, the Oneness of all Believers

This precious treasure in His word that made all the difference in the early days of the church has fallen into disrepute. It does not seem important anymore about the unity of the church or His name. Everyone is satisfied in his own denomination, his own panelled house (Hag 1:4). Oneness is obscure, it is held in a state of low esteem. It is obscure because it is hidden. It is hidden because the prophetic light has not been shined upon it so it is hidden as if shrouded in the darkness. Therefore it is not clearly seen or understood. But who today can shed light upon it since each comes from his own sect or denomination which no one will admit is a division. Because of this willful blindness, unity or oneness is obscure and held in disrepute.

It is not held high as the meaning of our existence as followers of Messiah, those endowed with the Holy Spirit, who is one without any divisions or barriers. If God's word is true in Gal 3:28 and Col 3:11, how can people be divided by race, temperament, educational level, wealth, and political party affiliation? (Gal 3:28; Col 3:11; Phil 2:2-4; 14-16). Did Paul labor in vain?

Are they not supposed to be one through the blood and Spirit of the Lord?

The obvious lack of such unity in Christianity today is testimony to the lack of prophetic light. If there were such light then there would be an observable unity in order that the world may believe that the Father sent the Son. Where is the grace and authority to bring God's people to the obedience of the faith? (Rom 1:5).

Can the world see oneness in His disciples today? Unity has fallen so low and is held in such darkness that Christians believe it is no longer possible to be one as the Lord prayed. His prayer was that the world would believe in this age. He was not referring to the next age or in heaven somewhere.

His name has also fallen into obscurity and darkness. It too is held in low esteem and disrepute. The prophetic word is the need of the hour, to which you do well to pay attention as to a lamp shining in a dark place until the day dawns and the morning star arises in your heart. But know this, no prophecy can come forth from darkness -- from any one sect, division or denomination. So it must come from without.

That is why Mt 17:11 is so important to understand. If prophetic utterance came forth from anyone who is a part of a Christian denomination, whether Catholic or Protestant or Greek Orthodox, it would be by an act of human will. Only man moved by the Holy Spirit, in whom there is no division, speaks from God. 2 Pet 1:19-21 — The restoration of all things must come through that prophetic word as a lamp shining in a dark place, until the revelation of Yahshua shines fully in our hearts. When men are moved by the Holy Spirit they speak from God (Jn 7:17-18; 1 Jn 4:6; Lk 10:16; Jn 6:44).

Satan cannot cast out Satan. Anyone who prophesies from division cannot cure division. How can one call people to unity if he won't let go of the seed of disunity? Therefore the call must come from outside the camp (Heb 13:12-13).

The day of 1 Pet 2 is still waiting for the light to break forth through the gloom. The day must dawn. Now there is but dim light cast on these subjects. When those in denominations hear about unity, oneness and Jn 17:21, they try harder to be one with their brothers and sisters on Sunday morning or with their family

They become more friendly with each other for a while. They try to work out a way in their busy schedule to visit a fellow church member and help them in some way or other. But it doesn't even get over to the other denominations. Yet Jn 17:21 says explicitly that all may be one, not just members of your own denomination. "Well, it's got to start somewhere" is the excuse offered.

This is a living example of the darkness that dwells in a squalid and dark place. A squalid place is marked by filthiness and degradation from neglect because no light has been let in to expose the degradation. The place Peter is speaking of is a destitute or demoralized state. The church today is in a state of moral and intellectual decadence. It is in a state of degeneration deprived of standing for its true function. It has been stripped of rank and brought into low esteem and disrepute. The light is dismal so the place is dismal too. There is a general lack of interest in unity and oneness because the false prophets have said "Peace, Peace," when there is no peace.

Peace means a state of security or order within; a state of mutual concord between members in Israel, in the church. This is not denominational peace or unity, but agreement in every place that He has caused His name to dwell (1 Cor 1:2,10; 1 Tim 2:8).

This is where one can worship. No one can worship and offer up sacrifices in disunited unity. There is no such thing. So, is there any hope, that light could emerge so bright as to dissolve the corruption of the word of God? Does Isa 49:6 has any validity for today's church? Or is it to be put off somewhere in the next millennium? The apostle's word that produces unity (Jn 17:20) is the gospel of the Kingdom that produces the commonwealth of Israel (Eph 2:12; 1 Pet 2:9). This message, this good news, is the fire our Master spoke of (Lk 12:49). Without the fire there will be no light.

To sum up, the way to derive the true name of the Son of God is Jn 17:11-12 and Rev 19:1-8. The name of God as verses 1 and 2 show is *Yah*, from *Halle-lu-yah*, praise to Yah (Pr 30:4).

The Son came in the Father's name (Jn 5:43) and His children are one without any division. There are no denominational divisions in baptism for they are kept in His name, the name He gave the Son of God. He is the Savior, YAH SHUA, powerful to save and keep in His name (Jn 17:6,11,12,20-23,26; Eph 4:2-6).