

Yeshua, YaHshua, or Jesus ?

The Christ's Name, is it Yeshua, or YaHshua, or Jesus?

Part 1 of 3 ([Part 2](#)) ([Part 3](#))

The following article is by Dr. Daniel Botkin

Comments added by your *servant* and author of this web site: *Servants Comments*

[Dr. Daniel Botkin explains the Hebrew linguistics of the names "Yeshua" and "Yahshua" and how "Yahshua" is a mistransliteration by Sacred Name advocates to fit an erroneous interpretation of John 5:43 and how "Yeshua" is far more accurate. He also clearly establishes the fact that the English name "Jesus" has absolutely no pagan connection and is simply a derivation of "Yesous," the Greek transliteration of "Yeshua." Most important, Dr. Botkin addresses that slander and criticism surrounding the name controversy in entirely non-Scriptural and not glorifying to the Holy One of Israel].

Servant's Note: Go to this link for a definition of the word [TRANSLITERATION and Translation](#), they are different and need to be understood to get a grasp of this article. *The above statement was attached to this article by Dr. Botkin and I left it in so the reader can get a sense of the kind of reasoning we are up against from the critics of restoring our Savior's Name to its original form, as a proper transliteration in favor of a name far removed from the original, or a proper transliteration.*

When I say we I mean those of you that already understand the name "Yeshua" is no more our Savior's name than is the bogus name "JESUS". It will be my goal to point out where the error is made in accepting or teaching this error. You will read that the Name YaHshua is a missed-[transliteration](#) while the name Yeshua is "far more accurate".

For this article we need to first establish which of the two choices being discussed is a "far more accurate" transliteration. Every source concerning the study of the Bible admits the name Yeshua is a later development from the earlier name, YeHoshua and YeHushua. Also it should be noted that the vowel "e" was and is supposed to be pronounced as the "long" "ee" thus producing a letter sound nearly identical to today's "a" vowel as in the word "Jaw" or "all". The "e", however, in the Name YeHoshua and as used in Yeshua has adopted the short form as

in the word, “yes” so the transliteration is no longer valid but when an “a” vowel is used the proper transliteration is restored and this is what nearly everyone ignores. They forget the “a” and the “e” are only vowels and not the original parts of the purity of the name. As an example that should set the stage for clarifying the rightly dividing the truth we only need look at the Name of the God of Israel as found in the Hebrew Scriptures (Torah).

YHWH is recognized by all as His Name and is call [“Tetragrammaton”](#), a Greek meaning for “four letters” and these four letters when pronounced is YaHWeH, which is accepted by nearly everyone, Jew and Gentile alike, though the Jew is more apt to stir clear of making a direct reference to this Name, preferring to use terms like, HaShem (The Name). Those willing to recognize YaHWeH, using the “a” vowel suddenly become nervous or reject the idea of using the “a” vowel in the transliteration of our Savior’s Name and in fact opt for not only use the short “e” but for dropping the transliterated “H” which is an actual part of the Name – YHWH. How do they explain this? They don’t, they plow merrily along in an effort to convince you and themselves that Yeshua is the “more accurate” because this will then lead them to the answer they really want and that is that the bogus name Jesus, is but a transliteration of Yeshua.

Even if we were to accept that as true it would be wrong. Yeshua, and Jesus do not come out as [transliterations](#) of one another, being pronounced completely different, only alike in appearance and, as we shall see, neither is a transliteration of the ORIGINAL YeeHoshua – see how difficult it is to pronounce the Name even when the long “ee” is supplied – the more accurate today is actually, YaHoshua, YaHushua, and YaHshua.

Now to the article by Dr Daniel Botkin, in "blue" font:

The Messiah's Hebrew Name: "Yeshua" Or "Yahshua"?

by Dr. Daniel Botkin

The Messiah’s Hebrew name is usually transliterated as either *Yeshua* or *Yahshua*. Under normal circumstances I would not bother to write an article about something as trivial as the difference between the vowel sounds "e" and "ah." There is a need to address the subject, though, because some people who use the *Yahshua* form say untrue things about those who use the *Yeshua* form. The opponents of the *Yeshua* form claim that this pronunciation is the result of a Jewish conspiracy to hide the Savior’s true name. Those who call the Messiah *Yeshua* are accused of perpetuating a Jewish conspiracy and "denying His name" or "degrading Him" by their use of the *Yeshua* form. If you have never read or heard these outlandish accusations, you probably will eventually. From time to time I receive personal letters to this effect.

Servant’s Comment: Dr Botkin begins with a wrong assumption right from the start. Notice the comparison with the “e” and the “ah” and you have to ask why is the “h” included here? Why, in the comparison, isn’t it “eh” and “ah”? Actually it should be a comparison of the two vowel the “e” and the “a” and as I stated above in my opening statement the “ee” is not being used and the “a” vowel is more appropriate today. The reason it is a comparison of “ah” is because this is a sound the Hebrews use and is in many of there words but what is ignored is that in this case the “h” is an actual part of the

Name of the Hebrew God YH-WH, and not a part of the vowel sounds. In the view so simple as to suggest it is a battle between the “e” and the “ah” is ridiculous on the grounds it leads to cutting the God of Israel’s Name in half, from YH to Y and then going so far as to suggest the “e”, a vowel, is the replacement. If you can see this then you can understand how very intelligent men can error, all that is need it to begin with a wrong assumption, a wrong number in the equation and you have a wrong answer.

The proponents of the *Yahshua* form claim that the Messiah’s name was the same as Joshua’s, written [vwhy or [vwwhy (Strong’s #3091). The only problem is that neither of these Hebrew spellings of Joshua’s name can possibly be pronounced "Yahshua." The third letter in Joshua’s name (reading from right to left) is the letter *vav* (w) and a *vav* cannot be silent. The letter *vav* must be pronounced as either a "v" or an "o" or an "u." (In the case of *Joshua*, it takes an "o" sound, giving us "Ye-ho-SHU-a." Strong’s confirms this pronunciation.) For a name to be pronounced "Yahshua," it would have to be spelled [wv--hy, and no such name exists anywhere in the Hebrew Bible. You don’t have to just take my word for it, though. Dr. Danny Ben-Gigi says of the *Yahshua* form that "there is no such name in Hebrew" and that "people invented it to fit their theology."^[1] Dr. Ben-Gigi is an Israeli and the former head of Hebrew programs at ArizonaStateUniversity. He is the author of the book *First Steps in Hebrew Prayers*, and he designed and produced the "Living Israeli Hebrew" language-learning course. Dr. David Bivin, a Christian, says that the *Yahshua* form "is rooted in a misunderstanding."^[2] Dr. Bivin is a renowned Hebrew scholar and teacher and author of *Fluent Biblical Hebrew*.

Servant’s Comment: *This is all true but look at how the shoe fits – in the name Yeshua this also applies but the scholars and critics such as Dr. Botkin, are all too willing to accept the mis-pronounced Yeshua, without the “O’ and without the “H”, at least, in this discussion, the Name YaHshua has not dropped the “H” also as we see in the name, Yeshua. But wait, there is more, remember we are told the “e” (Wikipedia article: Pronunciation -Yeshua The Hebrew letter Yod is vocalized with the Hebrew vowel /e/ (a 'long' e like the first syllable of "neighbor") being used in the Strong’s pronunciation is supposed to be the “long” “ee” which has the same (nearly identical) sound of the way the modern vowel “a” is sounded, just as the Wikipedia article points out in its example in the word, **neighbor**. Also remember, the “long” “ee” is never used anymore by those pronouncing Yeshua as a transliteration and it is no longer used in pronouncing YeHoshua either, if it were it would sound like, YaHoshua, or YaHushua -- seeing then, it has been changed and the "e" vowel is applied incorrectly in todays language as a proper transliteration of the Original Name. Go to this link for even more proof - [YaHshua's Name](#)*

Once this is settled all you are left with is the adding or the dropping of the letter “o” which is a minor point as this merely changes the definition of the Name YH (YaH) from “salvation” to “savior” as in “my salvation” or His “salvation” or Savior and both would be correct as a statement found in His Name. YaHoshua, or YaHushua is to say, YaH my Salvation, or YaH is Savor and there are other alternatives such as YaH is His Savior and YaH is Salvation, and Yah Savior, etc., but you will notice the constant is in the Name, YaH which some claim or recognize as the short form of the name YHWH

(YaHWeH). I personally recognize this as a complete Name YH, either way it proves the error of dropping the "H" from the name, which everyone seems so willing to do?

I do not know of a single individual that knows Hebrew well enough to actually read it and understand it and converse in it who uses the *Yahshua* form.

Please do not misunderstand. A person does not need to know Hebrew and Greek linguistics in order to be spiritual. However, if a person is going to take it upon himself to instruct others about subjects of a linguistic and Hebraic nature, he should know the Hebrew language and he should know some basics about linguistics. This is especially true if he is going to use his Hebrew-based linguistic teachings to accuse his brethren of being part of a "Jewish conspiracy" to "deny the true name of the Messiah."

***Servant's Comment:** This is exactly true, these linguist and Hebraic experts should know, right? But look at how they violate the definition of "transliteration". So, the Hebrew Bible does not contain the Name YaHshua, but it does contain the Name YeHoshua and with the restoring or the "e" to the **long form** we actually have YaHoshua. True, the Jewish scholars do not write it as such, in fact the Hebrew scholars and Biblical linguists use the "admitted" later form of Yeshua most often, and they call this, when backed into a corner, the "short form" -- why use a short form when you have the original? Now why would they do this? Why replace the earlier form, of YeHoshua with Yeshua a version that is not a transliteration of the earlier and original form (according to them) of YeHoshua? Remember a "transliteration" is not a "translation". A transliteration means to reproduce a word or letter from one language to another in its original sound, so the name or word may be pronounced as the original but the name they, the critics, prefer does not do this, while, YaHoshua, or YaHshua does produce the proper transliteration.*

*So, YaHshua, is not seen in the Hebrew writing, but guess what, the original Hebrew writing, like those of the New Testament writings, are lost. All we have, and all they have, are copies and when we look into this more closely we find the modern Hebrew it is nothing like the ancient Hebrew. With this in mind, we can come to an easy conclusion -- the forms of His Name are presented to the world by Jewish translators actually following in the foot steps of the English and this is clearly seen in the Jewish translations of, *The Holy Scriptures According To The MASORETIC Text*, where credit is given to the English and we find the same admissions, including the importance of the Greek in helping to restore or develop a modern Hebrew translation in the Preface of the TANAKH of the Holy Scriptures, called the Jewish Bible.*

Looking in the prefaces of this Hebrew/English translations you will find the admitted influence the Greek Septuagint had and has on this translation, and the English traditions also given credit as an influence. Can we count on the Jewish scholars to deliver the Holy Name of God to us? Will they proclaim His Name to the World? Have they glorified His Name? Do they Glorify and Proclaim His Name in their translations? The answer is, NO, to all of these questions. Should we then rely on the Jewish scholars and translations, even in the Hebrew, remembering modern Hebrew is not original, to give us the Name of our Creator and Savior in a properly transliterate form? Again, the answer is, no.

A transliteration does not have to appear the same to everyone, it merely has to reproduce the intended sound or pronunciation of the original. For example, in other languages the name of Obama remains Obama, and Bush remains pronounced as Bush. There may be alternate spellings but the sounding out of the names will, or should, remain very close to the original and this is not what we see when using the name Yeshua, which the Jewish Scribes have so generously supplied in their translations. Still, the original name has not been completely hidden as we do find, in a very few places, the Name YeHoshua which is the proper name for Joshua of the Old Testament. Joshua is a better transliteration of the original than Yeshua and most definitely better than the bogus name "Jesus". Joshua is found in the form of a complete book of the Torah and according to Strong's, as quoted by Dr. Botkin, H3091 has the spelling of --- Wait a minute, he does not really give the spelling as presented by Strong's Hebrew Dictionary, so why don't we do just that? Here is Strong's presentation of H3091 for the name Joshua:

H3091

y^oh^oshu^a? y^oh^oshu^a?

yeh-ho-shoo'-ah, yeh-ho-shoo'-ah

From [H3068](#) and [H3467](#); *Jehovah-saved; Jehoshua* (that is, Joshua), the Jewish leader: - Jehoshua, Jehoshuah, Joshua. Compare [H1954](#), [H3442](#).

You will notice the "e" vowel posted as a "vowel" and not an actual part of the Name. Remember, Strong's Dictionary was composed before the "J" letter was pronounced, or transliterate as we see in the word "Just" – it used to be pronounced as we do the "Y" in Yawn.

To people who actually know Hebrew – people like Dr. Ben-Gigi, Dr. Bivin, and others – it is very obvious that those who insist on the *Yahshua* form know very little about the Hebrew language. The only Hebrew that most of these self-appointed scholars know is what they can learn from a Strong's Concordance.[3] Strong's is a great study tool and a fine place to start, but it is not a means by which a person can learn the Hebrew language.

Servant's Comment: *Well, pat us on our pointed heads and slap me in the face for being of such low rank. Those of us not hampered by higher education are in good company as we read the Apostles, save Paul, were an uneducated lot, gaining their instruction from the common sense of the Spirit and from the Holy Words of Scripture. What a concept, imagine, using you brain for something other than calm acceptance.*

They say YaHshua is a sign of a lack of knowledge, "...know very little about Hebrew language", and this is true, but as we have already discovered, Modern Hebrew is not ancient Hebrew and some changes have occurred. They say YaHshua is not in the

Hebrew Bible? Please, let me invite you to read the article, [YaHshua's Name In Scripture?](#) and I think you will see otherwise, but for now here is a little task to prove these learned men wrong:

Strong's Hebrew Dictionary: H3442 & H3443 -Yeshua -- pronounced -- YaH-shoo-ah

note: In the "New Strong's Complete Dictionary of Bible Words" H3442 we see a change made. No reference made to the earlier versions and the pronunciation as well as the transliteration is changed from "y e shua" to "Yeshuwa" -- "yay-shoo-ah", for 3091, he will save; Jeshua, the name of ten Isr., also of a place in Pal. --- Jeshua"

You will notice from this, this term is tied in with the name YeHoshua when you see the connection being made with the reference to 3091 (H3091 - Y e howshuw'a, yeh-ho-shoo-ah, or Y e howshu'a, yeh-ho-shoo-ah, from 3068 and 3467, Jehovah-saved; Jehoshua (i.e. Joshua), the Jewish leader -- Jehoshua, Jehoshuah, Joshua.

You will notice the "J" in this "New Updated" Strong's is still in place while the pronunciations are corrected. As a name Yeshua has been changed (?) without explanation but is saying it is another reference to Joshua of the Old testament. Joshua is the Old English transliteration and you will also notice at the end of the Strong's reference several choices in the Transliteration of this name are offered up. The correct forms should be -- Yehoshua, YeHoshuah, Yoshua (old English) and YaHshua which is the correct pronunciation for Yeshua (missing H is to be supplied by the reader, as the translators of the Holy Scriptures from the Masoretic Text).

Isn't there a joke here? The name these scholars all support is "Yeshua" and it is to be pronounced, YaHshua, according to Strong's, but they say it is not really there but when we look we find this term and it is not a name, according to some, but means is the word for "salvation". As a name we see it is really supposed to be pronounced as YaHshua (YaH-shoo-ah). Go to the Link provided above for an in-depth look at this and other revelations.

When using the Strong's, as the author, Dr Botkin acknowledges is a "great study tool", we are not trying to "learn Hebrew" but to understand the meaning and pronunciation of certain words and names. You do not need to be able to read Hebrew, to some it may actually be a hindrance, especially when you come to realize the ancient Hebrew has been lost and Modern Hebrew is actually based on other languages. You would think it is the other way around but it is not and one of the reasons we see so many words and terms that appear to have Hebrew origin it is just the opposite as the Hebrew has adopted terms and

names from other peoples. Using works like Strong's you can understand and gain the sense of the Hebrew just as well as by reading several modern translations in English and English translations of the Jewish Bible. These English translations, like the Tanakh and the Masoretic Text admit to this in their preface -- they followed the traditions of the English translators.

My mother and father relied on a doctor of higher learning and of high standing when my mother was not feeling well. This doctor of knowledge insisted my mother was suffering from "old age depression". He put her on antidepressants and sent her to quilting classes and 17 months later she died of liver cancer. The warning here is not to say all scholars are wrong, or of no use, certainly they have given us some wonderful tools and aids, but we must be very careful about giving up our life to a stranger just because he or she has letters hanging on their wall. These are the very types YaHshua argued with, over and over again, men in the form of religious authority, known as the Pharisees and the Sadducees and the Scribes as He walked and taught on this earth. Yes, some of these learned men confessed they believed in Him, but privately, for fear of their losing their position and where were they when push came to shove? (John 12:42, Luke 11:52, John 7:45-53)

Even the experts Dr Botkins referred to make observations that actually point to other sources for the name Yeshua. Let's not forget, when the modern Hebrews were putting their bible back together they relied upon the Greek Septuagint to a great extent, and when it came to making an English translation, not for the gentiles, but for the Jews having lost their language, it was primarily for the English speaking Jews.

Certainly, in the matter of translation, they did have fragments, ancient scrolls, archeological findings to compare and to demonstrate the accuracy of the Greek Septuagint from around 200BC but what they allowed was the corrupting of Names within the translations into English and other languages. Even in their own English translations they use the Greek names in the English form as opposed to the Hebrew transliteration and the easiest example of this it in the Name "Joshua" and in names like "Isaiah" and "Jeremiah". The Greeks used the letter "I" as a transliteration for the Hebrew English transliterated "Y". Jeremiah uses both the "J" and the "I" both which have changed in pronunciation down through the ages and have a need to be updated to keep the transliterations accurate. Jeremiah would then be YeremYah, the emphasis on the YaH at the end as this is the proclamation of the Name of the Creator God and the God of Israel. Strong's, again --

H3050 -- YaH (JaH) "The Sacred Name" (found in Ps 68:4 KJV)

When you see this form, "iah" in other names and realize the more accurate transliteration in modern language is YaH, the "Sacred Name" a lot of things will become clear, a lot of the smoke blown away. Simple but true, the Sacred Name, YaH never appears as Ye, only to the critics does this make sense as they continue to insist Ye_shua is the name.

It becomes clear the “experts” are working from outdated material and are not restoring the proper transliterations of names allowing for a corrupted pronunciation of some very important names and then saying, “These forms are not found in the Hebrew Scriptures and you will not find YaHshua in the Holy Bible” and in this they abandon the principle of transliteration in translation. They are the first to tell us how language changes over the centuries and they are also the first to deny the change when it comes to our Savior’s birth name. It is not how it appears for when we pray we do not see the name in letters or of some appearance in the sky, no, it is what we say and how we say it. Imagine, a world praying to our Savior all in the same Name, no matter what language you speak you would vocalize the Savior’s birth Name. As a simple example when we hear the song HalleluYaH, or the praise in the congregation of Hallelu-iah, we all hear and repeat the same transliteration with the meaning of, Praise You YaH. It could also be “Praise God all you YaH”. Again, take the time to go to this link for more on this -- [YaHshua's Name](#)

The English form *Jesus* is derived from the New Testament Greek name *Insous*, pronounced "Yesous." According to Strong's, *Yesous* (Strong's #2424) is "of Hebrew origin" and can be traced back to Joshua's Hebrew name, *Yehoshua* (#3091, [wvwhy]). But how do we get the Greek *Yesous* from the Hebrew *Yehoshua*? Someone armed with nothing more than a Strong's Concordance may have difficulty answering that question. Someone who reads the Bible in Hebrew, though, knows that the name *Joshua* sometimes appears in its shortened form, *Yeshua* ([wvy]) in Neh. 8:17 it is apparent even in English: "Jeshua the son of Nun." (The letter *J* was pronounced like a *Y* in Old English.) Strong does not tell the reader that the Greek *Yesous* is actually transliterated from this shortened Hebrew form, *Yeshua*, and not directly from the longer form *Yehoshua*. The process from "Yehoshua" to "Jesus" looks like this:

Hebrew *Yehoshua* à Hebrew *Yeshua*

Hebrew *Yeshua* à Greek *Yesous*

Greek *Yesous* à English *Jesus*

There is no "sh" sound in Greek, which accounts for the middle "s" sound in *Yesous*. The "s" at the end of the Greek name is a grammatical necessity, to make the word declinable.

Servant's Comment: Now we come to the real reason for defending the name "Yeshua" over YaHshua. Yeshua is easier to tie to the name Jesus as they have a similar appearance. Yeshua, however is not the precursor to Jesus as Jesus comes from the Latin which comes from the Greek. The Greek is *Insous*, or *Iesous* and sounds nothing like Jesus. The Latin is *Iesvs*, or *Iesus*, and sounds nothing like the name Jesus and not one of these sounds like or is a transliteration of Yeshua, let alone the Original, *YeHoshua*, or *YaHushua*, or *YaHshua*. Remember, the name Yeshua is supposed to be pronounced as *YaH-shoo-ua*, or *YaHshua*. Some knowing this cautiously spell Yeshua as *Y' Shua* and by this quietly make note of the missing "H" which is then to be "mentally added" by the reader (Preface of *The Holy Scripture According to the Masoretic Text*, page V, 1917, 1955 edition)

There is a lot in what Dr Botkin presents here but cutting through the weeds the short of it is the name "Jesus" is not a transliteration of Yeshua any more than Yeshua is a transliteration of Yehoshua, or Yehushau, or YaHushua. We should never forget the purpose of a "transliteration". It seems the experts are only too willing to violate the rules of language for their own contrived purposes. It is pointed out that the letter J is pronounced like a Y in Old English as we noted earlier, so what's the beef? They proceed to make the connection with Yeshua, then transforming it to the name "Jesus" which at every turn ignores the transliteration of these names.

As transliterations it is apparent they are not from the Hebrew original, YeHoshua, which can be transliterated as YaHushua, or YaHshua and these are nothing even close to JESUS. Not only that, we have already seen how the name Yeshua, or Y' shua was meant to be pronounced as YaHshua, and not Yes shua. Following the sequence from above we see exactly what they are trying to do, they want us to accept the name JESUS as His Name when it is not. See how they allow for the corrected transliteration of the letter "J" into the "Y" a more correct and accurate form in today's language but they drop the "H" completely. Why, because the Jewish Scribes say so, because the Jews do not read it like the original any longer? This does not take a linguist, it only takes common sense, and a little tiny bit of encouragement from others that see this same truth.

In Neh. 8:17, Joshua's name is 100% identical to the name which today's Messianic Jews use for the Messiah, *Yeshua* ([wvy]). Strong's confirms this pronunciation, and tells us that there were ten Israelites in the Bible who bore this name (#3442). Therefore the shortening of *Yehoshua* to *Yeshua* predates the Christian era by at least 500 years, and cannot be the result of a Jewish conspiracy to hide the Savior's true name.^[4] To claim that the shortened form *Yeshua* is the result of a Jewish conspiracy is to ignore the facts of history and the facts of the Hebrew Scriptures. The form *Yeshua* existed for several hundred years before the Messiah was even born. Even in the pre-Christian Septuagint, we see the Greek form *IHSOUS* (*Yesous*) in the title of the Book of Joshua. (This is also proof that *Yesous* has no connection to the pagan god Zeus.)

Servant's Comment: *This first statement is an out and out lie, the name Joshua is not 100% identical to the Jews reference for the Messiah as Yeshua. Go back and look at the Strong's Hebrew Dictionary quote I supplied and you see this right off. The spelling is clearly "YeHoshua" not "Yeshua". Look, my friends, the Jews have a dog in this fight, they deny our Savior as Messiah and the Messianic Jews while coming to the knowledge of the true Messiah have made an error based on faulty education they have received from birth, just as have the English speaking people accepted the bogus name "Jesus" just because that is all they have heard, just like the Spanish speaking peoples have only heard Hey-zeus. This does not make it so and when there is an "original" alternative we see the error in the thinking.*

YeHoshua, YaHushua, YaHshua are all alternate transliterations which are denied and refused on the grounds a later spelling found in the modern Hebrew Scriptures trumps the "original" because the scribes choose to use it more often. Now that is scholarship (more sarcasm).

Oh, but wait, we are told Yeshua is a “shortened form” predating the Christian era by 500 years. Well, there you have it, it must be true, of course we will ignore it is called a “shortened form”. This then does bring up the question, “Shortened from what” and then we have to answer, YaHshua, or YeHoshua, or YeHushua, or YaHushua all of which would be far more appropriate than the “shortened form”. Also we need to ask the question, “When our Heavenly Father named our Savior would He have used the shortened form or the original of that Name, a Name by which, and under which all must be saved? (Acts 4:12, Acts 2:21)

To discount the name conspiracy on the basis this “shortened form” was in use hundreds of years before the birth of Christianity is silly as this ignores the existence of a very special being we know as Satan and then there is the mention of demons and their false doctrines (1 Tim 4:1, 2 Cor 11:14). These super beings are going to still be around when we go to our grave just as they were present before the Christian era and after, they are present now and attempting to delude mankind at every turn. It is not reasonable our Heavenly Father would Name His Son a name cut in half, a name that is not His name for the jest of this article is to get you to accept the bogus name JESUS.

As for the name having nothing to do with the Greek god Zeus it is strange how in the Spanish the name JESUS is pronounced The Zeus, or He Zeus. Strange how that happens, but of course, you are not going to find an authority from back in those days saying this is how they came up with the name JESUS. It is also an interesting observation that the name "Jesus" is actually from the Greek. Oops, is this a slip up? How is "jesus" the transliteration of the Greek? The Greek form (why do they avoid using the term, Transliteration?), as they say, is IHSOUS, and then corrected to "Yesous" then to "Ieous" - - is this then the correct form? Notice the dropping of the transliterated letter “H” when they move to the corrupted Iesus and now we can begin to see, again, that if the name "Jesus" comes from anything it comes from the Greek, not the Hebrew, as Jesus and Iesus in two thirds of the world is pronounced as Hey-Zeus. Where does this leave the English name "Jesus"? Out in the cold, it can be traced back to the Latin and the Latin's do not say, Jesus, but Heyzeus, and this dates back to the Greek of the first century, while the name "Jesus" dates to within the last 400 years.

Again, you have to wonder why the Jewish Scribes drop the transliteration of the letter “H” in His Name? They have always denied YaHshua as Messiah. They have always denied YeHoshua as Messiah. They have always denied YaHushua as Messiah. When we see the original pronunciation of Yeshua or Y' shua was to be pronounced as YaHshua (YaH-shoo-ua) and is the proper transliteration of the original we can then see how this came about in the changing of a "vowel" and the "vowels" were supplied by the Scribes and the dropping of letters, like the consonant "H" setting a rule to be honored mentally while reading in restoring certain missing consonants by the reader and when this fails, we have Yes shua instead of YaH shua as originally intended.

[So where did the transliteration Yahshua come from? This form of the name can be traced back to the beginnings of the Sacred Name movement, a movement that grew out of the Church of God, 7th Day, in the late 1930s. I have in my files an article entitled, "A Brief History of the](#)

Name Movement in America" by L.D. Snow, a Sacred Name believer.[5] According to this article, "John Briggs and Paul Penn were the FIRST to pronounce and use the name Yahshua" (emphasis Snow's). This was in 1936 and in 1937, the article states. No information is given about how Briggs and Penn came up with this (mis)translation.

***Servant's Comment:** Now the word, "transliteration" is used and to me this is an admission that YaHshua is a "transliterated" form. Please remember what a "transliteration" is and you will then see no problem with YaHshua as a "Transliteration" but you will most definitely see a problem with the false name JESUS as being a transliteration. Notice, at the end of this paragraph the earlier mentioned YaHshua as a "transliteration" is suddenly termed a "(mis)translation".*

This has been covered and is covered in greater detail at this link -- [YaHshua not in Scripture](#) -- and I gave a brief look into the original pronunciation of the name Yeshua. Understanding this original intended pronunciation of this form, Yeshua, or Y' shua as YaHshua we can see that no particular group can be given credit for having invented this name. Dr Botkin is not correct in this and he incorrectly refers to the Name as a "(mis) translation" when in fact it is a "transliteration" and I find it hard to believe Dr. Botkin does not know the difference. YaHshua is not a translation but a transliteration.

Later Sacred Name literature appeals to the Messiah's statement in John 5:43 as "proof" of the Yahshua form: "I am come in My Father's name," He said. In the minds of Sacred Name believers, this means that "Yah," a shortened form of *Yahweh*, must appear in the name of the Son. However, the Messiah did *not* say "My name contains My Father's name" or "My Father's name must appear inside My name" or any such statement. He said absolutely nothing here about His own name. The only "name" mentioned here was the Father's name. He said, "I am come in My Father's name," which simply means that He was coming by His Father's authority, on His Father's behalf.

***Servant's Comment:** I have to break into this long paragraph with a response. We have heard this argument before and while I am not a great defender of the Sacred Name Movement they are closer to the truth on this than Dr. Botkin of others want to believe. If they are right this would mean the name JESUS is most definitely in error. If the Father's Name must be in the Name of our Savior then the bogus name JESUS cannot be the name of our Savior. We have already read the double speak used when attempting to degrade the transliteration form of YaHshua. Now it is an attempt to make this form guilty by association. What do they say for the transliterations of YaH-0-Shua and YaH-U-Shua? They are silent aren't they? Now let's see what the Bible really says when the old tired and worn excuse that YaHshua never meant He came in the Father's Name but rather in His authority -- not really His Name?*

(John 17:26) **And I have declared unto them thy name**, and will declare *it*: that the love wherewith thou hast loved me may be in them, and I in them.

(Heb 2:12) Saying, **I will declare thy name unto my brethren, in the midst of the church will I sing praise unto thee.**

(John 17:12) While I was with them, I protected them and kept them safe **by that name you gave me.** None has been lost except the one doomed to destruction so that Scripture would be fulfilled.
NIV

(John 5:43) I have come in my Father's name, and you do not accept me; but if someone else comes in his own name, you will accept him.

(Php 2:9) Therefore God exalted him to the highest place and **gave him the name that is above every name,**

(Mat 1:21) She will give birth to a son, **and you are to give him the name YaHshua, because he will save his people from their sins."**

Taking these verses into consideration we can see what the Messiah was saying in John 5:43 a little more clearly. To come in His Name is to come in His Authority, certainly, and it seems quite apparent the Name given Him does have our Heavenly Father's Name present in it. One thing is certain, JESUS is not His Name and is most certainly not the name of our Heavenly Father.

If we take Yeshua's statement "I am come in My Father's name" to mean that His own name must contain the Father's name, then we ourselves cannot do anything "in the Father's name" unless our own personal name happens to contain the syllable "Yah." The folly of this interpretation is also evident if the same line of reasoning is applied to the rest of Yeshua's statement: "...if another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive." If the logic of Sacred Name believers is applied to this half of the verse, it would be saying "a person's name must contain his own name," which is meaningless. If, on the other hand, "in his own name" means "by his own authority," then the statement makes sense.

***Servant's Comment:** I'm at a loss for words here, not understanding what is being said. Dr. Botkin is using some kind of logic that is beyond my small mind. Hum, let me see, if I accept someone else in his own name and, say, my earthly father's name is David but someone else comes along and says he is my father but his name is Daniel and I say that is alright by me, from now on you, Daniel are my father, does that then make my real father, David, Daniel? Of course not and the reasoning Dr. Botkin used here is cracked. Certainly it makes no sense to him because his very reasoning is so clouded as to make ridiculous assertions like this. He completely takes apart what our Savior said, "I have come in my Father's Name..." and makes it anything but "Name" like "authority" but what did He say?*

Is it so hard, to admit He meant what He said? Then Dr Botkin continues to twist this verse in an attempt to make it say something other than what it says, "...someone comes in his own name and him you will accept." What Dr. Botkin wants you to believe is that this part of the verse actually says the "him" does not mean "him" and the "someone" does not mean "someone" but actually means "authority". Funny thing about "authority" it too can and does come in names, all kinds of names. When you hear the challenge, "By whose authority do you say such things?" Is the answer, "By authority"? Can you see the stupidity of this? I apologize to Dr. Botkin for making such an observation but please give the reader credit for some intelligence. By whose authority does YaHshua, our savior, speak? Can you Name Him or can you Name His Son?

Why is the *Yahshua* form used by no one but Sacred Name believers and people who have been influenced by Sacred Name believers? Probably because no such name exists in the Hebrew Bible and, to my knowledge, no such name exists in any extra-Biblical Hebrew literature. It appears that Dr. Ben-Gigi is correct when he says that people invented the name *Yahshua* to fit their theology.

Servant's Comment: *I am an independent and belong to no Sacred Names group as an active member. I was baptized into His name, YaHshua but have no aversion to the use of the admitted original name, by some, as YeHoshua. Dr. Botkin is so opposed to the use of the "transliteration" YaHshua, which he himself called a "transliteration", then I wonder what he thinks about the name YeHoshua, YaHoshua, YeHushua, and YaHushua as transliterations. No, he does not accept these either as it is the false name JESUS he is defending. To end the argument would be to start using YeHoshua, which is found in the Hebrew Bible in that form and then what? No, those denying the Messiah's true identity would still be pushing the fake name JESUS with faulty reasoning pressing forward with self supporting proofs that are no proof only biased opinions trying to squirm out from under ages of deception.*

I have read a lot of literature from writers who seek to expose the "errors" of those who refer to the Messiah as *Yeshua*. The only thing these writers actually expose is their lack of knowledge. I could give several examples of statements which are absolutely ridiculous. I do not have the space in this publication to give all the examples I have in my files, and I do not wish to embarrass sincere people for their honest but misguided efforts. There are some examples, though, that grossly misrepresent the facts, and some of these examples need to be exposed.

Servant's Comment: *From the critics against the use of the transliteration YaHshua comes the altered form Yeshua, which is no longer a transliteration at all. In the Strong's Hebrew Dictionary Yeshua appears as a Name in its own and is to be sounded out, vocalized, as YaHshua (YaH-shoo-ah) but this has been lost and replaced the Name Yeshua into a different name. Christians in favor of Yeshua, like Dr botkin, use this in an attempt at giving support to the bogus name Jesus. They rationalize this only because the Jewish Scribes (friends of our Savior?) have turned the Name of Joshua into Yeshua as opposed to the true spelling of YeHoshua as found in Hebrew dictionaries. They, those more intelligent than anyone disagreeing with them, accept the altered Yeshua, why? Because the Greeks say so? Yeshua is no longer a transliteration of YeHoshua and a very*

poor representation of the Greek Iesous. No, these highly intelligent super brains accept a name with part of the true original name missing and for those of us that see this they say we are uneducated so we should shut up and sit down. Actually, as said before, it is not in defense of the name Yeshua they seek but the perpetuation of the name JESUS. But then what do we know, we are just dumb country bumpkins seeing clearly through their smoke and mirrors.

In one popular booklet published by a well-known Sacred Name organization, the anonymous author makes this statement: "Most reference works agree with Kittel's *Theological Dictionary of the NT* statement on page 284, which states that the name Yahoshua was shortened after the exile to the short form *Yahshua*." This statement makes it sound like Kittel uses the forms *Yahoshua* and *Yahshua*. I went to the library and looked at this page in Kittel's. The words *Yahoshua* and *Yahshua* do not appear even one time on this page. This can be verified by going to a library and looking up this page. (It's in Volume III.) If your library does not have Kittel's, I can send a photocopy of this page to any skeptics.

Servant's Comment: *I see what Dr. Botkin is doing here but notice he does not mention what the subject of that page is? What I would be concerned with is if this reference does say or give evidence there was a dropping of the letter "O" bringing a shorter form YaHshua into use. If neither name is mentioned on the page then perhaps the wrong page was cited? This does happen from time to time as any author well knows as I find it hard to believe they, the Sacred Names group of any sort, would make such an error on purpose. Still it does not take away from the fact that the Name YaHshua is one of the correct transliterations of the "original" where as the name Yeshua is not, unless, that is, you restore the correct pronunciation for that name, Y ' Shua as YaHshua, just as the Strong's Dictionary presents (I just cannot point that out enough). Figure it out, does Yeshua sound like YeHoshua, or returning the long "e" vowel we then see it as YaHoshua? Nope, not at all so it is either a transliteration with the missing "H" which the reader is supposed to supply or it is a deceptive attempt at misdirecting, at deceiving -- or it could be an innocent mistake?*

This same Sacred Name organization which misrepresents Kittel's also misrepresented a Jewish author. In a magazine article written by this organization's main leader, a lengthy segment is quoted from a book published by KTAV, a Jewish publishing house. When copying this quotation for his magazine article, this Sacred Name author freely used *Yahshua*, making it appear that the Jewish author used that transliteration in his book. I got the book from the library, though, and discovered that "Yahshua" did not appear in the book. I wrote to this Sacred Name leader asking for an explanation. I told him that unless he had some other explanation, I could conclude one of three things: either he deliberately misrepresented the facts, or he did it accidentally, or the book I got from the library was a different version from his, in which case I would owe him an apology. My letter was sent September 1, 1997, and I am still waiting for a reply. I will not embarrass this man by mentioning his name or the name of his ministry. It is not my intention to embarrass anyone.

Servant's Comments: I guess we know how old this article by Dr. Botkin is. Things on the internet go on forever, I guess. The leader of the Sacred Name organization whom Dr. Botkin makes silent reference has deceased. From what I know of this man he had an aversion to using any name other than the name YaHshua in any writings of his because he was so convinced to do so was to disrespect our Savior's name. So, I understand why, in making reference to other works, it may become confusing to the reader, even misleading. This is why I use other terms and names for the purpose of clarity, even then I have made mistakes. Why Dr Botkin has taken this article in this direction I can only guess.

I am not writing this article to persuade people to quit saying "Yahshua." If people want to continue using a mis-transliteration that was erroneously contrived by early Sacred Name pioneers who didn't know Hebrew, it really doesn't matter to me. I don't that the substitution of an "ah" sound for an "e" sound matters much to the Lord, either. What does matter, though, is the spreading of false accusations against Messianic Jews and others who called the Messiah "Yeshua."

Servant's Comment: If there is a mis(?)transliteration it is found in the names Yeshua and Jesus as neither are accurate transliterations of the original while YaHshua, and YaHoshua and YaHushua are within the realm of correctness as the rule of transliterations go. It is really easy to prove and does not take a lot of brain power. Ask yourself the question, "Is JESUS a transliteration of the original, YeHoshua, or even of the Old English Joshua?" No it is not, sounds nothing like it, a completely different name. How about Yeshua, it looks like the name Jesus, but listen, it sounds nothing like the name "Jesus" either. Yeshua equals Yes shua while Jesus equals, Geez us – no transliteration here and neither is close to the original Joshua, or YeHoshua. The Name YaHshua is the same as YeHoshua as a transliteration and look at the old English transliteration "Joshua" by restoring the "J" to the "Y" you have an improved and updated transliteration of "Yoshua" which is closer than "Yeshuah" at least to my ear.

Paul warned Timothy about "doting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmising [suspicions]" (1 Tim. 6:4). Unfortunately, this is an accurate description of what goes on among many people in the Sacred Name movement. Personally, I would rather fellowship with non-contentious people who call the Messiah "Jesus" than with contentious people who insist that everyone call Him "Yahshua."

THE END of Dr Botkin's article

Servant's Comment: When Paul made this remark it was before the name "Jesus", or Iesus or Iesvs, or Iesous were in vogue. When Paul said this he was warning Timothy of what was to come and we see just what he meant after decades of misuse and twisting of our Savior's Name. Dr. Botkin's use of this instruction to Timothy is actually, or appropriately, applied to generation following them. Come on, let's not be stingy with the verses written to warn and guide the believer about the times we live in. It is a warning to Timothy and others about what was to come and a time we now live in.

(2Ti 3:13-15) "... while evil men and impostors **will go from bad to worse, deceiving and being deceived.** But as for you, **continue in what you have learned and have become convinced of,** because you know those from whom you learned it, and **how from infancy you have known the holy Scriptures,** which are able to make you wise for salvation through faith in Christ Jesus.

(2Ti 3:16-17) **All Scripture is God-breathed and is useful for teaching, rebuking, correcting and training in righteousness,** so that the man of God may be thoroughly equipped for every good work.

Timothy is warned of those coming to deceive and being deceived themselves and we can see Timothy is reminded he has known, from birth, the Holy Scripture and it is these books Paul says is "God-breathed". When Paul wrote this warning of deception the New Testament had not been assembled yet, and some of the writings had not yet been put to papyrus. Dr. Botkin misapplies these verses against those attempting to restore His Holy Name back to the proper Transliteration. But wait, there is more –

(Eph 4:14) Then we will no longer be infants, tossed back and forth by the waves, and blown here and there **by every wind of teaching and by the cunning and craftiness of men in their deceitful scheming.**

(Eph 5:6) **Let no one deceive you with empty words,** for because of such things God's wrath comes on those who are disobedient.

(Tit 1:10-11) For there are many rebellious people, mere talkers and deceivers, **especially those of the circumcision group. They must be silenced,** because they are ruining whole households by teaching things they ought not to teach--and that for the sake of dishonest gain.

(Col 2:8) **See to it that no one takes you captive through hollow and deceptive philosophy, which depends on human tradition and the basic principles of this world rather than on Christ.**

If the shoe fits, as the saying goes and it seems to fit in these days of the defenders of Jesus. Who can say it better than the Spirit guided Apostle? These words were written and preserved not only for our instruction but for those believers of then. If these are the warnings for the first century church then what would this mean for us? Wouldn't it mean the very deceptions of then would be even more prevalent today, greater and far more expanded? We should all be leery of anything accepted so easily by the majority. Satan and his kind have had a long time to further the deception, to deceive the deceived and to help those deceived deceive others – "... deceiving and being deceived."

I hope this has been of encouragement as well as informative. I want you to use you mind, to think, read the Scriptures as the source of truth and listen to it as the Spirit guides you into the foundation of all truth, our Savior and Creator YaHshua -- or YaHushua, if you prefer, even YeHoshua but never Jesus and not Yeshua as they are not the transliteration of our Savior's name but the name of another.

You may find the following of interest also -- [His Name from Ancient to Now](#) and [Original Name and Jesus is Not His Name](#)

If you have questions or comments send email to – dan@servantsofyahshua.com – www.servantsofyahshua.com -- www.yahshuaservant.com

More Links on the same subject --

[Yeshua, YaHshua Part 2](#) [Yeshua, YaHshua Part 3](#)

[YaHshua's Name In Scripture? YaHWeH Pronounced](#)

[JESUS, Name Origin](#)

NOTES from Dr. Botkin:

[1] *Love Song to the Messiah* newsletter, March 1999, p. 1.

[2] "The Fallacy of Sacred Name Bibles," *Jerusalem Perspective* Nov.-Dec. 1991, p. 12.

[3] These teachers very heavily rely on Strong's Concordance, yet when Strong proves them wrong, as he does with the pronunciation of *Yehoshua*, they insist that Strong's rendering is erroneous! I have a Sacred Name publication which actually claims that Strong wrote down incorrect pronunciations because "his understanding of the Name was lacking." Anyone who wants to disprove this ludicrous assertion can simply look at Joshua's name in a Hebrew Bible and see that Strong used the very same vowel marks that are used in the Bible.

[4] There is some debate over whether or not the Jews' final shortening of Jesus' name to *Yeshu* (wvy) was a deliberate attempt to avoid acknowledging Yeshua of Nazareth as Savior.

[5] This article first appeared in a publication called *The Eliyah Messenger* in May-June 1966, and was reprinted in 1975 in *World Today Analyzed*, a publication of the Assembly of Yahvah in Tahlequah, OK.