

Original Name Jesus

Original name for Jesus – From Wikipedia --

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Yeshua_%28name%29#cite_ref-3

Comments by Dan Baxley

www.yahshuaservant.com

The following is an article taken from Wikipedia. It is not my intent to correct or demean this excellent article in any way but to add my comments to further the understanding that is presented in this balanced article. Many observations and sound research is presented in this article and I hope my added comments will expand on the positive and enhance what has happened to our Savior's true birth name from the beginning to the present. Any comment may be addressed to servant@yahshuaservant.com and for further information on various subjects may be found at, www.yahshuaservant.com Let's begin --

My Comment: One small observation to consider before getting into the meat of this article: How would you pronounce these names? Isaiah, Jeremiah, Zechariah, Nehemiah or Zephaniah - all names from the Old Testament? The last three letters from each name is "iah" or more accurately, YaH, not Ye as in the name Jesus or Yeshua. No one spells or pronounces the name Jeremiah as Jeremye but this is what those supporting the use of "yeshua" as a name do and want you to do.

Wikipedia:

Original Name of Jesus: The English name *Jesus* derives from the [Late Latin](#) name *Iesus*, which transliterates the [Koine](#) Greek name Ἰησοῦς *Iesoûs*.

In the [Septuagint](#) and other Greek-language [Jewish](#) texts, such as the writings of [Josephus](#) and [Philo of Alexandria](#), Ἰησοῦς *Iesoûs* is the standard Koine Greek form used to translate both of the Hebrew names: *Yehoshua* and *Yeshua*. Greek Ἰησοῦς or *Iesoûs* is also used to represent the name of Joshua son of Nun in the New Testament passages Acts 7:45 and Hebrews 4:8. (It was even used in the Septuagint to translate the name *Hoshea* in one of the three verses where this referred to Joshua the son of Nun—Deut. 32:44.)

My Comment: First Paragraph -- We have been saying all along, of course, that the modern English is derived from the Latin, not Greek. The defenders of JESUS are then saying IESUS is a "transliteration" (see "Note A" at end of article for discussion of this word, Transliteration - or this link [Transliteration](#)) of IESOUS but it is plain to see this is in no way an accurate transliteration of the Hebrew/Aramaic Name YaHshua, or YaHoshua. It is a different name completely from the beginning, as IESUS, as a

transliteration of IESOUS (pronounced as Hey-s-oo-s) cannot be a transliteration of Yeshua either. Taking the IE and matching YE, in the name Yeshua one could say this is a transliteration, except the language has changed and these letters are no longer good transliterations of one another and it would be pointed out by some, like myself, that would say, SHUA and SOUS destroys the whole idea of a complete transliteration of His Name as it is obvious to the casual observer – Shua and Sous have nothing in common other than they both begin with the letter “S”.

Comment on Second Paragraph – *Koine Greek? Again it is plain to see, Inoous or Iesous cannot be a transliteration of the Hebrew/Jewish birth Name of our Savior as the Hebrew or the Aramaic transpose His Name into the Greek. The Greek is incorrect as is the Latin, which follows the Greek, or so they say but come up with IESVS or IESUS, perhaps a Latin transliteration of the Greek, maybe, or not, but even in today’s language this is not how the name of our Savior is pronounced. The Savior declared by the writings of the Apostles is transformed into a Latin name too similar to a Roman god, Zeus, and how strange it is we find the Latin name for the Christ of the New Testament is pronounced, Hey-Zeus (The Zeus)—imagine that. This Latin name is not pronounced as the Yeshua, nor YaHoshua, and not YaHshua. IESUS and YESUS have a similar appearance but are pronounced differently, which violates the “transliteration”. The efforts of the Latin Church, from whom all of Christianity receives this false name, Jesus (Geezus, or Heyzeus) work to proclaim “another”, different, Messiah, causing all to accept a name belonging to another. This name, JESUS is not a transliterations and it is not a transliteration, it is completely different name from His Birth Name – born a Jewish Child, of the tribe of Judah (YaHudah). Named by an Angelic Messenger (Mat 1:21), a name found in the Hebrew Scriptures and among the people (Acts 4:12).*

The statement that “Hoshea” (Yeshua) is found in a couple of place in the Old Testament as authority, quoting Deut 32:44, for its use is quite wrong, as there is a whole Book, the book of JOSHUA, written in His Name, a name of a man that stood with Moses, his right hand man and the man that led the people into the promised land – Joshua (YaHshua) led the people into the physical promised land, the Kingdom of God. Joshua is an Old English transliteration of YeHoShua which is a transliteration of His, our Savior’s Hebrew/Jewish Name. The following names are accurate equivalents as is YaHshua and YaHushua (YaH-Shua and YaH-U-Shua)—notice they all sound very similar and nothing like the bogus name “Jesus”. The Hebrew spelling of the English Joshua confirms this and while the name Joshua is a lesser equivalent it is still a faithful attempt but the name, Jesus, is not an attempt but a “change”. The existence of this English attempt, Joshua, actually proves the Hebrew/Jewish Name given to our Savior has always been in the Bible, ignored and replaced by the Latin name IESUS and accepted by the English translators ignoring the better choice, Joshua.

Like it or not the Jewish scholars trying to convince you the Hebrew does not contain the Name, YaHshua, want to ignore the principles of “transliteration” (phonetic attempt at creating a proper pronunciation of one language or name to another language) except for when they use this procedure in their own translations, themselves being influenced by the Greek Septuagint. Ancient Hebrew was being lost and to preserve what they could a

committee of 70 Jewish scholars were commissioned to translate, to the best of their knowledge, the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek. It was feared the whole of the Jewish population was losing their language so the Greek Septuagint was to preserve what was being lost so the common people could read it. From this the name Yeshua makes its appearance – notice the missing letter, the “H”. They, the modern Jewish bible teachers do admit to a few other equivalents seen in the Hebrew writings as YaHoshua, YeHoshua, YaHushua, YeHushua, all transliterations of the original Hebrew and the transliteration spellings of the name, Joshua, not Jesus. Talk about a great deception, it could not get much bigger than this. Everyone is calling on a false name, praying to a different Savior?

Continuing, Wikipedia:

During the second Temple period (beginning 538 BC – 70 AD), *Yeshua* first became a known form of the name *Yehoshua*. All occurrences of *Yeshua* in the Hebrew Bible are in I [Chron.](#) 24:11, II Chron. 31:15, [Ezra](#), and [Nehemiah](#) where it is transliterated into English as [Jeshua](#). Two of these men (Joshua the son of Nun and [Joshua the High Priest](#)) are mentioned in other books of the Hebrew Bible where they are instead called *Yehoshua* ^[20] (transliterated into English as Joshua).

My Comment: *Third Paragraph – This supports the YaHshua transliteration as YeHoshua is admittedly the proper transliteration for the English Joshua, which begs the question of why the English translators use Jesus as opposed to Joshua? When the linguist point out that in YeH the “e” is supposed to be used as the “long” “e” which has the sound of “a” vowel and both are vowels and not actually part of the Original Name. So, the “e” even in the “long” is not part of the Name but was added to aid in pronunciation, the purpose of transliterations, and when the vowel or vowel point for the “e” it had a different sound closer to the vowel “a” of today’s languages into the English. To argue over the “e” as more correct is only correct over 2500 years ago and only then if those pushing for the retaining of the “e” accept it in the “long” form which would then make the pronunciation virtually the same as YaH-Shua. What about the “o”, or “u” in the middle? The “o” and the “u” are interchangeable as the language changed so did the sound so it move from “O” to “U” in keeping with the a more correct transliteration. This letter is of the smallest concern as it changes the “SHUA” from the meaning “Savior” to “Salvation” both having the same outcome in meaning. He is, our Savior, or Salvation so adding it is to say He is our Salvation, our USHUA, or He is our Savior, our SHUA.*

Continuing, Wikipedia:

The earlier form *Yehoshua* did not disappear, however, and remained in use as well. In the post-exilic books, Joshua the son of Nun is called both *Yeshua bin-Nun* ([Nehemiah 8:17](#)) and *Yehoshua* ([I Chronicles 7:27](#)). The short form *Yeshua* was used for [Jesus ben Sirach](#) in Hebrew fragments of the [Wisdom of Sirach](#). (Some concern remains over whether these fragments faithfully represent the original Hebrew text or are instead a later translation back into Hebrew. ^[21]) The earlier form *Yehoshua* saw revived usage from the [Hasmonean](#) period onwards, although the name *Yeshua* is still found in letters from the time of the [Bar Kokhba Revolt](#) (132-135 AD).

My Comment: Forth Paragraph – Here we find complete support for the “full” form of our Saviors Birth Name as opposed to the “short form”. Actually, Yeshua is really not a short form but a form that came later and coming later ignoring the earlier accepted form of YaHoshua (remember the “e” is in supposed to be in “long”, “ee” form and in today’s language transliterates into the “a”). What makes Yeshua a “short form” is the dropping of a principle letter of the Name of our Creator and Savior, the letter “H”, so it is not a short form but a changed name. Some say YH, or YaH is short for YHWH and if we follow that as a possibility it would then deny Ye-shua as a short form. What would the short form really be, then, if there is a short form? It would be YaH-shua, not Ye-shua. In today’s language Ye-shua is a different name and a mistake on the Jewish scribes part in continuing with a “later” form and rejecting the “original earlier” form. The consistency is either a glaring error or it is on purpose, you decide.

Continuing, Wikipedia:

In the context of the documentary entitled [The Lost Tomb of Jesus](#), archeologist [Amos Kloner](#) stated that the name Yeshua was then a popular form of the name Yehoshua and was "one of the common names in the time of the [Second Temple](#)."^[22] In discussing whether it was remarkable to find a tomb with the name of Jesus (the particular ossuary in question bears the inscription "Yehuda bar Yeshua"), he pointed out that the name had been found 71 times in burial caves from that time period.^[23]

My Comment: Fifth paragraph – This is in keeping with a profound statement from the lips of Peter recorded in Acts 4:12, “...no other name under heaven given to men by which we must be saved” (NIV). One has to wonder, did the Angel Gabriel coming from the Living God of all Creation with a Name to Name our Savior be coming with a “short form” of the ORIGINAL? I think we all know the answer to that and when we consider the principle of the Commandments we can see the truth – “If you break the least of these you are guilty of breaking them all” – by this principle alone we can see that to “break” His Name into anything other than the complete form is to break it entirely – the short form is from men, not our Creator and our Heavenly Father. It does not matter how many times the Jewish/Hebrew scribes use the self confessed “short form” in the copies of the Scriptures (Torah, Tanakh, etc.) this is a choice they have made and they admit to the “original form” but prefer to use the “short” or “broken” form of this Name, especially when it comes to making reference to our Savior, YaHshua, to them this would be, Yeshua or maybe even, Yashua?

Continuing, Wikipedia:

Thus, both the full form *Yehoshua* and the abbreviated form *Yeshua*, were in use during the Gospel period – and in relation to the same person, as in the Hebrew Bible references to Yehoshua/Yeshua son of Nun, and Yehoshua/Yeshua the high priest in the days of Ezra.

My Comment: Sixth paragraph – So, both were used and this means our Savior was then named a name in the “short form” which actually cuts the Father’s Name out? If there were two choices being used during the time of our Savior’s birth it would only make sense

that of the two choices our Heavenly Father would have chosen the longer, original form, doesn't it? YaHshua said He came in His Father's Name, not some short form of that Name. When you look at the so called short form it is easy to begin to see it is nothing like the name JESUS except in a similarity of appearance as neither of these two are pronounced the same, so the transliteration between these names fails as does the transliteration between the name Yeshua and YaHshua, even if you spell it YaHushua, it fails miserably as a transliteration or even as representative of His birth Name.

Continuing, Wikipedia:

In the [Talmud](#), only one reference is made to the spelling *Yeshua*, in verbatim quotation from the Hebrew Bible regarding Jeshua son of Jozadak (elsewhere called Joshua son of Josedech). The Talmud does refer to several people named Yehoshua from before (e.g. [Joshua ben Perachyah](#)) and after Jesus (e.g. [Joshua ben Hananiah](#)). However in references to [Jesus in the Talmud](#), where the name occurs, it is rendered [Yeshu](#), which is a name reserved in Aramaic and Hebrew literature from the early medieval period until today, solely for Jesus of Nazareth, not for other Joshuas. However some scholars, such as [Maier](#) (1978) regard the two named "Yeshu" texts in the Talmud (Sanhedrin 43a and 107b) to be later amendments, and not original.^[24]

[Clement of Alexandria](#) and [St. Cyril of Jerusalem](#) considered the Greek form *Iesous* to be the original, even going so far as to interpret it as a true Greek name and not simply a transliteration of Hebrew, (A similar situation is seen in the use of the true Greek name Simon as a translation of the Hebrew name Shim'on in texts such as Sirach.) Eusebius related it to the Greek root meaning "to heal" thus making it a variant of *Jason* meaning *healer*.

***My Comment:** Seventh and Eight paragraphs – Simple truth is hard to ignore. In the latter paragraph we see the obvious answer to how His Name was changed and accepted, not by some mysterious twisting but by a simple CHANGE from the Hebrew to the Greek claiming it to be the true Greek name and “not simply a transliteration of Hebrew”. How much plainer can it get? Scholars of the Roman Church changed His My Hebrew/Jewish Name to that of a Greek.*

Continuing, Wikipedia:

However, the New Testament describes Jesus as being a part of a Jewish milieu, reading the Hebrew Bible and debating with [Pharisees](#) over interpretations of the [Jewish legal tradition](#). The [Gospels](#) record several [Hebrew](#) and [Aramaic](#) words or expressions spoken by him. Moreover, [Eusebius](#) reports that Jesus's student [Matthew](#) wrote a [gospel](#) "in the Hebrew language". (Note, scholars typically argue the word "Hebrew" in the New Testament refers to Aramaic.^[25])

An argument in favor of the Hebrew reduced form *Yeshua*, as opposed to *Yehoshua*, is the Old [Syriac](#) Bible (c. 200 AD) and the [Peshitta](#) preserve this same spelling but using the equivalent Aramaic letters . *Yeshu/je?u?/* (Syriac does not use a 'furtive' pathach so extra /a/ is not used) is still the pronunciation used in the West Syriac dialect, whereas East Syriac has rendered the pronunciation of these same letters as *Išō 'i'o?/*. These texts were translated from the Greek, but the name is not a simple transliteration of the Greek form because Greek did not

have an "sh" [ʃ] sound, and substituted [s]; and likewise lacked and therefore omitted the final 'ayin sound [ʔ]. It can be argued that the [Aramaic](#) speakers who used this name had a continual connection to the Aramaic-speakers in communities founded by the [apostles](#) and other students of Jesus, thus independently preserved his historical name. Alternatively, Aramaic references to the Hebrew Bible had long used *Yeshu* for Hebrew names such as Yehoshua Ben Nun.^[27] So the possibility of Jesus having been *Yehoshua* remains.

My Comment: Last paragraphs –The last line really says it all and while men on both sides, the Jews, and the Christians can argue for the name Yeshua in the “short form” it still does not measure up to the bogus name JESUS. All of the reasoning can be used in how certain letters could not be sounded out in the Greek because they did not have letters to properly transliterate the name properly is a faulty argument from the sheer fact that today we do have letters and combination of letter to do the proper transliterations. We have already read where the Greek Name comes from, not from the Hebrew nor the Aramaic but from a couple of Roman Saints saying His Name is Greek. JESUS comes from the Roman Church, from the Latin language claiming to come from the Original Greek. The faulty think should be clear, the Roman/Greek Church, East and West, wanted a non-Jewish god and they created one, name and all.

Rabbinical commentary on the difference Yeshu/Yeshua

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Yeshua_\(name\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Yeshua_(name))

This small article was lifted from Wikidpedia at the address above. This is part of an excellent discussion and presentation concerning the name “Yeshua”, pro and con. I have added my own comments, of course.

Yeshua was used as the name for Jesus in late additions to the [Yosippon](#); however, its usage here is a translation back into the Hebrew *Yeshua* from the Greek.

*My Comment: This is not true, of course, and is of no surprise considering the source. Looking at the title you would think the Rabbinical Commentary is dealing with two variation Yeshu/Yeshua but right from the start we see it is Yeshua/Jesus. This is the lie being pushed by many scholars in a self imposed deception of the truth -- that Yeshua and Jesus are the same. First, the names Jesus and Yeshua **are not** “translations”, and I will assume the Rabbinical commentators of this article know this*

Continuing, Rabbinical Commentary:

In general rabbinical sources use *Yeshu*, and this is the form to which named references to [Jesus in the Talmud](#) as [Yeshu](#) occur. **The name Yeshu is only found in the Babylonian Talmud**, and some scholars, such as [Maier](#) (1978) have argued that those a late additions. Other Hebrew sources referencing [Yeshu](#) include the [Toledot Yeshu Sefer Nestor ha-Komer](#), Jacob ben

Reuben's [Milhamoth ha-Shem](#), [Sefer Nizzahon Yashan](#), [Sefer Joseph Hamekane](#), the works of [Ibn Shaprut](#), [Moses ha-Kohen de Tordesillas](#), and [Hasdai Crescas](#), etc.

Some of these sources comment on the reasons for the missing [ayin](#) from Yeshu, as opposed to the Hebrew Bible Yeshua and Yehoshuah. [Leon Modena](#) argues that it was Jesus himself who made his disciples remove the ayin, and that therefore they cannot now restore it. **A tradition states that the shortening to Yeshu relates to the Y-SH-U of the [yimach shemo](#) "may his name be obliterated."**^{[27][28]}

Etymology

The Greek transliteration Ἰησοῦς (*Iesous*) *jesu-os → [\[je'sus\]](#) can stand for both Classical Biblical Hebrew *Yehoshua*[\[j'ho'ua?\]](#) (top two) and Late Biblical Hebrew *Yeshua*[\[je'ua?\]](#) (bottom). This later form developed within Hebrew (not Aramaic).^[6] All three spelling variants occur in the Hebrew Bible, including when referring to the same person. During the Second Temple Period, Jews of Galilee tended to preserve the traditional spelling, keeping the <?> letter for the [o] in the first syllable, even adding an additional letter for the [u] in the second syllable. However, Jews of Jerusalem tended to spell the name as they pronounced it, [\[je'ua?\]](#), contracting the spelling to [\[je'ua?\]](#) without the [o] letter. Later, Aramaic references to the Hebrew Bible adopted the contracted phonetic form of this Hebrew name as an Aramaic name

***My Comment:** Way back when the Greek transliterated the name YeHoshua (this being the transliteration in English today) the Greek was pronounced quite differently than it is today. The original spelling and pronunciation is admittedly, YeHoshua, as the modern English transliteration, along with, YaHushua and YaHshua . As a transliteration YaHshua also fits the bill but IESUS (He-Zeus) does not. Yeshua might have a favorable vote but for the fact it is not pronounced as a true “transliteration” due to the dropping of the all important letter “H”. What about the “O” being dropped from the transliteration, YaHshua? That letter is not part of the Father’s Name but is the beginning of the descriptive part. With the “O” or “U” present it changes the definition of what is being said in His Name from “Savior” to “Salvation” and both declarations are correct. YaH is our Savior and YaH is our Savlation. This is where we can determine the name “Yeshua” is incorrect as it drops the Name and in effect replaces the transliterated “H” with the lowly vowel “e”. The pronunciation is then distorted from the true “transliteration” from YaH-Shua to Yes-shua. Some have rendered it as Yea-shua but the same problem occurs with the cutting of His Name in half discarding the letter “H”.*

There record shows there was an original form not Yeshua. Yeshua is said to be a “later contraction” and in this the error is apparent. Ask the question, would the Father of our Savior have named His Son in a contracted form or the whole? The answer is obvious and by not keeping with this His Name, a Name by which we must all be saved has been changed, little by little until we have a name today that is not even close to His Birth Name. JESUS is not a transliteration and it is a poor transliteration of the poor attempt by the Greeks (Iesous). Even these two names are hard pressed to be called transliterations as they sound nothing alike.

Some have tried to say that IESUS is the transliteration of IESOUS and if this is so it is also true it is not a transliteration of His Hebrew Name, YaHshua, or YaHushua. Then the defenders of Yeshua and Jesus say, there were no proper letter replacements in the Greek for the total transliteration of the Hebrew. If this is true, it is no longer true as in today's languages we do have the complete letterings and words to properly transliterate His Name. The Original Greek was mishandled and abused for purposes to change His Name From Hebrew to a Greek Name as admitted to by St Cyril of Jerusalem and Clement of Alexaderia (see first article).

I personally see nothing wrong in dropping the "O" or the "U" but to drop half of the Name of our Creator and Savior by dropping the "H" in the transliteration changes everything. The pronunciation is completely thrown off and when you look at the name JESUS compared to the original YeHoshua and the alternate "transliterations", YaHshua, YaHushua is not a "translation" and it is definitely not a "transliteration" of any of these names of our Savior as He was Named by the Messenger from Heaven, a name given to Mary (Maryam) and Josheph (Yosheph) to Name Him, they were not given a choice, nor was their opinion requested, no, they were given the Name to Name Him and it was not some contraction of the Original, how could it be?

Note: For those unfamiliar with translations and transliterations let's have a look at the difference --

American Heritage Dictionary will be used for the definition of these two terms

*Translation -- n. Abbr. **tr.**, **trans.**, **transl.** **1.** The act or process of translating, especially from one language into another. The state of being translated. **2.** A translated version of a text. [\[1\]\[1\]](#)*

*Transliterate -- v.tr. **trans-lit-er-at-ed**, **trans-lit-er-at-ing**, **trans-lit-er-ates**. To represent (**letters or words**) in the corresponding characters of another alphabet. [\[2\]\[2\]](#)*

*To **translate** from one language to another the words and letters may sound differently but produce the same meaning as the original language. The purpose, then, of "transliteration" is to produce corresponding "letters or words" for the production of the same sound. Some confuse translation and to transliterate missing this important point. They seem similar and some think to "translate" is really the same as to "transliterate" which it is not and the those dealing in languages and have knowledge of how language is handled from one to the other know this.*

To Transliteration -- to repeat -- is for the purpose of producing letter and words to correspond with the original from a different language in an effort to create the same sound (phonetics) and this is attempted by the use of letters or words that have, or create, the same sound, or pronunciation as the original language being transliterated. In effect, if a complete book were to be "transliterated" the person may be able to read the book but it would make no sense because the reader would be sounding out the words of another language, written in his or her own language. This is where the "translation" comes in.

The same book being translated and then read would be understood as if the book were produced in the readers own language with a meaning for meaning -- to “translation” from one language to another. Transliterations are different, reproducing a phonetic sound and this is why “transliterations” are mostly concerned with “names”. Many names, in fact, such as names of Leader, Presidents, or Kings, are presented in their original languages and everyone, by repetition, know how to say the "Exalted Leaders" name, like President Bush or Obama, but this is not true when it comes to our Savior's Name, a Name that is to be above every name (Isa 12:4, Php 2:9)

To “transliterate” a name from one language to another is to make that name sound like the original in the lettering or wording of a different language so the sound or pronunciation of that name is the same no matter which language it is spoken in. It may look different, on paper, to the owner of the name, but it would come out the same, or very near the same giving some allowance for accent and dialects when pronounced, or sounded out. This, however, is not what we find in the name, JESUS and YESHUA. One is not the transliteration of the other, and it is not the translation either, it is totally made up. In 1611 AD, when the King James “Authorized” Version what published the name appeared as IESVS. When people here the word, authorized, used when speaking or writing about the King James Bible we need to remember, the authorization of this Bible was by the King, King James. In other words, the KJV Bible was a government issue and contrary to some beliefs, it was not written by the Apostles (tongue in cheek sarcasm).

email: servant@yahshuaservant.com

www.yahshuaservant.com

[1][1]Excerpted from *American Heritage Talking Dictionary*. Copyright © 1997 The Learning Company, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

[2][2]Excerpted from *American Heritage Talking Dictionary*. Copyright © 1997 The Learning Company, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

