

The Complex Name of the Almighty

By Yoseph Viel

The Complex Name of the Almighty

By Yoseph Viel
© 2010

About the Author

Yoseph Viel frequently teaches using symbolism as a teaching tool in many types of congregations. He has spoken in Messianic Synagogues and Christian Churches and frequently demonstrates the hidden truths of the God's message as hidden in the spiritual understanding of the scriptures and the Gospel of our salvation. He has produced an abundance of teachings including two groundbreaking books:

- **The 42 Journey Pattern of Our Spiritual Growth and Prophecy.** This book delves into the names of the places Israel stayed at in the Wilderness and shows how it represents a pattern that appears many times in Scripture in many places; Torah, Psalms, Revelation, Romans, etc. It has implications in teaching us about our Spiritual growth as well as how prophecy will unfold in the future.
- **The Creative Forces** delves into how we can see the meaning of each letter of the Hebrew alphabet from the way each letter is used in Scriptural poetry.

Preface

Herein, I will examine several things;

- That there is an abundance of Hebrew writings that explain to us how to pronounce the Divine Name – most people just haven't read them. And most of them have not been translated into English.
- Most people who have read them have not understood them because they were trying to fit what they read into a box of thought based on English logic and assumptions – without even realizing they were making the assumptions they were making.
- A lot of error has been taught both about the Name as well as the history behind how the ban on speaking the Name evolved.
- What many ancient Hebrew writings teach about the pronunciation of the Divine Name.

Also, in way of a few side notes, while the letter VAV (ו) sometimes makes a “v” sound and sometimes makes a “w” sound in modern Hebrew, most best sources trace this to a “w” sound in the most ancient of times. For that reason, I've transliterated it as a “w” where it's expressed in English despite more modern conventions. If you have a different opinion, feel free to make that substitution in your mind.

Chapter 1 – The Name

Introduction

Isaiah 55:9 tells us,

“For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are My ways higher than your ways, and My thoughts higher than your thoughts.” (Isa 55:9)

So it should come as no surprise that His Name would be higher than the name of most humans? “Higher” in what way? Simply a manner of honor? Or is it possible that His Name is far more complex than our name?

Most humans have simple names. “Joe”. “Mike”. If a parent gives a child a name like “Theomatorus” and his schoolmates will call him “Tom”. And many people make the assumption that the Divine Name has the same sort of simplicity and ease of pronunciation as any ordinary human name. That philosophy is wrong. While my name has one way to be pronounced, the God who said, “My thoughts are higher than your thoughts” has a Name that can be pronounced many different ways, with more complexity of meaning, to reflect the greater complexity of His being and character.

The Divine Name has not one, not two, but *many* different ways it can be pronounced. It is not possible to know the meaning of each pronunciation without understanding what each letter means, what each vowel means, etc. As I progress in this I will document numerous ways that the Name can be said. There are several ways to say it that have a known and honorable meaning. There are several ways to say it that have a known and blasphemous meaning. There are many ways to say it that are known to be accurate pronunciations, but who's meaning is not well understood.

The presumption that the Divine Name can only be said one way is one of the first erroneous presumptions that has caused many people to come to erroneous conclusions about how to say it. However, even though there is more than one way to say it, selecting any pronunciation at random does not work. Some pronunciations are blasphemous, some aren't, but should still be avoided. Some are valid, but should be only used in certain circumstances. Some should be avoided for reasons that you may have never thought of before. No one should try to say the Divine Name without learning all of these types of issues.

Herein, I will document many of each of these kinds. But there are several common myths that needs that I'd like to address first:

- There's more than one way to say “יהוה” / “YHWH”
- Many of these ways are well known and well documented in Hebrew writings. The knowledge of how to pronounce it has never been lost to history.
- Most written information on this topic has never been translated into English. Some of it will be translated into English for the first time in this body of work.
- Sources for knowing how to say the Name are varied:
 - Some pronunciations for the Divine Name can be constructed from and understood by **applying the rules of grammar**.
 - Some pronunciations are understood from known meaning of vowels combined with the letters.

- **Some pronunciations have meanings that have been documented throughout history**, though there is no way to explain the origin of that pronunciation, or the link between that pronunciation and the understood meaning.
- Many attempts to reconstruct the Divine Name from information available to English sources produces blasphemous results.

What's In a Name?

What is a Name? The English concept of a “Name” and the Hebrew concept of a Name aren't exactly the same thing.

In English:

- A **name** is a collection of phonetic sounds with no apparent meaning to English ears. There's exceptions to that like “Hope” or “Faith”, but most names come from foreign languages and mean something in a foreign language, but mean nothing in English. So English ears EXPECT to hear a meaningless string of syllables for a “name”.
- A **title** describes your role and/or what you do.

In Hebrew:

- A Name describes your character, your role, what you do, something about you or your life, where you were born, etc.
- A title is a name. Because a Hebrew name has meaning, there is not the same distinction between a “title” and a “name” that exists in English. Hebrew uses the word “*shem*” for what we would call a “name” and for what we would call a “title” in English. “Wonderful”, “Counselor” and “Prince of Peace” are called NAMES (*shems*) in Isaiah chapter 9.

So when someone tells you, “there's a difference between a name and a title”, and then proceeds to talk about names or titles for God, they may be going down a path that doesn't agree with how Hebrew speech describes names and are trying to understand this topic from an English perspective instead of from a Hebrew perspective, where a title is a “*shem*” and a name is a “*shem*”. It is only because we use names that are meaningless to English ears that we view such a distinction to exist in English.

Most of this work will be devoted to understanding the four letter Divine Name, with only a few side discussions of God's other Names, such as “Adonai”, “Elohim”, etc., which are considered “names” / “*shems*” in Hebrew. However, even if Hebrew calls both a *shem* or “name”, Adonai, Elohim, and other terms we see used do not have the same level of complexity that “YHWH” / “EHYH” (יהוה / אהיה) have. And it is this complexity that would cause the English mindset to set the tetragrammation apart as a “Name”, and classify the others as what English would call a “title”, even if Hebrew does not make such a distinction. But keep in mind that Hebrew thought considers “Elohim” and “Adonai” to also be Names, just as YHWH / יהוה is a Name.

Why is the Name not said today?

Here's another issue about which that there has been a lot of error. Many people teach that:

- Judaism quit saying the Name after the Babylonian captivity and killed anyone who said it.
- When the Masorets wrote down the vowels for the Name, no one had spoken it in 1400 years, so they did not know how to write it down.
- People who speak Hebrew don't know how to say the Divine Name, but people who speak English can reconstruct the pronunciation from information available in English.

That's the error. Next, let me explain the reality. The purpose of this dissertation is not to prove every item on this theory from historical evidence, but a lot of historical evidence will surface as I discuss this topic in detail. When you are done reading this you will have no choice but to agree that all of the evidence that will be shown herein makes no sense unless the following items are the **correct** reason the Name is no longer pronounced. Proving **all** of these items is behind the scope of this discussion. But much of the information I will provide herein about what Jewish history records about speaking the Name will indeed demonstrate the truth of how this *really* developed.

- After the Babylonian Captivity, Jews decided not to speak the Divine Name in any language but Hebrew. This is evidenced by the fact that the Aramaic parts of Scripture **never** use the Divine Name.
- Later, it was declared that the Divine Name could not be spoken in a publicly mixed environment, except at the temple. However, there was no ban on speaking the name privately, in prayer, or in selective privileged communications.
- Among the privileged communications were:
 - that a Father had a **duty** to teach his son how to say the Name once every 7 years. Also, rabbis could teach it to their students, or scribes to other scribes. *Maimonides* said in *Guide to the Perplexed* (1140 AD) that the pronunciation of the Name should be taught every 7 years by a man to his son, or a rabbi to his student. So we can date the fact that there was a **duty** to say the name a few centuries after the Masoret period in selective cases.
 - Further evidence to this is found in the translation of a commentary on Psalm 20 I will provide in this dissertation. This commentary says that “teachers will say it with their students” and goes on to add that the students would respond using “the vowels of the Name as” he recorded it in the document. The vowels to the Name or other unusual situations (such as feminine vowels with masculine constructions as in this Psalm) are presumed to have been passed down orally before the advent of writing them down.
- During private prayer, one could speak the Name under certain conditions.
- There actually is evidence that at least some Jewish congregations spoke the Divine Name liturgically even into the 17th / 18th centuries. However, this may have been with the same frequency as Maimonides records (perhaps every 7 years as well). Jewish prayer books, holiday liturgical books, etc, are well recorded in which the Divine Name is used, pronounced, both with the traditional Masoretic pronunciations as well as with other pronunciations.
- The not so distant view that the Divine Name is spoken only in Hebrew and only in certain situations and times has somehow evolved into a near complete ban on speaking the Name, only within our more modern age.

Chapter 2 – Pronouncing the Divine Name

יהוה

As will be shown through numerous Jewish writings in the subsequent parts of the document, Judaism understands that there are multiple ways to pronounce the Divine Name. Based on grammar, we can conclude that some vowels, when inserted into YHWH (יהוה), provide a meaning that is sensible. Other vowels mean something bad and we would not want to use them. Many combinations of vowels, when put to the Divine Name, have no apparent meaning, but are supported as valid in Jewish tradition. Many of those will be shown later in this document through references.

Grammatically Understood Meaning of the Divine Name

The Name YHWH (יהוה) is built from adding a YUD (י) prefix to the root verb “הוה”. Many scholars have argued that “הוה” is Aramaic and not Hebrew, but if that were the case, then “יהוה” would be an Aramaic Name and there would be no problem using it in Aramaic, however, it never appears anywhere in the Aramaic parts of the Tanach. While “הוה” is rarely used in the *Masoret* text (it occurs in Genesis 27:29), this may have multiple reasons. First, “הוה” is used for present tense, with “היה” or “היה” with a prefix used for past and future tenses (or perfect versus imperfect uses). The present tense version of “הוה” is often optional and can be avoided, and it seems the Hebrew *Tanach* (Old Testament) avoids this construction where it can find another way to express such an idea, perhaps because of the fact the Divine Name is derived from it. In the present tense, sentences are often structured so that “הוא” or “היא” can be used and “הוה” can be avoided. “הוה” is used in Torah, but it is rarely used. It's connection to the Divine Name may be part of it, but there are other reasons that will become clear in the later sections of this.

Gen 27:29 says this:

הוה גביר לאחידך	(You) are a strong man to your brother.
	(Gen 29:27)

But the deeper one gets into analyzing this word, and how it is constructed and its various Hebrew meanings, there's no room to be mistaken that “הוה” and the Divine Name built from it is very Hebrew, very meaningful, and very complex. In fact it is the complexity of it that has scared some people away from accepting the idea that it has more than one pronunciation, but this is all part of the beauty of understanding a God Who's ways are higher than our ways, and Who's Name is more complicated than our Name in parallel of His greater complexity.

Vowels aren't always written in Hebrew. If they are optionally included, they are written either underneath or to the side of the consonant letters in a word. Vowels work differently in Hebrew than in English. In English, people think of vowels as the least important parts of a word, since pronunciation of vowels varies depending on what part of the world you live in. Most English speaking people pronounce the consonants the same way no matter where you live, but pronounce vowels a bit differently depending on region. However, in Spanish, its the consonants that often are pronounced differently in Spain that South America, while the vowels are more uniform. In Hebrew, the vowels are not part of the word definition, as with both Spanish and English, but they define the grammar. For example, “מֶלֶךְ” (or MLK in English) is a word. Pronounce it “MeLeK” and it means “king”. Pronounce it “MaLaK” and it means “reign”. Pronounce it “MoLeK” and it means “He Who reigns”. Add a YUD prefix and pronounce it “YiMLooK” and it means “He will reign”. The vowels don't affect the root meaning of the word – just the grammar by which it is expressed in a sentence.

So unlike English, the vowels are not some sort of trivial part of the word that can vary in pronunciation without changing the meaning. The whole grammatical construction changes if you change the vowels.

הוה is understood to have the following meanings:

- הוֹה = HoVeH or HoWeH means “is”, and is considered masculine and used for masculine constructions.

- הוֹהָ = HoVaH or HoWaH means “is”, and is feminine

- הוּהָ = HaYaH means “was”

- הוּוהָ = HuWWaH / HuVVaH means “has become”

- הוּוהָה = HiWaH / HiVaH means “cause to be”

- הוּוהָהָ = HaWWaH / HaVVaH means “evil”

When one adds a YUD (י) as a prefix, it puts the word in 3rd person future tense. Or in other words, similar to adding “He Will” to the above. Adding YUD (י) as a prefix to הוה yields “יהוה”, which is described as the 3rd person, imperfect/incomplete form of the verb “is”. Thus, the following forms would have the following meanings:

1. “Y'howeh” = “He (masc) Will Be the One Who Is” (masc)

2. “Y'howah” = “He (masc) Will Be the One Who Is” (feminine)

3. “Yehiwah” = “He Who causes to be”

4. “Yehuwwah” = “He Who has become”

5. The “הוּוהָהָ” form (I dare not write it in English as a single word) could yield a meaning of “He Who Is Evil”.

Obviously the last one is one you would never want to say about the Creator. It would be blasphemous, but it is a mis-pronunciation some people make, and one of the big reasons why speaking the Divine Name became discouraged when foreign speakers began to inter-mix with Hebrew speakers. It was their tendency to say it wrong, and thus say something blasphemous, that prompted banning publicly speaking the Name. There are people who love God with all their heart who mis-pronounce His Name in a blasphemous way, simply because they do not know better. This is why a careful study of Hebrew is needed to pronounce it correctly, and thus why the decision was made to not say the Name in any language other than Hebrew.

“He Who has become” would only be true of someone who, at one time, did not exist. Again, such a phrase is not something one would want to say about the only Eternal Being, but a slight mispronunciation of the Divine Name could cause someone to be calling “יהוה” that.

While there are multiple ways to say the Divine Name, that does not mean that “anything goes” and you can fill in whatever vowels you want and it will make sense and be something good to say. Some vowels, when inserted into the Tetragrammaton (the four letter name of YHWH), are blasphemous. Some aren't blasphemous, but are still somewhat problematic. For example, if one pronounces the Name so as to be saying, “He Who Allows To Be”, there's several philosophical problems about how to apply or interpret that. Is one saying God allowed Himself to exist? Or is one saying God allows things He could control to the contrary to exist? He doesn't allow everything to happen. He forbade Satan from killing Job. He's not a *laissez faire* Diety who ignores His creation. He answers prayers. He performs miracles. But there are times He leaves people alone too. So that would be one pronunciation you would not want to say, even though it may not necessarily be blasphemous.

Some pronunciations may be meaningless, and this could be a big problem. For one of the 10 commandments says not to take His Name “in vain” according to most English translations. The Hebrew says “לִפְנֵי ה'” which could be translated “for vanity” or “for emptiness” or “for nothing”. Does someone do that if they pronounce His Name so that it means nothing? The Name is supposed to mean something. If it is supposed to mean something, did I **empty** (שוּא) it of its meaning by saying it with vowels that have no meaning? The safe approach is to only say it in a way that conveys a well known meaning.

The earliest ban on using the Divine Name appears to be not using it outside speaking Hebrew, which appears obvious from the fact that the Aramaic parts of Scripture omit any use of the Divine Name. Since the earliest ban on speaking the Name within Hebrew speech only applied to **public** speech, not private prayer, the reason for this is simple. There was no general objection to speaking the Name, but a fear that non-Hebrew speakers would hear the Name pronounced, try to repeat what they heard, and mispronounce it, yielding something blasphemous such as “He Who Is Evil” or “He Who Has Become”. These mispronunciations frequently happen today in many American “Sacred Name” congregations where people not familiar with Hebrew have tried to reconstruct pronouncing the Divine Name using English based logic as the means for deriving that pronunciation.

No one is likely to have any problem with pronunciation number three above of “He Who Causes To Be” in my above list of grammatically constructed meanings of the Name, because YHWH is indeed the one who caused everything to exist. Since we think of God as masculine, most people would be naturally inclined to chose “Y'howeh”, the masculine form. But in reality, Jewish tradition testifies to an acceptance of “Y'howah” (He (masculine) Who Is (feminine)) over the masculine form. But I will show examples of “Y'howah” (יה'ה) used as one of several pronunciations in places where it is being very explicit that these are exact and proper vowels.

Historically Accepted Meanings

Some pronunciations of the Divine Name have been historically accepted as having a meaning that may be understood, or not understood, or its purpose usage is understood. Their meaning cannot be explained from grammar, but it's still believed that the meaning is accepted.

For example, on the Day of Atonement, the Divine Name is said to be pronounced as “יְהוָה” or “YoHeWaHe”. I have seen this mentioned in numerous Hebrew documents (I learned the above vowels from one of those Hebrew documents), and it is one of the few I've also seen in English (recorded in page 158 of “Sayings of the Jewish Fathers” by Joseph Garfinke). The explanation of its meaning is complex, and does not come from grammatical rules like the previous ones I mentioned, and its usage is understood to be restricted to this special day. A special pronunciation for this special day. And only the High Priest would say it this way.

There are other historically accepted and understood meanings that will emerge as this discussion continues. But first I will turn to the one that is recorded in history by the greatest quantity.

The most common vowels found in the Masoret Tanach are:

- (1) “Yehowah” (יְהוָה) or “Y'howah” is used 6,518 times and is the basis for the derived form of “Jehovah”.
- (2) “Yehowih” (יְהוִי) is used 305 times.

Keep in mind that the English vowels only approximate the sound and fail to notate that the “e” in the second case is a shorter version than the first “e” and not exactly the same sound.

Many scholars have dismissed “Y'howah” (יְהוָה) as an error and claimed that this set of vowels were written only because Judaism used “Adonai” as a euphemism, and they were writing the vowels for “Adonai”. That is, when Jews see “יהוה” (YHWH) in the text, they say “Adonai” in its place.

But there are numerous problems with this assertion. First, “Y'howah” (יְהוָה) does not have all the same vowels as “Adonai” (אֲדֹנָי). Those scholars who have been able to get past that issue and have rejected it on the grounds that it combines masculine and feminine together. However, I will demonstrate in one old Hebrew writing known as “*Segulah Niphlah*”, that there are several words mentioned in which it is stated that in ancient times, Psalm 20 was pronounced with several words having masculine consonants and feminine vowels. That of course makes “Y'howah” (יְהוָה) normal, overcoming the biggest objection to it. Of course this is only done when God Himself is the one performing the action. Masculine consonants and feminine vowels aren't *always* used when it describes God performing some action, but the only time feminine vowels are used with masculine consonants are when God is indeed the One performing the action.

Also, we see a mixture of both masculine and feminine in the use of the phrase “*Ruach HaQodesh*” (רוח קדש in Ps 51, Isa 63:10,11, and רוח הקודש in the *Mishnah*) or “Holy Spirit” which merges the feminine “רוח” with the masculine adjective of “קדש” instead of with the feminine version of that same adjective.

Another flaw in the theory that the vowels were chosen for the sake of a euphemisms is that *Masoret* scrolls were forbidden to be used for public reading. When publicly reading the Scriptures, a scroll with no vowels must be used. *Masoret* manuscripts are only for private use, and the ban on speaking the Name only existed for public speech at first. It did not always apply to private prayer time, though it has been extended to

that in our modern time. However there are Hebrew prayer books from only a few hundred years ago that have the Divine Name written out in completion with vowels.

It may be possible, even likely, that the use of the euphemisms “*Adonai*” and “*Elohim*” had some *influence* on these pronunciations being put into the *Masoret* text. However, that does not mean the *Masorets* wrote down vowels that were “wrong” and would yield a pronunciation that is not a correct way to say the Name of the Almighty. They had too much respect for his Name to do that. But what is used in the Masoret text represents only *some* of the ways the Name can be pronounced; it has many different ways it can be pronounced that are legitimate. They were not the vowels for *Adonai*, and if someone pronounced the Divine Name as written in the *Masoret Tanach*, it would still mean “He Who Is”, which is what Judaism teaches to be the traditionally understood meaning of the Name.

Now having said that the Masoret pronunciation of “Y'howah” (יהוה) is not a euphemism for “Adonai”, would it sound contradictory if I said that it was chosen because you're supposed to say “Adonai” there? It might sound like a contradiction. But I do believe that this pronunciation was *influenced* by the fact that tradition teaches to say “Adonai” there. But not in the way many people teach. The reality is that there are multiple ways to say the Divine Name, and where “Elohim” is vocalized, YHWH with the vowels of Elohim is written because it is understood to be a valid pronunciation of the Divine Name. Where “Y'howah” (יהוה) appears, Adonai is to be spoken, and it may have been chosen because it is the *closest valid* pronunciation of Adonai that CAN be spoken. In other words, I am suggesting that when the vowels of “Adonai” are written underneath the Tetragrammation, it has a known meaning, and that meaning is not to be spoken. I have not covered enough information to explain what that pronunciation means, and why it is not to be spoken, but what I am saying is that these two pronunciations were chosen in the Masoret text at least partly because they were the two *closest valid* pronunciations of the Divine Name that can be said, and the Tetragrammation is not to be spoken with the same vowels as used for Adonai.

In the following I will provide an English translation for the treatise called “*Segulah Niphlah*”, which helps to demonstrate several important things about the Divine Name. It shows that Judaism understand there to be multiple ways to say the Name. It uses “Y'HoWaH” as one of several pronunciations, thus, it is obvious that it is not being used as a euphemism, but accepted for it's He Who Is” meaning. And it demonstrates that the construction of “He (masculine) Who Is (feminine)” is not a problem since other similar verbs are treated the same way in a similar context. For that reason, I have decided to translate the entire document in the next chapter.

Chapter 3 – A Wonderful Treasure A Commentary On Psalm 20

“*Segulah Niphlah*” / “סגולה נפלאה” has been published in several sources, including *Shulchan Aruch*, *Nagid U'Mitzvah*, and other ancient Hebrew texts. It means “A Wonderful Treasure” and it records Psalms 20, and comments on it as well. It is significant for several reasons:

- It is a partially vocalized copy of Psalm 20 with some of those vocalizations differing from the *Masoret* text of Psalm 20.
- It goes into a discussion about what the proper way to say the Divine Name is in various places.
- It records that there are multiple ways to pronounce “YHWH” / “יהוה”.

At the time this document was written, Jewish *halachah* was that there are several factors that go into when one can and cannot say the Divine Name:

- It was only permitted to be spoken in Hebrew. Never another language.
- The ban on speaking the name publicly did not apply to prayer. In prayer, one could speak the Name under certain conditions. One of those conditions is when calling on God for relief from a problem.
- This commentary says that “teachers will say it with their students” and goes on to add that the students would respond using “the vowels of the Name as” he recorded it in this document. The vowels to the Name or other unusual situations (such as feminine vowels with masculine constructions as in this Psalm) are presumed to have been passed down orally before the advent of writing them down.

The tradition on when/where it is proper to speak the Divine Names has evolved over the years. Today, “YHWH” is never spoken under any circumstances, but remnants of the ancient traditions are seen in the fact that “Elohim” is only pronounced as such during prayer and study, and it is pronounced “Elokim” at other times. This is a far more limited remnant of the more ancient rule that “YHWH” could be spoken in prayer, but not at other times.

No one knows exactly who wrote *Segulah Niphlah* or where it came from originally. It can only be verified to be as old as the 16th century, but there is some intrinsic evidence that it goes back farther than that, and may even be pre-Masoret. That will be demonstrated later.

The vowels, as written in this document, do not contain a *cholam* present anywhere due to printing issues. On the next page is a photo copy of the first page of this commentary. The first page includes all of Psalm 20, and some additional commentary. There are a few more pages of commentary after this first page. I have provide the first page in Hebrew, and the entire article in English translation. This allows the reader to see the pronunciation as it is used in the Psalm, but the pages that follow after that are only given in the English translation.

סגולה נפלאה

רא

לומר בשעת צרה ויולדת

א' י"א ה"ה"ד יו"ג ה"ה"י יכוין בכל פעם

למנצח מוזר לרור יענך יְהוָה בַּיּוֹם צִרָה יִשְׁנַבֵּךְ שֵׁם
אלהי יעקב (יכוין בשם הו"ה הנזכר בניקוד
(הצינני נא מיד אחי) (ויכוין נ"כ י'חוד כ"יום צרה י'שנבך נ"י
יב"ק כסנין נ' שמות כידוע מה שהוא מכין ויאמר בלשון נקבה

יענך ישנבך ישלח עזרך

מקודש (מתלת אילעי דאי קרי קודש ויושפע בציון דהאי ימד
סלוק בכתר ברוא דמוסף) ומציון יסְעֶרְךָ יזכור מנחותיך ועולתך
ידשנה סלה יתן לך כלבבך וכל עצתך ימלא נרננה
בישועתיך ובשם אלהינו נגדול ימלא יְהוָה ויכוין בשם הו"ה
הנזכר בניקוד (ומיד עשו כי ירא) כל משאלותיך עתה
ידעתי כי הושיע יְהוָה בניקוד (אנכי אוחו סן יבא) משיחו
יענהו משמי קדשו בנבירות י"שע (ס"ת למפרע נ"י יב"ק)
ימינו אלה ברכב ואלה במוסים ואנחנו בשם יְהוָה (בניקוד
תפול עליהם אימתה וסחד) אלהינו נזכיר המה כרעו
ונפלו ו"אנחנו ק"מנו ו"נתעודד (ר"ת נ"י יב"ק יְהוָה (בניקוד
בגדול זרועך ידמו כאבן) הושיעה המלך יעננו ב"יום
קדאנו (ר"ת יב"ק ויאמר פלוני ב"פ מאן דעני לאמך הוא
יענה יתך אין כמך בשמים ובארץ מי יוכל לספר שכחך :
יהי רצון מלפניך אלהי השמים ואלהי הארץ אלהי אברהם
אלהי יצחק ואלהי יעקב האל הגדול הגבור והנורא אלה
אשר אהיה יְהוָה אלהים יְהוָה צבאות שדי אֲדֹנָי רחום וחנון
העונה לעתות כצרה את יראיו הוא יקבל
תפילתינו ותפילת עמך בית ישראל ובכללם יזכור ויפקוד ברחמים
אשה עצורה חזק בחבלי מרת פלונית אשת פלוני היא יושבת
על המשבר היא שוכרה על אלהים הש"י יראה צרתה ודמעתה
ויעתר לה ותעלה לרצון תפילתה הש"י ברחמיו הרבים יפלוט
וברחמיו הרבים יחלצה ממ"ה הקב"ה ששמע וענה תפלות
אמהות הקדושות והטהורות שהיה טבעם עקרות והפך ושנה
מערכתם והיו מאותו עקרות נפקדות ונזכרות כזרע אנשים הוא
יזכור לאשה הנזכרת שיושבת על המשבר כי עיניה תלויות לך לברך
רשפחה

The Divine Name appears 6 times in Psalm 20 and several other times in the commentary with the following pronunciations:

- יְהוָה
- יְהוָה
- יְהוָה
- יְהוָה
- יְהוָה

- יהוה , or “Y'howah”, which is in the Masoret Tanach and can be interpreted as “He Who Is”, combining a masculine prefix with feminine vowels for “הוה”

When the content of the Psalm is examined and analyzed in correlation with which pronunciation of the Name, it becomes clearer why more than one different pronunciation is used in the same text.

It is clear that each of these pronunciations are considered a proper way to say “YHWH” in each case. The writer is drawing an enormous amount of attention to the pronunciation through his comments, attempting to strike the fear that God will punish people if they do not carry forward the tradition of pronouncing the Name as written that he is passing on to them in exact detail.

It also confirms that “Y'howah” / “יהוה” is not a grammatical mistake. It means “He (masculine) Will Be the One Who Is (feminine)”. While this seems like an error to some people, this commentary on Psalm 20 tells us that there are 5 words in Psalm 20 that have masculine consonants combined with feminine vowels. In each case, God is referred to by these words. 3 are verbs describing an action God is performing. So if words describing the action of God can have masculine consonants and feminine vowels, then it is not an inherent problem if the traditional *Masoret* use of “יהוה” also combined masculine consonants with feminine vowels. The writer draws a lot of attention to these words with masculine prefixes but feminine consonants, probably because the pronunciation of “Y'howah” / “יהוה” does the same thing, and so the reader will know that the way the vowels were written

On the following page, I provide a translation of this commentary. This commentary will provide several key pieces of information to demonstrate that the above is not a grammatical mistake by showing that:

- There are times that verbs describing the action God is doing are written with masculine letters and combined with feminine vowels.
- “Y'howah” / “יהוה” is included as one of several pronunciations used in this commentary, and the writer goes into great detail to validate that this is the correct pronunciation, not a euphemism.

A Wonderful Treasure

Learning In the Hour of Affliction and Birth

[With] “Adonai”, “YHWH”, and “EHYH (I AM)” as they are intended each time

For the Conductor. A song of David. **YaHeWiHa**¹ (יְהוִה) will answer you during the day of affliction. The Name of the God of Ya'acov (Jacob) will exalt you.

(Established with the the name of HaShem preserved with vowels (Please continue preserving my brother)). And the Prophets and the Writings have special ones like “day of affliction ... He will exalt you”. A gematria² of 112 is similar to the counting of the 3 names³ as they are known from what is established. **And it says in the feminine tongue**

יְעִיבְךָ	יְשַׁבְּרְךָ	יְשַׁלַּח עֲזִירְךָ
He Will	He Will	He Will
answer	exalt	help
you	you	send forth
<i>(feminine vowels)</i>	<i>(feminine vowels)</i>	<i>(feminine vowels)</i>

He will send your assistance from the sanctuary.

(from three upper [sefirot]⁴ which are called “holy” and he [or “it”] will discharge in Zion⁵, this is the Foundation rising into the Crown⁶, which is hinted at in the Musaf⁷ [prayer].)

And from Zion **he will support**

A
commentary
of Psalm 20

¹See comments below

²A gematria is a numerical sum of a word.

³3 names are YHWH, “I AM” & Adonai add up to 112.

Note: The words to the left have masculine consonants but feminine vowels

⁴See notes at end of section

⁵A paraphrase of “He will send forth from Zion” but in Aramaic

⁸emphasis is to show vowels are feminine.

you (feminine)⁸ (יִסְעָדְךָ) He will remember all your meal-offerings and the fat of your Ascension⁹ Offerings. *Selah*.

Give according to your own heart and fulfill all your counsel. We will shout for joy in your victory and in the Name of our God we have excelled / enlarged.¹⁰ May **YiHeWiHa** (יְהוָה)

(with the Name of HaShem preserved with vowels (and continued for fear / respect))

fulfill all your petitions. Now I know that **YaHoWeHa**¹¹ (יְהוָה)

(with vowels; I letter it lest He come)

saves His annointed. He will answer him from His holy heaven through the strength of His saving right hand.

(The start of the words have a gematria of 112¹²)

Some [trust¹³] in chariots and some in horses, but we will remember the Name of **YiHWeHa** (יְהוָה)

(with vowels falling upon them with great fear and trembling)

our God. They are bent down and fallen, but we are risen up and stand erect.

(The first letter of each word have a gematria of 112¹⁴).

Let **YiHWiHa** (יְהוָה) save!

Note:
Masoret has “יִסְעָדְךָ” where this has “יִסְעָדְךָ”

⁹traditionally “burnt offering”, but this is more literal.

¹⁰Masoret has “set up standards”

¹¹An implied cholam may be present after the HEY.

¹²The first letter of the 3 words preceding that comment add up to the value of the 3 names.)

¹⁴ Text has a mistake explained in later footnotes.

¹⁵In other words, he's instructing later scribes to

(with pronunciation enlarged, your arm¹⁵ comparable to stone.)

Let the King respond to us in the day that we call.

(The [gematria of] the first letters [of each of the last 3 words] is 112.) And it said certainly 2 times that things are refused from the afflicted are for your people, because there is none like you in heaven or on earth who can tell of your power. Let more of your presence be desired O God of the heavens and God of the earth and God of Abraham, God of Isaac and God of Jacob, the Great God, powerful and Whom we fear, the “I Am that I Am”, **Y'HoWaH (He-Who-Is) God Y'HoWaH (He-Who-Is)** of hosts Almighty ADoNaI, merciful and graceful to the lowly. At times like affliction, they will revere you.

He will receive our prayers and the prayers of your people, the House of Israel, and He will remember all of them and He sets free with His mercies.

A treasured woman cries with the agonies of the bitterness of the things of a woman when she is seated on the travailing chair. She receives through God. She fears affliction and weeps and He enriches her and her prayer rises for good will. Through His many mercies He rescues her and His many mercies save her. The Holy One hears and answers her prayer. The holy handmaidens and the purifications that were immersed pass, and are turned and change from their arrangements and it is from Him that barrenness is visited and the remembrance in the offspring of men is remembered to the woman who is remembered that sat on the travailing chair for her afflictions [and] hangings¹⁶ for You to bless like a maidservant through strength being sent

continue the tradition of making the letters and vowels larger than the rest of the text. See additional comments in next section.

¹⁶While תלויה literally translates “hangings”, it culturally implies an insult about menstruation/reproductivity. Sebastian Munster notes this in chapter 1 of his commentary of Secundum Matteum and equates תלויה (hangings) with “טמעה ונדדה” (unclean and menstruating)

out with an abundance.¹⁷ And she fasts in this hour on her own that she hears Him Who brought about the prayer herein in this psalm. And the prayer rises before you like a fragrance placed upon her, and a crown of fragrance covering the back of the altar.

I called to you with all my humbled heart, O YHWH. Your statutes are a treasure.

And He will whisper in her ears this infusion,
“His proceeding has proceeded and [continually] proceeds and is stored in His storage-box and has been stored”¹⁸

When a man is in trouble, whether alone or whether with many, he should say this psalm 12 times. And also teachers, likewise, will say it with their students. (And corresponding to this psalm, He will answer you with all the purpose of the previous Scripture and also the vowels of the Names as above).

To the conductor of this psalm: For the generation of those who fear the Book of Torah, when they come to recite this psalm they must say it in fear and in dread and in great trembling and needing great purpose and needing preparation with one from His God. The 3 Names (“אהיה”= “I am”, יהוה = YHWH, and אדני = Adonai (Lord)) are revered like this “איהיה”^{f 19} And the first letters of the word hinted at in “AMT”²⁰ (אמת) are the letters for “אהיה” (for “I AM”) MALKUT (kingdom) and TIFERET (beauty)²¹. And also in [the Hebrew word] “AMT”²⁰ (אמת) is a *Notarikan*²² in detailed examination of the letters of the reshuffled word.²³ And it needs to be clarified that there is no error in the

¹⁷ See Deut 15:13 and also compare with content to footnote number 5.

¹⁸ Original text is very poetic and given in footnotes

¹⁹ Note: This is a rescrambling of the letters in the 3 Divine Names, and was used in the title above

²¹ referring to the link between these two in “Etz Chaiim”

²² term similar to an acrostic, but not exactly.

reshuffling when the mouth is not used, for from the power of the reshuffling comes a different arrangement and from the construction it makes another more interesting matter within the brilliance of the Song of Songs²⁴ and also a collateral examination of “יִם”^{f 25} of the later letters and this is its language. For one is not to release what is to be grasped or to grasp what is to be released. And one does not lead what is set to rest and what moves is not to be set to rest. But no expression is placed in the letters that were moved or of the vowels given at Sinai. And it is necessary to know every outward-shell²⁶ like this is supported for that which is required except what ceased to be annotated in 60 chapters of poetry. And this is the entire adoption in your hand that captures another great movement. There is a guiding element ^(or reason) to what is seen of the [letters] moved and for other small demands of what rests ^[the letters not moved] and sufficiency of wisdom.

Also, if a man desires that his prayers be received, he must repair transgressions²⁷ and with detail that is not defective of the proposals and therefore the original mercies ^[or merciful acts] will be their prayer²⁸, breaking through all the firmaments that are shined upon. Do no be faulty in what goes out with the evil tongue and in mockery and in vain oaths and in idle words. And this psalm has 313 letters as opposed to 310 words, which are hinted in the wisdom upon it that said to acquire loved ones, “310 and 3 versus 3 words in Emanation, Creation and Formation. And afterwards, “the court will appraise with great purpose.”²⁹

And may a desire for Your presence, Adonai our God, and the God of our fathers, the Almighty of Holy Jacob Israel place upon us the guard of 60³⁰ mighty men surrounding

²³ *referring to how letters were reshuffled above.*

²⁴ *this may refer to a place where it was commonly understood that the Song of Songs does a similar respelling at a symbolic level , not obvious in English translations. See next section for more detail.*

²⁶ *Literally reads “garment” here, but figuratively referring to the way we make something appear on the outside.*

²⁷ *See notes at end.*

²⁹ *Writer appears to be quoting something he suspects most readers would already be familiar with.*

³⁰ *See SofS 3:7 . 60 is the number symbolically linked to support and the letter “ו” in Hebrew thought. See*

and the destruction of the fringes (*which has a gematria of 216*) through us to perform a raising of our enemies and as the name that is an affliction to Jacob our father (may the peace be upon him) like Bethel when he said, “And I will make there an altar to God who answered me³¹ in the day of my affliction” (Gen 35:3) and thus was Adonai HaShem (may the peace be upon Him) worshiped and thus was Joab in the war whom You answered, HaShem, in the day of affliction. He set on high there the God of Jacob, who is HaShem, for Jacob said to God, “...who answers me in the day of my affliction”. In this Name I will call upon You (“אהיה”= “I am”, יהוה = YHWH, and אדני = Adonai (Lord)). He answered us in the day we called. And Exodus credits those who went out with this psalm and its vowels and writings and its letters and its accents preserved upon us who cut all thorns and the ending of that which surrounds the flower.

“The Creative Forces” by Yoseph Viel for more detail on this topic.

³¹ אורתי is what is in this text but אהי is in the Masoret text.

Rabsha³² redeemed the sons of Jacob from rage and anger (Chance stitches together every uprising upon us with rage). Compassion and grace will be before your eyes of our affliction. [When you] see with our eyes, then our argument is compelling. And may all nations know that you are set apart, Israel. Please remembered your lowly sons and their fathers watching for your salvation every day.

Our Father Who is in the heavens, You are righteous and You are merciful and all Your works are through faithfulness. They exiled Your mercies through Your sons for we are thirsty for Your mercies. And we remembered what You commanded us in Your holy teachings^(feminine) for he made Your brother poor and he stretched out his hand and she³³ grasped it. And we are the sons of the children that You made. May [Your] compassion be upon us like the majority of Your mercies we enjoy. The accounting of our affliction is life and resurrection. You performed for us miracles and wonders in the Name of YHWH of hosts for victory against Your enemies and in the Name of the God of hosts for salvation through Your hands.

And in the Name of *El Shaddai* the Righteous, He founded a world to be guarded by the Righteous³⁴ who feared Your Name through the Name of “I AM” (EHYH), Your first crown, through the Name of YHWH, Your beauty, and through the Name of *Adonai*, Your holy temple. For many will rise up upon us to destroy us, the Holy Place and from Zion. You will support us in the day of affliction. You will set us on high, because Your Name is Holy and Your letters are holy. For *Adonai* will save us for Your Name is feared, *HaShem*, our Guardian, and because the merciful perfect “I AM” (EHYH) is our redeemer. He rose from the throne of judgement and sat on the throne of compassion, opening to us the gates of the heavens to the rising of prayer of

the knocking on Your doors, for to You is Your people Israel raised to Your salvation. *Selah*. You will bring Israel to You first, accepting your faithfulness and your teachings. *El Shaddai* is our deliverer from all that rises upon us and You give us grace and mercy and compassion in Your eyes and in the eyes of all who behold us. May we find rest for our souls. Faithful shepherd, come quickly and redeem us with Your power, YHWH our God, and build Your city speedily in our days. And build Your holy temple and beautify it and may Your presence dwell among us in the light of Your Face, the light in us.

May Life be upon us
([“Life” has the] gematria of *EHYH YHWH EHYH*)

Our Father , Our King

Footnotes:

¹ Shulchan Aruch reading is clearly “יְהוָה”. Nagid Umitzvah reading is arguably either “יְהוָה” or “יְהוָה” (He Who Causes To Be). In English, I am using “a” (underlined) for patach and “*a*” in italics for qamats, “*e*” for tsere, and “*e*” for segol.

² A “gematria” is a numerical sum of a word.

³ Gematrias are counted with “א” equals 1, “ב” equals 2, “י” equals 10, etc. The Hebrew words אהיה יהוה אדני add up to 112. There are several places in the Psalm where the writer points out that certain letter combinations add up to 112. So this statement may have been an introduction to pointing that out in other places. The author may see a connection between the phrase “ביום צרה ישגברך” and 112 explained in the next chapter.

⁴ It may be possible the author sees a connection between the 3 upper *sefirot* and the 3 words with masculine consonants and feminine vowels.

⁵ Commentator may be paraphrasing “שלח” (send) in Hebrew (which is also an Aramaic word) as “[י]שפע” (discharge) in Aramaic. This probably relates to what is sent forth from the 3 upper *sefirot* as well.

⁶ This is a references to the spheres of “Foundation” / *Yesod* and “Crown” / *Keter* in the Tree of Life.

⁷ The *Musaf* is a set of liturgical prayers added as a replacement to sacrifices.

¹⁰ This psalm has “נגדול” = “enlargened” where the Masoret has “נדגל”, which is translated “we will set up our standards” by the JPS and “we will set up our banners” by the KJV.

¹² The first letter in the 3 words that preceded this comment were the three letters that are used to indicate the gematria of the 3 names.

¹³ Psalms 20:7-8 reads like this:

בגְבוּרַת, יִשַׁע יְמִינוֹ חֲזָאֵה בְרָכָב	...with the strength of His Right
--	-----------------------------------

	Hand. Some in chariots....
--	----------------------------

But is generally translated as if it read like this....

בְּגִבּוֹרֹת, יֵשַׁע יְמִינוֹ יֵאֱמִינוּ הַאֱלֹהִים	...with the strength of His Right Hand. Some trust in chariots....
---	--

There's a verb missing from Ps 20:8, and some believe the proper verb should be “יֵאֱמִינוּ” and that the similarity between this word and the previous “יְמִינוּ” may have caused its omission by a scribe, although I believe the omission of a verb here was poetically intentional to make a point and not a scribal accident. A rejection of this theory and accepting the “Scribal accident” theory would lead us to use the verb near the end of the sentence (remember) twice and translate this as...

“Some remember in chariots....”

But because this is poetry, the unusual sentence constructions found here may be an intention part of the poetry. In this particular case, it may well be that the text is trying to hint at the word “trust” being missing through this sentence construction as a poetic way of getting across the idea that trusting in Chariots is really a lack of trust in the one to whom trust **should** be directed. So the missing verb (“יֵאֱמִינוּ”), that is hinted at by the previous word (“יְמִינוּ”) that is almost like it, was something I believe was done intentionally and poetically to indicate a lack of trust in God.

¹⁴ The text actually says “רִיחַ גִּי יִכְיֶק” (the heads of the words have a gematria of 130), but this is a clear error and should read “רִיחַ גִּי יִבְיֶק” (the heads of the words have a gematria of 112) since the first letter in each of the 3 words that precede this statement are QUF (ק), VAV (ו), and another VAV (ו), which adds up to 112. I have translated as intended, rather than as the scribes have miscopied. Since a “כ” and a “ב” look a lot alike, it is easy to see where the mistake came from.

¹⁶ While the Hebrew word involved here is literally translated “hangings”, it has a cultural implication that carries an insulting connotation to a woman concerning either her menstruation or reproductivity. Sebastian Munster notes this in chapter 1 of his commentary of *Secundum Mattheum* (1537 AD) and equates “תלויה” (hangings) with “טמעה ונדא” (unclean and menstruating).

¹⁸ The phrase “פוק פקו ופק ופק קפו קפו” has “קפ” not “קף” in the original text. The phrase is built from two root words:

- “פק” refers to something that goes forth, in this case, from God, to the woman who prays.
- “קף / קפ” could be understood as the masculine form of “קפה” referring to a box or storage container to put something in.
- “קוף” in the name of the letter “ק” in Hebrew, and understood to symbolize man calling on God and God answering. (See Yoseph Viel's *The Creative Forces* for more information on this topic.) Since this phrase is about God answering someone's prayer, this would explain why “קפה” was transformed into the a masculine form of “קפ” so the mystical connection between the answer/call cycle of the letter “קוף” and the storage container being used to store something of value (קפה masculinized to קפ) would be

easier to see. This may also be why it was written “קפ” instead of “קר” since another letter usually does follow it.

- “פק” is a rare word that was chosen as a permutation of “קפ”, which is a play on words with “קר”.

Note also that the previous line says, “Your statutes are a treasure” so it is a poetic response measured in like manner to the statement.

¹⁹ In the rescrambling of יהוה, אהיה, and אדני as “איהההי יוהיההי” The first letter of the rescrambled words is אהיה, the second letter of each word is יהוה, and the third letter of each word forms אדני.

²⁰ Essentially this is saying that the word “אמת” contains the first letter of 3 words:

אהיה	= “I AM”
מלכות	= “kingdom”
תפארת	= “beauty”

which represents the 3 *sefirot* that are the “middle stem” of the tree of life. The word “אמת” is the word “אמה” (stem) in construct form. In this section, he does not make the connection very well between this thought and the scrambling of the Names in the part footnoted in 19, but it is obvious from the part footnoted in part 35 that He sees אהיה (the first letter of each word in footnote 19) in Keter, יהוה (the second letter of each word in the previous) in Tefirot, and אדני (the third letter of each word in the previous) in Malkut. However, this is a bit forced since it inconsistently uses אהיה instead of KeTeR, and he swaps the order of Tiferet and Malkut to make this work.

²¹There are many ancient Jewish teachings that map the letters of the Divine Name to the concept of the “Tree of Life”. This appears to be what the author is referring to in this usage.

²²A *Notarikan* is a notation in which letters stand for words, like an English acrostic, but not necessarily with the same logic.

²⁷Text actually says “אבריים” (members, parts, etc), but due to context I assumed this was a spelling mistake for “עבריים”, which can mean several things including “transgressions”.

²⁸ In other words, he is saying that a merciful act to repair damage done by a previous action is a substitute for prayer.

³² probably an acrostic abbreviation of someone's name.

³³ There is a gender shift in this sentence that has been preserved in the English translation. It could be saying that Torah (feminine) grasped the hand reaching out to it (her) for help.

³⁴ Text reads “צדקיט”, which may be a spelling mistake for “צדקית” or may be a proper name derived from “צדקית”.

Chapter 4 - Commentary On the Commentary

It is clear from the multiple republishing of “*Segulah Niphlah*” / “סגולה נפלאה” that this writing was popular in Judaism and the authority of what it teaches is not in dispute. It was published in the following works:

1. 1550 AD, Shulchan Aruch, a publication so important in Jewish history that it defines the end of the period of the Rishonim.
2. 1712 AD in Nagid U'Mitzvah / “נגיד ומצוה”
3. 1925 AD in הקונטרס היחידי אלי

So this commentary has been a popular and important part of Jewish history. And while the content may surprise some people, there are other writings that add understanding to this topic elsewhere in Jewish history as well.

The author goes out of his way numerous times to tell us that the vowels underneath the Divine Name are the correct way to say the Divine Name when reciting the song. He does this in enough detail that we know he is not writing **any** of the pronunciations in order to satisfy some standing of the vowels conforming to a euphemistic use, as many have alleged the Masoretic manuscript does. However, he still uses the most popular Masoretic vowel markings in more than one place, using “יְהוָה” (“Y'howah”) in his commentary after the Psalm, and there's no reason to think that the author was using a euphemism when he spent so much energy teaching people the correct way to say the Name in numerous places.

The omission of the *cholam* was probably a printer issue. It is not easy to do in the modern computer age as well, since it can create additional spacing that is not desired. In ancient times, the *cholam* may have been considered optional. Before vowels markings were invented, the VAV was used as a *mater* for the *cholem*, and may have continued to be so, thus it was one of the easiest vowels that would have been considered unnecessary to mark.

The author's cites two thoughts that he does not connect very well. He states, “And the Prophets and the Writings have special ones like “day of affliction, He will exalt you”.” He then goes on to add, “A gematria of 112 is similar to the counting of the 3 names as they are known from what is established.” By some sense of counting, the phrase “in the day of affliction, He will exalt you” could be considered to have a gematria of 112 in the initial letters, plus the preposition if the prepositional BET is counted independently. At that point, this phrase “ביום צרה ישגבך” has, as its initial letters Yud (י) + Tsaddi (צ) + Yud (י), which adds up to 110. If the prepositional BET (ב) is considered independent of the entire phrase, one could add 2 more and get 112. Thus its possible that the writer could see a connection between the Psalm starting with the phrase “ביום צרה ישגבך” and that this is a hint that the Psalm is important in revealing something about the Divine Name. Or it may simply be that the second statement was a setup to the fact that there are several places in the Psalm where he stops to point out the the initial letters to a phrase add up to 112, but he doesn't explicitly do that for this phrase. Perhaps the phrase “ביום צרה ישגבך” suggested this thought to him, but he stopped short of making the connection since the prepositional BET (ב) should either be omitted (yeilding a count of 110) or used in place of the Yud (yielding a count of 102). This would explain why the two sentences seem to be there, somewhat disjointedly, without a smooth connection between the two thoughts.

The statement “may your arm be as stone” could mean multiple things. In English, we use the phrase “set in stone” to refer to something that cannot be changed. In Hebrew thought, a “stone” (אבן) is sometimes used symbolically to represent what passes from father (אב) to son (בן). Merging father and son together results in “אב + בן” yielding “אבן”. Here, a stone is being used when discussing what passes from one scribe to the next generation of scribes, fitting by analogy the symbolic meaning of a stone as what passes from father to son. This is covered in more detail in my commentary on *Vayetse* at www.messiahalive.com/parshah7-vayetse-Leah-Rachel.wmv

While there is no record of *nikud* used prior to the Masoret period, there may have been a more general type of method for notating pronunciations that preceded this.

If it was generally understood that one uses “He Who Is” in certain situations, such as when asking God to preserve things as they are and “He Who Causes To Be” in other situations, such as asking God to change things, and other certain pronunciations in certain situations, then one does not have to pass on via written vowels or oral tradition what vowels to use in what places, one simply fills in the blanks based on the situation.

If the reason for using feminine vowels with masculine constructions were known at the time of this writing, that too could have been a matter where one simply fills in what is appropriate. However, the commentary cites the usage of feminine vowels, cites it as unusual, and makes no comment on it other than that. One would suspect he did not understand why feminine vowels were used there. Perhaps his generation learned it from a group that did understand the why. Without knowing the why, one must ask how it was transmitted.

The Talmud does record that prior to the Masoret period, **some** system of accent marks were used. Vowels weren't used, but some sort of system for marking some type of pronunciation was used in Talmudic times, for it says....

“Why should one wipe with the left hand and not the right?.....” [after a few answers, one becomes...] “...R Akiva says, “because he points to the accents in the scroll (טעמי תורה) with it.”” (Brachot 62a, Socino)

We do not know today what the accent marks (“טעמי”) were since we have no scrolls from that time period. Dead Sea Scrolls from well before that time period have no such examples that fit. We do know it dates to the time of Rabbi Akiva (50 AD – 135 AD). These accent marks may not have been a pointing for each vowel, but if any of them marked a word to be pronounced with feminine vowels, without necessarily saying WHAT those vowels were in detail (not needed anyway), then the knowledge of when to use feminine vowels could have been passed on this far back without necessarily using the same system for doing it. However, there is no known such system.

There may be portions of the pre-Masoret Scriptures, particularly from the Psalms, that have been preserved in Jewish prayer books and were copied from previous prayer books that were themselves copied from pre-Masoret scrolls rather than being copied from a Masoret scroll.

Of course, it is probable that the accent marks discussed in the Talmud were not complete vowel markings. What is debatable was whether those accent marks contained enough information to reconstruct what

vowels went with the intention behind those accent marks. *Shulcan Aruch* (1550 AD) states this, “The Amoraim (Period the Gemara portion of Talmud was written) were without vowels, as they remembered with reconstruction and intention” (page 11 of “*On Rabbi Isaac Luria*”).

The reference to the Song of Songs in which the writer discusses the permutation of the 3 names of “אדני, אהיה, יהוה” as “איהי יהוה” and says, “and from the construction it makes another more interesting matter within the brilliance of the Song of Songs” may refer to a teaching that was well known at the time, but unknown at present. There are three places in the Song of Songs that could potentially be what he is referring to based on information available to us at the present time.

There are two places that involve some sort of permutation or alteration of the Divine Name. In Song of Songs 6:8, “יהללוה” = “they praised her” is a permutation of the more familiar “הללויה” = “HalleluYah”. The man in the allegory is understood to symbolize God at a spiritual level. So this could have some spiritual interpretation of which the writer knew.

Or there may have been a connection seen between Song of Songs 2:4 and this Psalm. If we compare the following two verses:

Masoret Ps 20:6	בשם אלהינו נדגל	In the Name of our God, we will setup a banner
SofS 2:4	דגלו עלי אהבה	His banner over me is Love

Note here that “love” (אהבה) is one letter different from the spelling of one form of the Divine Name of “אהיה” = “I AM”. This is a replacement of a single letter, not a permutation of all the letters. While this is not an exact match to the technique he was discussing, it could still be what he was referring to in his comment. There may be some other part of the Song of Songs that was understood to have a teaching similar to one of these two not presently known.

However, the author discusses a connection that the reverse of the normal “ים” pluralization ending as “ים”. And while there is no place where existing known manuscripts of Song of Songs have “ים” instead of “ים”, this could have been a shorthand notation for referencing that Song of Songs 4:5 and 7:4 reads, “עפרים תאומי” instead of “תאומי עפרים” or “עפרי תאומים”.

Whatever he meant, he did not explain himself thoroughly enough to be completely sure what he was trying to say. But if he was referencing a common teaching in his day, he may have assumed the reader would understand.

Here is a comparison of the vowels in Segulah Niflah versus the Masoretic version of Psalm 20.

Masoret	Segulah Niflah
יַעֲנֵךְ (ya'anaka)	יַעֲנֵךְ (ya'anek)

ישגבך (yeshagebka)	ישגבק (yeshagbek)
עזרכ (ezreka)	עזרק (azrek)
יסעדכ (yisadeka)	יסעדק (yisadek)

So in each case, the Masoret is all masculine, and Segulah Niflah combines masculine consonants with feminine vowels. A feminine verb would take a TAV prefix instead of a YUD in the imperfect or future tense

Gender

The matter of gender causes some people to have a perplexed view of the Divine Name. But gender has a broader meaning in Hebrew than it does in English. In English, masculinity and femininity refer to gender roles of men and woman, and never anything else. In Hebrew, this *can* be what gender refers to, but gender is also used for other things as well. Masculinity speaks to us in Hebrew about completion while femininity is for incompleteness. Masculinity is associated with providing things in Hebrew thought while femininity is associated with containing things. Since God both provides and contains, we can understand how both aspects could apply.

Linguistic gender is also not necessarily in line with biological gender in Hebrew. In [Psalm/Tehelim 34:2](#) David said, "*My soul shall make **HER** boast...*". David calls his soul a "her". Is he saying he is a woman? No? The word "soul" here is a feminine word and it seems that the proper pronoun to replace it would be a feminine pronoun, even though the subject here is a man.

Because masculinity and femininity always refer to physical gender roles in English, this is not always an easy concept for English readers to grasp. But nothing in the combination of masculine / feminine gender should raise any cause for concern in connection with the Divine Name.

Textual Issues for *Segulah Niflah*

The writer seems quite confident that he has all the correct vowels, despite the fact that it does not agree with the Masoret Tanach, which had become a standard by the time this appeared in *Shulchan Aruch*. The author of it is not known, but it appears in or after a section attributed to Isaac Luria. It appears at the end of that section, without his name at the top of the pages as in previous pages, leaving some ambiguity as to whether it came from him or was simply put there to fill out space at the end for lack of a better place to put it.

The document presents the impression that the annotation of vowels has been going on for a while in some form independently of the Masoret scrolls, where it says, "...except for what ceased to be annotated in 60 chapters of poetry". Of course, the Masoret scrolls have vowels marked in every occurrence of the Divine Name. So this cannot be referring to any Masoret tradition, but something outside the Masoret chain of transmission. Somewhere, perhaps not well published, someone has been copying manuscripts with vowels that are not part of the Masoret tradition. This would make more sense if we assume that *Segulah Niflah* was written in a pre-Masoret period and the accent marks were converted to Masoret vowels at a later point in time.

Irregardless of when *Segulah Niflah* itself was written, it is telling us that it got the vowels from some non-Masoret source where 60 chapters of the Psalms no longer had the vowels recorded. That would suggest that the source had been around for an extended period of time. So if *Segulah Niflah* was written in the time period of Isaac Luria's lifetime, it raises more hope that the source documents being referenced by *Segulah Niflah* could be found. But whether it was written later or earlier does not change much since the vowels were based on that source text, on not something that originated from the author.

It is clear not only from that comment that the writer of *Segulah Niflah* did not invent the pronunciations, but was simply passing on what he received from those before him, but from other comments as well. Another area where this is obvious is how he comments on the unusual nature of masculine consonants with feminine vowels. He drew attention to it, but did not comment on it. He appears to not know why it was done, but has simply accepted that this is something that should not be viewed as a error and needs to be preserved and carried on.

It appeared in both *Shulchan Aruch* and in *Nagid U'Mitzvah* along with another document called, "*Nevuat Hayered*" (The Prophecies of the Child), who's author and date of writing is well known to be 497 AD. Yet *Shulchan Aruch* (1550) was the first printed version of "*Nevuat Hayered*" known to exist, although it was passed down in some written manuscripts prior to that time. *Segulah Niflah* and *Nevuat Hayered* are very different in many ways. One is a prayer plus a commentary, the other is a series of prophecies. One is in Hebrew (mostly), the other in Aramaic. But perhaps they were published together because they came from the same time period. If these works published something known to come from 497 AD, there's no reason *Segulah Niflah* could not be pre-Masoret. While it does use vowel markings the Masorets were credited with inventing, a pre-Masoret version may have had some other type of accent mark (similar to what the Talmud mentions as existing as early as the 1st/2nd century AD) that was converted to Masoret vowel markings at a later time.

Also, if *Segulah Niflah* was written after the Masoret period, why would he not discuss the differences between the Masoret text and what he records? Why would he not address the fact that the Masorets do not use the feminine vowels he uses in some of the verbs to which he drew attention? He wanted to make certain that

the reader continued to pass what he had copied on just as he received it. If he was writing after the Masoret period, would he not need to explain to someone not to let the Masoret version influence the way he copied the prayer? It could also be that the commentary is contemporary with the 16th century (or shortly therefore) but the vowels and/or feminine words were obtained through exo-Masoret sources such as old prayer books.

But the theory that the Masorets wrote “יְהוָה” and “יְהוֹה” to instruct people to pronounce “Adonai” and “Elohim” is flawed by several problems:

(1) The vowels for “Y'howah” share only two of the same three vowels for “Adonai”.
(2) A scroll marked with vowels is not valid for public reading anyway. Jews were required to read from a scroll that omits vowels.

(3) The vowels for “יְהוָה” (Y'howah) are attested to as an accurate pronunciation by *Segulah Niphlah* as well as many other Hebrew documents that use both this pronunciation, as well as other pronunciations in the same document. If they were not afraid to use a non-euphemistic set of vowels in one place, there's no reason to conclude that another set of vowels had to be euphemistic.

(4) Since we can build a case that “יְהוָה” (Y'howah) is the correct pronunciation for “He (masculine) Who Is (feminine)”, and that this mixing of masculine and feminine is supported by a similar mixing in this document as well as in other phrases such as “רוּחַ הַקּוֹדֵשׁ” (Holy (masculine) Spirit (feminine)).

(5) Even if the Masorets were **influenced** to standardize on these two pronunciations by the encouragement of the use of “Adonai” or “Elohim” as euphemisms, it does not mean that what they wrote was wrong. They may have chosen these pronunciations knowing that if someone pronounced the Name “as written”, they would still be using a valid pronunciation. In the next section, I will demonstrate more evidence that both of these pronunciations have been viewed as valid in Jewish tradition.

(6) Also, it will be shown in the next section that “Yehowim” was sometimes written as “YHWH with the vowels of Elohim”, but “Y'howah” was NEVER written as “YHWH with the vowels of Adonai”, but instead, as “YHWH with the vowels of t'horah”. This will be shown in the next section. But if “Y'howah” was a euphemism for “Adonai”, writing it as “YHWH with the vowels of t'horah” makes no sense.

Psalm 121 in *Shem Tov Qatan*

Another Psalm that has also been recorded in Jewish literature with a different set of vowels than what's in the Masoret Tanach is Psalm 121. It is found in *Shem Tov Qatan* on page 6 where all occurrences contain the vowels for “He Who Causes To Be”. In this Psalm, the Psalmist is asking Elohim to change his circumstances, thus the pronunciation for “He Who Causes To Be” is used indicating that God has the power to intervene in one's life and cause it to be better than it is today. It appears in *Shem Tov Qatan* like this...

שיר למעלות	A Song for Ascention:
אשא עיני אל ההרים	I lift up my eyes unto the mountains.
מאין יבא עזרי	From where does my help come?
עזרי מעם יְהוָה	My help is from He Who Causes To Be ,
עושה שמים וארץ	Maker of heaven and earth.
אל יתן למוט רגלך	He will not set your foot to slip ¹ ;
אל ינום שומרך ישראל	Your preserver will not sleep, O Israel.
יְהוָה שומרך	He Who Causes To Be is your Preserver
יְהוָה צילך על יד ימינך	He Who Causes to Be is your shade upon your right hand.
יומם השמש לא יככה	The sun will not strike you by day
וירח בלילה	Nor the moon by night.
יְהוָה ישמרך מכל רע	He Who Causes To Be will preserve
ישמור את נפשך	you from all evil; He will preserve your soul.
יְהוָה ישמור צאתך ובואך	He Who Causes To Be will preserve
מעתה ועד עולם	your going out and your coming in from now and forever and ever.

Note that this pronunciation adds some logic to the prayer. For it calls Him “He Who Causes To Be, Maker of Heaven and Earth”, indicating the first time that if He can cause heaven and earth to be, He can do anything to change things happening in earth for the better for us. I used a translation of the Divine Name to “He Who Causes To Be”, rather than a transliteration (such as YHWH or Y'HiWaH), to provide the English reader with more of a “same sense” feel for how it would strike Hebrew ears. The pronunciation used is the one that most greatly hints at God's power to change our life for the better is used in a prayer that asks Him to do just that.

This Psalm is word-for-word the same as the Masoret Text, but not letter for letter. However the main differences are matters, including:

- “צילך” here instead of “צילך” in the Masoret text.
- “שומר” here instead of “שמר” in the Masoret text in more than one place.
- And of course, the vowels under the Tetragrammaton are different than what's in the Masoret text.

Footnote

¹The Hebrew word here is “למוט” which literally means to stretch out, resulting in less than sure footage, and ultimately slippage.

Divine Name in Other Works

There are other works where the Divine Name has been recorded and provide insight to the variance meanings. Hebrew prayer books are one common source for information about how tradition views the correct ways to pronounce the Divine Name. Many of them contain information similar to what was observed in *Segulah Niphlah*, where the Divine Name has vowels added to it. In fact one could probably trace out the history of when Jews quit saying the Divine Name in private prayer by when variety in vowel pointings began to disappear from Hebrew prayer books. Many modern *sidurs* do not even spell out the entire Name anymore, choosing to use ם or ן instead. Several ancient prayers will be examined in this treatise to document some of the variety that has been accepted as to what valid pronunciations of the Divine Name are.

One of the things that makes interpreting some of these writings difficult is that sometimes vowels are missing. *Segulah Niflah* is not the only document I have seen omit the *cholam* and I've also seen the *shwa* omitted as well. The problems gets worse when one is dealing with photocopied or scanned copies of manuscripts where the small vowel markings end up not getting reproduced in the copy obtained.

It is in this wide variety of accepted Names that the complexity of the Divine Name is not likely to overwhelm the English reader. To assemble a list of 20 or 30 or 40 pronunciations might cause a simple minded person to think the whole thing is nonsense because it is more complicated than he would like to handle. The simple minded philosophy would be, "Why do you have to make a name so complicated?" To the scholar, such a long list creates a sensation of amazement that makes him say "WOW!", because the complexity of the issue causes him to appreciate a greater meaning to what God said when He said, "My ways are higher than your ways..." (Isa 55:9) It is like the discussion that occurs in many Passover *hagadahs* of the 4 sons.

Some people have looked at the multitude of ways to say the Divine Name and concluded that it represents one Jew disagreeing with another. But when multiple pronunciations come from the *same source*, that theory is not supportable, because someone cannot be arguing with himself and obviously believes that there is more than one way to say the Name. This idea seems odd to some English speakers, but in many respects part of the cause of this is simply that Hebrew grammar changes the vowels, and English grammar does not evolve by changing the vowels, so it is hard for the English speaker who is not familiar with Hebrew grammar to understand this. If it seems odd, it is because our cultural expectations have biased us to expect a certain outcome that is not in line with Hebrew thinking. But when this happens, we should change our thinking, not try to change how Hebrew is interpreted.

For the simple man, the basic advice Judaism has is; don't say the Name. The more you learn of it, the more you will understand why it is an impossible task for someone who wants to call God one and only one thing, and wants it to be put in a form that's simple and just like any other human name. For those people, the Name you want to learn is "Adonai" or "Elohim". Because Y"H is far more complex than what the simple minded man wants to be forced to comprehend.

But the Divine Name is also discussed in many writings from ancient Jewish scholars. And it is in those writings that the complexity begins to fade away. For each time someone learns a single pronunciation of the Divine Name, and what it means, and when to use it, then the complexity of the multitude of pronunciations moves from being incomprehensible to being sensible, and no longer overwhelms the observer.

I've already discussed how to say "He Who Is" (Y'HoWaH) and "He Who Causes To Be" (Y'HiWaH). And knowing what those pronunciations mean makes the complexity of having more than one pronunciation seem more understandable and easier for the simple man to accept the multiplicity. Because to see *many* pronunciations and have no idea what they mean causes the simple person to be frustrated by what he does not understand. But a deeper thinker is not bothered by what he does not understand, but sees what he doesn't know as a road map for where to find his next learning adventure. He sees the complexity of the multiplicity as a challenge to be overcome.

In order to rise to the challenge of studying the Divine Name, one cannot allow himself to be frustrated by what he does not know, but welcome such information as a challenge and identification of what there is to learn, and thereby not allow it to overwhelm him. There is an introductory level of knowledge of this topic that can be explained to someone in English. But someone who chooses to not learn Hebrew cannot go beyond the simple approach and master the understanding of the Name.

Ancient prayer books record a wide variety of pronunciations, but usually tell us nothing about what those pronunciations mean. However, there are ancient writings that discuss the various meanings of various pronunciations. Sometimes these explanations provide no explanation of where the meaning comes from, and one simply has to accept what is told as the information of a Hebrew speaker more learned than him in the Hebrew language and the meaning of the Name from information handed down from one generation to another of Jewish men. At other times, we find that the explanation for how one derives the meaning from the pronunciation is given. Up next I will show examples of both.

Support for "YHWH" being pronounced as "Elohim" and for that to have some sort of legitimate meaning is found in *Pardes Rimmonim*, where it says this,

"ושם הבינה הוא שם בן ד' בנקודת אלקים"
(שער א פרק טי מן קבלה / מסרת, שער א פרק י מן גץ)

which translates to,

"And the Name of *Binah* is the Name of the Son of YHWH with the vowels of *Elohim*."

In his English translation of *Pardes Rimmonim*, Elyakim Getz rendered it like this,

"The name of understanding is the Tetragrammation punctuated like *Elohim*."
(Elyakim Getz, 2007 translation of 1542 AD text, page 46)

Here, he omits the "בן" or "Son [of]" from his translation which normally is done by Rabbinically Jewish translators. In fact there are numerous places where the phrase "Son of Yah/Tetragrammation" is used in *Pardes Rimmonim* and many other works that have never been translated into English. While "*Binah*" here means "understanding", he is referencing one of the *Sefirot* of the Tree of Life. For that reason, I translated it as a name, rather than rendering the meaning.

While there is no means by which one can turn to a grammar table and ascertain any meaning to יהוה from grammar, we are still told here in *Pardes Rimmonim* that this pronunciation refers to what comes from this sphere, so there is some meaning we can attach to this particular pronunciation, it is just simply not a meaning we can explain in words.

The next example provides some insight on how the pronunciation of the Divine Name was recorded. Some pronunciations had names, and providing those names next to the text was one way of notating how to pronounce it, without using Masoretic vowels. In fact this may have been one way they notated how to say the Name before Masoretic vowels were invented. Jews did not go through history until 800-1000 AD before ever having a means by which they could write down on paper which way to say the Name should be used in a given context. Notating the name of the pronunciation was one way of of notating how to say the Name.

Another way to explain how to say the Name was to write out the names of the vowels, rather than the symbols for them. In *CHaVuR HaQaTaN* (1767), the following appears on page לא [or page 31],

...יהוה (בניקוד מחשבה) שומרי יהוה (בניקוד טהורה) צילי על יד ימיני אמן
יכוין שומרי צילי ר"ת גי שמן הוא השכינה
וכן יהי רצון מלפניך יהוה (בניקוד פתח שבא קמץ סגול) אלהינו ואלהי אבותינו

Note that this contains two more pronunciations in which the name of the pronunciation is given in parenthesis. Apparently there was no name for the third pronunciation given, so instead, they wrote out the names of the vowels instead.

When it says, “בניקוד טהורה”, that means that YHWH is to be pronounced using the vowels for the word “טהורה”, which would be “יהוה” or “Y’HoWaH”. When it says “בניקוד מחשבה”, that means the Name is pronounced with the vowels for “מחשבה”, or in other words, as “יהוה”. This is even better seen in *Shem Tov Qatan*, where this same content appears written out with vowels like this:

שכתוב יְהוָה (בניקוד מַחֲשָׁבָה) שומרי יְהוָה (בניקוד טְהוּרָה)
(*Shem Tov Qatan*, page 8b)

In *Shem Tov Qatan*, it gives the line line from above with Masoret vowels instead of writing them out, like this...

“וכן יהי רצון מלפניך יְהוָה אלהינו ואלהי אבותינו”
“And thus let more of your presence be desired YaHWaHe Our God, and God of our Fathers...”

It's too early in this discussion to explain exactly these vowels were chosen. But these vowels were chosen because of the understood meaning they had and because they understood this pronunciation to fit in the context of the sentence. This can be explained, but doing so requires explaining information that is beyond the scope of this dissertation.

But if “יהוה” was indicating “wrong” vowels and merely a device to indicate a euphemism for saying “Adonai”, then why does it appear in the same three sentences as two other pronunciations in which it is clear

that no euphemism is intended? Again, this is evidence that there are multiple ways to say the Divine Name, and “יהוה”, meaning “He Who Is”, is one of them. The other pronunciations also have other meanings.

If “Y’HoWaH” was truly a euphemism for “Adonai”, then why would it not be called the “Adonai” pronunciation? Why is it referred to as “with the vowels of *t’horah*”. Wouldn’t they want to write this as “with the vowels of Adonai” in this was intended to be a Euphemism for “Adonai”?

The answer to that is several fold. First, because the first vowel for “Y’HoWaH” is not the same as the first vowel for Adonai. Second, because “Y’HoWaH” was not an invention to indicate a euphemism for “Adonai”, but it is a known pronunciation.

Some pronunciations for the Name can be translated reasonably easily into words and one can explain in words what that pronunciation means. At other times, the understanding of a pronunciation must be learned through example and intuition that is built from understanding the vowels and what they relate to on a very microscopic – sometimes sub-atomic level. To better understand that difference and/or combination, let me turn to an example in which we can do both – explain in words the meaning of a pronunciation that is built from understanding what the vowels mean when they are filled into the Name. *Pardes Rimmonim* states this,

“It is furthermore written in the *Tiqunim*, “He is called YaHaWaHa [יהוה] from the side of the upper Crown, because He is concealed like a closed fist (קומץ, *Qomez* or the vowel “ָ”) whose outside does not know the higher soul inside. But He Who is inside in thought and called the Cause of all Causes” (*Tiqun* 70, p 124)...like a closed fist that conceals...and no one knows what is inside... It is said “He Who Is Inside”.”

(*Pardes Rimmon*, Getz translation, *ibid*, page 102 of First Edition, 2007)

This requires some explanation. The *patach* (פתח or “ָ”) is described to English ears as an “a” sounding vowel *Qamats* sometimes make an “a” sound and sometimes an “oh” sound. While both the *patach* (“ָ”) and *qamets* (“ָ”) make a similar sound – so close we might write both as “a” in English, they aren’t exactly the same sound and they have different meaning. The *patach* (“ָ”) means “open”, while a *qamats* (“ָ”) means “closed.” Originally these names may have even been instructive on how to vocalize the sound. But this presents one of the reasons why Judaism has traditionally not pronounced the Divine name in languages other than Hebrew; non-Hebrew speakers have too much trouble learning how to produce the correct sounds. This is why the Divine Name is not spoken in English sentences, because the listener might hear a *qamats* in the “Y’HoWaH” of English and try to reproduce it as a *patach*, effectively changing the meaning, for each slight variation has some meaning, as will be seen more and more as this discussion progresses. In fact its easy enough to change the meaning of a word by using the wrong (but at times valid) pronunciation of a *qamats* in a word. For example, in “The Ohs and Ahs of Torah Reading”, Rivka Sherman-Gold documented that using the wrong pronunciation of *qamats* can change whether the Israelites collected “quail” in Number 11:32 or “donkey drivers”. And it could change whether Jonah / Yonah found a “ship” or a “poor woman” in Jonah 1:3.

He is saying that “YaHaWaHa” (יהוה) means “He Who Is Inside”, but inside of what? That too, requires some explanation, since it is easily misunderstood by English intuition. In Hebrew thought, the word *Olam* (עולם) can be translated as “world”, “conceal”, “age”, etc. It is called this because the Creator made numerous worlds, one within the other. When we put something “inside” a box, we limit what space it can move around. We also conceal it. But one world inside another world is not 'limited' in space, but simply 'concealed'. So while “He Who Is Inside” might sound like it is describing someone limited in movement by what is outside,

that is not what it is saying at all. It is describing how the World the Almighty created conceals Him. To us, this world looks like the outer shell, but that's because we are on the outside looking in. The world we live in looks infinite, and while it conceals the spiritual world, it does not limit or constrict it, but simply hides it. It cannot limit it in any way, because in most respects, it is in another whole dimension. “Inside” versus “outside” can be a matter of perspective.

So while we might translate “YaHaWaHa” (יְהוָה) as “He Who Is Inside”, this basically means “He Who Is Concealed” by the worlds that surround Him. One might easily prefer to say, “He Who Is Beyond”. The “He Who Is Inside” terminology is somewhat confusing to English ears, but it is not that it needs to be translated differently. It is just that in the Aramaic terminology of this text, “inside” is used differently than we are used to because it is coming from a perspective of viewing the worlds from the other side of the mirror that we perceive it to be on. But this pronunciation describes God as being concealed just like the closed fist that the vowel *qamats* was named after conceals what is inside it. The ancient Hebrew writers understood that each vowel has meaning, and each letter has meaning, and the placement of each vowel with each letter has meaning.

There are other words where the “closed fist” meaning of the *qamats* can be observed. For example, “פְּנִים” means “surface” but “פְּנִימִים” means “interior”. Note how the form with the *qamats* (ֶ) hides what's inside, while the version of this word that describes the interior, and thus *doesn't* hide what is inside, has a *shwa* instead. Many other similar examples could be cited. From a Hebrew perspective, this is very logical, but unfamiliar to the English reader.

In the original text, “YaHaWaHa” (יְהוָה) was not written with Masoret style vowels, but was explained like this in the original Aramaic “יהוה מסטרא דכתרא”, which literally translates to “YHWH from the side of the Crown”, or to paraphrase using terminology previously established beforehand; “The Crown pronunciation”. This is one of the 10 most commonly known pronunciations. But *Masoretic* vowels are NOT always needed in order to explain what pronunciation to use when because plenty of standard references exist.

In fact, we can see both the “Crown pronunciation” as well as the t'hora pronunciation of “Y'HoWaH” used in this following excerpt from a Chasidic prayer book from 1764 called “*Bet Menachim*”...

הַבְּקָר וּכְנֻסְכּוֹ תַעֲשֶׂה אִשָּׁה רִיחַ נִיחָח לִיהוָה :
 וְהוֹמַר פְּטוּם סְקִטוּרַת וְאַחַר כֵּךְ הוֹמַר
 אֲשֶׁרִי יוֹשְׁבֵי בֵיתְךָ עוֹד יִהְלָלוּךָ סְלָה : אֲשֶׁרִי הָעַם
 שְׁכַבְתָּ לּוֹ אֲשֶׁרִי הָעַם שִׁיחֻהוּ כְּתִיר אֱלֹהֵינוּ :

Note how **both** the pronunciation of “Y'HoWaH” and the “Crown pronunciation” is used in this excerpt. Does it really make sense to suggest that the vowels e-o-a were written under YHWH the first time in order to tell someone to pronounce AdoNaI (which only matches on 2 of the 3 vowels) and then they write a *qamats* under every letter a few lines later? In fact, in this prayer book, the bottom line of the above photo is the start of traversing through all 10 of the best known pronunciations within the same prayer. When I say “best known”, I mean best known to those who have examined Jewish tradition, since most seminar professors who claim

“Y'HoWaH” is just a euphemism for ADoNAI have simply never looked at the vast volume of literature that records the evidence demonstrating otherwise.

Why give names to various pronunciations? There's several reasons. First, many of these pronunciations had names before the *Masoretic* vowel markings were invented, so the names probably simply persisted thereafter as a way of writing down how to say it. But also, its a safer way to write down the pronunciation. Because in the process of rolling or unrolling a scroll, sometimes a little bit of ink get scraped off the scroll. Hopefully not enough to make a VAV (ו) look like a YUD (י). But if a YUD's worth of ink is missing from a MEM (מ) it will still look like a MEM (מ). But if even less is missing from a vowel, it can cause the word to be mispronounced. One does not have to have much ink scraped from a “ָ” before it looks like a “ֿ”.

Perhaps one of the most significant places that demonstrates that Judaism has not considered “Y'HoWaH” to be a euphemism is found in *Tikunei Zohar*, in this statement....

”יְהוָה אֱהַבָה דְאִיִּי קִמְץ רַחֲמֵי שְׁבַא מִסְטְרָא דְגְבוּרָה כִּי בֵּאֵשׁ ה' נִשְׁפֹּט קִמְץ מִיַּמִּינָא”

(*Tikunei Zohar*, page 5)

which says that the *qomats* (“ָ”) in the Divine Name of “יְהוָה” symbolizes, “the mercies that come from the side of Strength (*Gevura*), for with fire HaShem has judged the *qomats* from the right.” This is a very thought provoking statement when one understands the logic of it's origin, which is too complicated for the present discussion. But essentially the logic from which this came is drawing on both the *qamats* and the *shwa* (since *gevura* is associated with the *shwa*) being a valid part of how to pronounce the Divine Name. While the logic behind this statement is very complicated, the logic falls apart unless one assumes that the writer truly believed that “Y'HoWaH” was a valid set of vowels to use to pronounce the Divine Name.

Multiple Pronunciations does Not mean that “Anything Goes”

Some people might be tempted to look at how a multitude of pronunciations are used in Jewish tradition and conclude that perhaps they can pick almost any pronunciation and it will work. This is definitely not true. Some source say there are 70 ways to pronounce the Tetragrammation. Some say 72. I've heard as high as 86. But how many ways can it be verbalized?

יהוה

·
· :
· :
· :

There's a total of 12 vowels that can be placed under the Yud or the HEY. There's 12 vowels that can be placed under the VAV, though not all the same 12. In saying this, I'm counting short, long and half vowels as unique. Altogether, that means there's....

$12 \times 12 \times 12 \times 12 = 20,736$ ways to verbalize the Name.

At most, no more than 86 ways that are valid.

That means less than 0.41% of all possible phonetic sounds are valid pronunciations. So if someone picks a pronunciation at random, there's a 99.6% chance that it's wrong. So basing a pronunciation on English logic or other sound approaches such as a well documented history of usage has a 99.6% of being wrong. So it's advisable to stick with using pronunciations that have been documented to be used in history.

The Grammar – a deeper look

I mentioned earlier that the verb הוה is understood to have the following meanings:

- הוה = HoVeH or HoWeH means “is”, and is considered masculine and used for masculine constructions.
- הוה = HoVaH or HoWaH means “is”, and is feminine
- הוה = HaYaH means “was”
- הוה = HiWaH / HiVaH means “cause to be”

The future tense is built like this....

- אֶהְיֶה = I will be.
- תִּהְיֶה = You (masculine) will (use when talking to a man)
- תִּהְיִי = You (feminine) will (use when talking to a woman)
- יִהְיֶה = He will (be)
- תִּהְיֶה = she will (be)

But how do we get “יהוה” from “הוה”? We're told, from a matter of tradition, that “יהוה” means “He Who Is” in the following places:

- Rashbam (R. Samuel b. Meir 1085-1175) said the Divine Name means “He Who Is” in his commentary on Exodus 3:14.
- Philo (20BC - 40AD) said, "[the sacred scriptures is called "He that is" as His proper Name](#)" (Philo, *On Abraham*, 121)
- Clement of Alexandria (150AD - 215AD) probably explained the grammatical sense more clearly than the other two men when he said that the Divine Name meant, “He Who Is and Shall Be” (Stromata V:6:34). In other words, it is **both** future and present tense. “He Who Is” is a bit of a simplification, but “He Will Be the One Who Is” is probably a more complete way of describing it.

On page 14 of “שמירות וסגולות נפלאות”, it also agrees with the what Clement said, interpreting “יהוה” as meaning “הוה ויהיה” or “exists and will be”. And Stone's Chumash contains a commentary that says this:

“The Four-Letter Name of *HASHEM* [יְהוָה] indicates that God is timeless and infinite, for the letters of this Name are those of the words הוה, יהוה, יהיה, *He was, He is, and He will be.*” (Stone's Chumash, Eleventh edition, page xxxvi, intro to Bereishis.)

Note that in the phrase “הוה ויהיה” (*Was, and is, and will be*) we have used the letters of the Divine Name three times, using a different permutation of the letters than what appears in the Tetragrammaton. But the three tenses of past, present and future are written with a permutation of the Divine Name spelled three times.

Adding YUD (י) as a prefix to a word often does mean “He Will”. For example,

- “אמר” = “he says”
- “יאמר” = “he will say”
- “שמר” = “he keeps”
- “ישמר” = “he will keep”

But for the verb “to be” we have

- “הַיְהוּה” = “he is”
- “הָיָה” = “he was”
- “יִהְיֶה” = “He will be”

“הוה” goes to “היה” in the past or future usage. Yet “יהוה” keeps “הוה” in the present tense but adds the “he will” of a YUD (י) prefix. So when “הוה” becomes “יהוה”, by adding the YUD (י) prefix, the “is” part does not turn into a “היה” but remains “is” / “הוה”, and “יהוה” is understood to mean “He will be the One Who Is”. So it is merging the future tense of “He Will” with the present tense of “is”. This is why Clement's analysis of “He Who Is and Shall Be” (Stromata V:6:34) was very accurate.

Such a grammatical construction does exist with any other word in the Hebrew language, and some scholars have rejected this idea simply because it does not happen with any other word. However, the overwhelming voice of theologians over the ages has told us that this indeed is what the word means. Why does it not happen with any other Hebrew word? Those who are skeptical on these grounds are forgetting that the God who said, “My ways higher than your ways” (Isa 55:9) wasn't about to make His Name like every other word in the Hebrew language. It was *meant* to be different, but at the same time, deductible from what is known. For if one were to ask himself “How would I express what Clement said?”, the answer would clearly be combining “הוה + י”. It's the only word in the Hebrew language that has some sort of complex tense. Perhaps the reason this construction is *only* used for the Divine Name was to prevent people from using the Name in a sentence in referencing some other type of action. Whatever the cause, it is certainly clear that it has it's own unique grammar from what is conventional, since the any prefix normally puts the word in the potential/imperfect tense, and thus would be considered future tense for the verb “הוה”, yielding something more in the form of “היה”. But where “יִהְיֶה” means “he will be”, but isn't now, “יהוה” means he will be and IS now too.

Another problem many scholars have had with the construction of “הַיְהוּה” plus “י” to yield “יהוה” is that it is a mixing of the masculine and the feminine. But I have demonstrated that in *Segula Niflah*, this is considered normal, and it is done for “Ruach (feminine) HaQodesh (masculine)” (רוח הקודש) or Holy Spirit as well. So these issue at least make the construction of Y'HoWaH (יְהוָה) plausible, and the testimony of many people from history the certain explanation.

The verb “הוה” is sometimes written “הוה” and sometimes written “הוהה”. When it is written with two VAVs (ו), the first is a *mater* and the second is a *consonant*. It does NOT represent the idea that the middle radical is doubled, but that the first is a *mater* and the second the root. This is only done to help in pronunciation to those familiar in Hebrew, since the root is basically still “הוה”. But sometimes it confuses English speakers examining Hebrew as a second language since it is one more thing to absorb. In fact confusion over this has caused some people to conclude that the Divine Name is unpronounceable because the VAV (ו) has more than one vowel. But that is only because some people are not familiar with the fact that הוּנָה is sometimes written with one VAV and as a result two vowels on the same VAV. There's less confusion when it is written with two VAVs (ו).

The following table shows the various forms of “to be”. One could argue that perhaps “הוה” and “היה” should be *two separate* tables since they are not exactly synonymous. Both mean “to be”, but “הוה” is only used

for present tense, and “היה” is only used for when it is not the present tense. Some people put them both in the same chart. I have chosen to make them two separate charts, especially since they don't parse by exactly the same set of rules anyway.

Rules for הוה

Masculine Singular	הוה or הוה
Feminine Singular	הוה or הוה
Masculine Plural	הוה
Feminine Plural	הוה

Rules for היה

Singular forms only	Past / Perfect	Future / Imperfect	Imperative
1 st person: “I”	הייתי	אֶהְיֶה	
2 nd person, masculine “You” (to a man)	היית	תִּהְיֶה	הֵי
2 nd person, feminine: “You” (to a female)	היית	תִּהְיִי	הִי
3 rd person, masculine: “he”	היה	יִהְיֶה	
3 rd person, feminine: “she”	היתה	תִּהְיֶה	

“היה” has an imperative form, but “הוה” does not because imperative is a special case of a future tense of sorts, and “הוה” is only present tense, while “היה” can be past or future.

When one takes “היה” and add a prefix to it (such as “יהיה”), one alters it from past or perfect tense to future or imperfect tense. But when one takes “הוה” and add a prefix to it to form the Divine Name, one does not change it from present tense to something else. , but rather merges it with the future tense so that it does not lose it's present tense meaning, but gets a future tense meaning added to it. This is why the vowels for “היה” change when a prefix is added to it, but the vowels for “הוה” do not change when a prefix is added to it, because it continues to retain its present tense meaning.

The 3 Tenses

We're told that there were several pronunciations of the Divine Name that were of extreme importance to Judaism. *The Bahir* gives this explanation for how to pronounce the Name:

"What is the meaning of the verse

"May YHWH bless you and keep you. May YHWH make His face shine upon you and be gracious to you. May YHWH lift His face to you and place peace upon you." (Num 6:24-26)

This is the explicit Name of the Blessed Holy One. It is the Name containing 12 letters, as it is written "YHWH YHWH YHWH". This tells us that God's Name consists of 3 troops. Each troop resembles the other, and each one's name is like [the other's] named. All of them are sealed with *Yud Hey Vau He*"... *Yud Hey Vau He* can be permuted 24 different ways, forming one troop...Multiply 24 by three and you have the 72 names of the Blessed Holy One. These are the 72 names derived from the verses "And traveled...and came...and stretched..." (The Bahir, 107, Aryeh Kaplan's translation)

and later it says...

"...What is the meaning of the verse, '*God (YHWH) is a King, God (YHWH) was King, God (YHWH) will be King forever and ever.*'*? This is the Explicit Name (Shem HaMePoresh) for which permission was given that it be permuted and spoken. It is thus written ... "*And they shall place My Name upon the children of Israel, and I will bless them.*" This refers to the Name containing the 12 letters. It is the Name used in the Priestly Blessing "*May God bless you...*" It contains 3 names [each having 4 letters] making a total of 12." (Bahir, 111, Kaplan. *The footnoted quotation is from Exodus/Shemot 14:19-21)

The Bahir then goes on to explain *how* to pronounce those 3 names:

“ונקודו בו יפְעַל יפּוֹעַל יפְעוֹל”

which means....

“and its pronunciation is *done, do, will do...*”

In other words, it's telling you to use the past, present and future tense forms. Other writers outside the Bahir have made similar comments. For example, *Sefer Zachirah* says to interpret this phrase as “היה הוה ויהוה” (page 7) or “was, is and will be”. Which would sound a lot like what the Messiah said in Revelation....

““I am ...the beginning and the end....

“Who was, and Who is, and Who is to Come””

” (Rev 1:8)

Some people also have a philosophical problem with verbalizing “He Who Was”, because basically, He still is. Of course, when one says all three together, the intent is obviously to communicate his eternalness in a language that has no way to say “The Eternal One”, and has to **explain** that concept through more specific examples of speech.

The most popular form of saying this, but not the only form, turned into this....

יְהוָה יְהוָה מֶלֶךְ יְהוָה מֶלֶךְ יְהוָה יְמֻלֹךְ עוֹלָם וָעֶד	He Who Is is King, He Who Is has reigned, He Who Is will reign for ever and ever.
--	---

Where “He Who Is” is really, “He Will Be The One Who Is”. This puts the same statement in noun form the first time, then verb form, then future tense. Since this construction uses noun then a present tense verb, it avoids the problem of using the past tense. It therefore avoids the problem of having to say “He Who Was reigned”, “He Who Is reigns” and “He Who Will Be will reign”, and one can use the same pronunciation of “He Will Be The One Who Is” all three times and it grammatically agrees with the word “מֶלֶךְ” (“king”, or “reign”) each time as well, while also expressing His eternal nature.

I have also seen this cited as “יְהוָה יְמֻלֹךְ” so that the vowels of “יהוה” agree with “יְמֻלֹךְ” and we what is interpreted as a version of “He Who Will Be” that is more solidly future tense. This appears in *Pardes Rimmon* (See שער פרטי השמות פרק ח ט), *Siddur HaAri* (page 30) and numerous other places.

Other Pronunciations

There have been many Hebrew books that have documented pronunciations of the Divine Name in numerous ways. The most common one, “Y'howah”, is not only used in the Masoret manuscripts, but in many Hebrew documents where the intent was NOT to encourage someone to say “Adonai”. It is attested to over and over again. But it is not the only pronunciation.

Christian history does tell us that “Yahveh” was the Samaritan pronunciation, for we are told:

"The Samaritans call it [the Divine Name] IABE (ιαβε) while the Jews AIA (αια)."
(Theodoret of Cyros, 5th century AD, writing in Greek, in "Question 15 in Exodus 7")

One could interpret what Theodoret wrote as being pronounced “Yahveh” (יהוה or יהוה or some combination). This is how Samaritans pronounced the Divine Name. I've never seen it in any Jewish writings. But he is telling us that “Yahveh” is how the Samaritans said it, and is not how Jews said it. Yet since this is unknown to any Hebrew writings, no one knows if the “a” is a *qamats* or a *patach*, or whether the “e” is a *segol* or a *tsere*. The impossibility of knowing the correct Hebrew vowels that are behind this Greek spelling makes it useless even if it were correct due to a lack of knowing the exact Hebrew vowels.

Samaritan Hebrew can be described as a crippled form of Jewish Hebrew. Samaritan Hebrew usually does not pronounce HEYs and CHETs or pronounces them like YUDs. Samaritan Hebrew can only pronounce 5 of the vowels used in Judean Hebrew and can only pronounce long vowels on selective open syllables (never closed ones, and never in a variety of other cases that traditional Hebrew contains). "HaMashiach" appears in Lev 6:12 of the Samaritan text with vowels that lead a Samaritan Jew to say it as "ammasi". "טח" is pronounced "atta" in Samaritan Hebrew but "tach" in traditional Hebrew. So there are many words in Samaritan Hebrew that are pronounced different from Jewish Hebrew. It is odd that so many non-Jews will pronounce the Divine Name using the Samaritan “Yahveh”, but use Jewish pronunciations on every other Hebrew word they pronounce.

Would God fail to preserve the correct way to say His Name? As a matter of faith, I would think not. The Samaritan “Yahveh” pronunciation has not been preserved. We only have this interpreted in Greek, which fails to record for us whether it used a *qamats* or a *patach*, or whether the “e” is a *segol* or a *tsere*. On the other hand, many other valid pronunciations have been preserved using not only the Masoret vowels, but other systems as well, including relating the pronunciation to a different word, spelling out the names of the vowels, etc.

Common English Errors

I have run into many people that have made a number of erroneous mistakes concerning the Divine Name that can be traced to one common issue: they try to figure out how to say the Name using English logic. The problem starts with the assumption that there's only one way to say the Name, and whatever is in the Masoret text is wrong, because the vowels there are just a euphemism. Then they move on to thinking that there is enough information on the pages of their English Bible for them to reconstruct the pronunciation and they try to apply English logic to a Hebrew problem. But all of the common mistakes present good reasons why the it is a bad idea to try and mix Hebrew and English.

If you can't speak Hebrew, don't argue with Hebrew speaking people on how to pronounce the Hebrew language. That would sound like common sense. Most English speakers wouldn't argue with a Chinese man on how to say the Chinese word for a word as simple as “door”. But many English speakers do want to argue with Hebrew speakers on how to say something as complex as the Divine Name.

Let me address what some of the logical flaws are when people try to do this sort of English based construction.

The “Yehudah Error”

One attempt at reconstructing a pronunciation for the Divine Name is what I call the “Yehudah” error. It's based on this theory.

(1) “יהודה” is pronounced “Yehudah”

(2) “יהוה” is only one letter different, so it must be pronounced “Yehuwah”.

(*) What the person ends up saying is a pronunciation for the Divine Name that is closer to the 3rd person imperfect Pual form, which would translate to “He Who Has Become”. No one should say that. It's like saying that at one time, God did not exist. The exact Pual form would be, “Ye-huw-wah.”

I'm going to show what is wrong with this using English logic first, then using a Hebrew based explanation. This logic doesn't work in either language. Even though whether it works in English or not really isn't relevant to whether it applies to Hebrew, I'll address both languages anyway.

The English words “rough” and “cough” are only one letter different, but the “rough” is pronounced “ruff” and “cough” is pronounced “koff”. So even with what an English person would know about the English language, he should know enough to conclude that this logic may not work. Further, “through” isn't much different but presents yet a *third* vowel sound different from both of the previous two. The “Yehudah Error” is based on logic that doesn't work in English, nor does it work in Hebrew. Some people have accepted it simply because they want *some* method they think will tell them the answer. In the rush to find some answer, any answer, even if its wrong, one is likely to get something that is wrong.

From a Hebrew standpoint, it is even less logical. When “אם” is pronounced “em” it means “mother”. When “אם” is pronounced “om” it means “nation” or “people”. When “אם” is pronounced “eeM' it can mean “if” or “when”. So if 3 Hebrew words can be spelled the same way, but a change in one vowel changes the meaning this much, why would someone conclude anything remains constant about vowel pronunciation when the “ד” is removed from “יהודה”?

There's no grammatical connection between these two words.

- YeHuDaH (יהוה) is built from the root HWD (הוה) by adding a "H" (ה) to the end and a "Y" (י) to the beginning.
- YHWH (יהוה) is built from the root HWH (הוה) by adding a "Y" (י) to the beginning.

With no grammatical connection between them, why is there any reason to conclude that one word sets a precedent for anything about the other word?

Some modern day Israelis may be a bit slow to recognize the Pual form because it has dropped out of use in modern day Israel. There are people who live in Israel and speak Hebrew fluently who might have to look this point of grammar up if they are not Biblical scholars simply because this form of grammar is not longer used in modern day Hebrew and has been replaced by a Piel form instead.

The “Yah” Error

Another common error is built on the argument that progresses like this:

- (1) The short form is “Yah”
- (2) Thus, “YHWH” must be “YaH” + something with “WH”.

There's multiple things wrong with this. First “YaH” is not the only short form of the Divine Name. “YeH” is another and so is “Yo”, though “Yo” is usually written “י”, but the pronunciation used on Yom Kippur starts with “Yo” even though there's no VAV after the YUD. But also, if someone doesn't trust the Masoretic scribes to have written the vowels for one word correctly, why trust them for another? So this argument assumes as true what it is trying to disprove in order to disprove it!!! And most of these people do not realize that if English speakers were accustomed to shortening “Joseph” to “Jeph” instead of “Joe” and “Marcus” to “Mus” instead of “Marc”, they would be assuming that a known use of “YaH” implies “YHWH” is “YHWaH” with the first two vowels yet to be figured out. They do not realize how much English based logic is going into their assumptions.

Also, even if English logic could be applied, it misses something here. YaH is derived from YHWH, not the other way around. When you shorten “Y'howah” (יהוה) to “ה”, you *cannot* use the original first vowel because the original vowel is not an “e” but a *SHWA*, and one cannot speak a *shwa* as the only syllable in a Hebrew word.

Also, when the short form is used, it appears with a *dagesh*, which does not occur for the long form. We usually see "ה־" in the short form, but we don't see “ה” in the short form, but we never see “ה” in “יהוה”.

Understanding how to say the Divine Name is a Hebrew problem. It needs a Hebrew solution and Hebrew logic. Any attempt to approach this issue through English logic could result in something worse than just failure. In some cases, the end result is a pronunciation that is blasphemous.

The “4 vowel” error and “The 2 Witness Rule”

Josephus (1st century AD) said in Wars 5.5.7 that the Divine Name was written with "4 vowels". Some have argued that he was referring to how it was written with 4 vowels in Greek. Some manuscripts of Clement cite the Name as IAOU. And Porphyry wrote it as IEUO. Other writers used 3 or 5 letters. Others have said it is because the letters YUD (י), HEY (ה) and VAV (ו) are sometimes used for vowels.

First off, it really doesn't matter because we should not make decisions on how to analyze Hebrew based on Greek commentaries. We have to approach a Hebrew problem from a Hebrew standpoint.

But also, the YUD (י), HEY (ה) and VAV (ו) in "יהוה" are built from "הוה" as the root. All root letters must be consonants, not vowels. And a leading YUD (י) would also have to be a consonant. Even when a YUD (י), HEY (ה) and VAV (ו) are used where vowels go, they represent the consonant part of long vowels. A long "eey" or "ay" typically has a "y" sound at the end of the vowel. A long "o" or "oo" has a long "w" sound at the end of it. The HEY represents breath - the ability to hear an "h" sound come out.

It's a Hebrew name, and it needs to be understood through a Hebrew viewpoint. One can't examine how it was transliterated into Greek and know how the Name is pronounced. That's simply the wrong way to try and figure it out. There's no way to write a Hebrew "YUD" in Greek. Greeks substituted a "IOTA", but the "I" vowel is not the same as the "Y" consonant. Greek has no way of representing a word where a vowel ends in a HEY ("H") sound.

And Greek lacks a way to write a "W" sound. The Hebrew Divine Name has 3 different letters, all of which are either problematic or impossible to write in Greek. So there's no reason to consult Greek for how to pronounce Hebrew.

You wouldn't ask a German man for advice on how to speak Chinese or a Russian for advice on how to speak Swahili. So why do some people consult Greek for how to say the Hebrew Name? It makes no sense.

But some people do consult Greek writings and have concluded the divine name is "YaHiWaH" because Theodoret wrote it as AIA in Greek. Other have concluded it is said "YaHoWuH" because some manuscripts of Clement record IAOU. Of course other manuscripts of Clement record IAOUe leading other people to use YaHoWeH.

- IAHO was used by Pseudo-Jerome ("Breviarium in Pss.", in P.L., XXVI, 828)
- IAOTH was used by Irenaeus ("Adv. Haer.", II, xxxv, 3, in P. G., VII, col. 840)
- IEUO was used by Porphyry (Eusebius, "Praep. evang", I, ix, in P.G., XXI, col. 72)
- IEHIEH was used by James of Edessa (cf. Lamy, "La science catholique", 1891, p. 196)
- AIA was used by Theodoret (Question 15 in Exodus 7)
- IAOUe or IAOU is in Clement's text - multiple manuscripts disagree with each other.

A variety of other opinions also exist (see footnotes below) but all these people are violating the Scriptures to base a decision on what any of these men wrote. Why? Multiple reasons.

Scripture tells us "**by the mouth of 2 or 3 witnesses shall every word (דבר) be established.**" (Deut 19:15). Dare we establish one of the most important words - the Eternal One's Name - based on only one witness? The only non-Hebrew witnesses that seem to agree, don't use enough vowels to fill out all 4 letters

with syllables. "IAO" was used by Diodorus Siculus (I, 94); the Valentinian heretics (Irenaeus, "Adv. Haer.", I, iv, 1, in P.G., VII, col. 481), and Origen ("in Joh.", II, 1, in P.G., XIV, col. 105). But even if you argue there's an implied SHWA/SHEVA in here, where would it go? Is this YaHoWH or YahWoH? No way of telling what they meant by this other than to say it is not complete. So where we get 3 Greek witnesses to agree on a spelling, it doesn't seem to agree with the Hebrew spelling enough to be useful. So much for complying with the two witness rule!!! Without two witnesses saying the same thing about how to pronounce it, we would be violating Torah to conclude that is how to say the Name.

There's also the whole problem of whether a Greek witness is a competent witness to a Hebrew pronunciation for reasons I mentioned before. It's inability to write a "y" sound, "W" sound, or a syllable ending in "H", along with it's difficulty with vowels such as the inability to record a SHWA / SHEVA, inability to distinguish between a QAMATS versus a PATACH or a SEGUL versus a TSERE as well as other problems, just to name a few.

So why do some people consult Greek commentators to solve a Hebrew problem with all these very comical problems that exist? Mostly because they have those Greek texts translated into English and they don't have any Hebrew texts translated into English. Which essentially means they are making an English based decision, which is almost guaranteed to yield the wrong results.

For the most part one should not draw any firm conclusions about using any pronunciation without seeing a pronunciation used by at least two Hebrew witnesses.

Oy! What a problem!

Several words are used to describe the concept of “Oy!, things are not what they should be!” Among them are “הוי”, “הו” and “הה”. Where did these words come from? It is understood that Hebrew is the Holy Language God used to create the universe, and He spoke the Universe into existence by speaking Hebrew. But He probably did not speak any of these words when He created the universe, but we're told that he looked at His creation and called it “good”. He did not stop and say, “Oy, what have I done? This is not how it should be.” No, He did exactly what He wanted to do.

Note that in the case of “הו”, we can express the concept of “things are not what they should be” by taking the word “הוה” and deleting part of that word. Is this were the expression came from? Was this a poetic attempt to describe that “things are not what they should be” by taking the word “to be” and deleting part of that word? If so, it is a very poetic derivative. Similarly, “הה” does the same thing, but deleting the middle VAV instead. And “הוי” replaces the ending “ה” with a “וי”, a poetic substitution to describe that things aren't what they should be. [Note that something similar could be said of “אוי” and “ארה”.]

Whether this describes the etymology of the word or not, it does describe the interpretation of the word. Cutting short the word “הוה” (to be) leaves us with a word that describes how things are not what they should be. What happens if “הוה” is not pronounced completely? If we leave off the ending “ה” or replace it with a “וי”, have we gone from describing Him as “He Who Is” to some form of “Oy”? Indeed, this may be why the rabbis decided to stop pronouncing the Divine Name. Perhaps it was because people did exactly that.

Greek speakers would indeed have a problem NOT doing something like this, because in Greek, there are no words that end in an “h” sound. Greek doesn't even have a way of writing down how to pronounce a word that ends in a “h” sound. So there's no way to write the phonetic equivalence in Greek of the Divine Name, and it might be expected that Greek speakers would indeed amputate the Name if they tried to say it.

English speakers don't have as much of a problem, since there is a way to write a word ending in an “h”, but English speakers often don't pronounce ending “h” as it is written. Here are a few examples....

English Writes	English Pronounces
rough	ruff
through	threw
bough	bow
cough	koff

English speakers aren't bothered that they don't pronounce words as they are written. So much so that frequently people will write the Divine Name one way and pronounce it another. One of the most common pronunciations of the Divine Name used in many sacred name congregations is “Yahweh”. But while they write it “Yahweh”, they often pronounce it “Yah-way” or “Ya-way”. About half of the people leave off the first “h” sound. Nearly all English speakers leave off the final “h” sound and the overwhelming percentage of them replace the final “h” sound with a “y” sound. Have they rendered the Divine Name as some form of “oy” when they do that”? That possibility helps us understand why the rabbis thought people were blaspheming the Divine

Name on a frequent basis when they tried to pronounce it, and why they eventually decided that the Name should simply not be spoken in order to prevent people from pronouncing it in a blasphemous way.

“Ya-way” would be written "יַיִ" in Hebrew. So when English speakers pronounce the Divine Name as “Ya-way”, they are essentially saying that "יַיִ" is the correct way to say "יהוה"!!!! That, of course, is rather absurd! But it is what happens when you try to solve a Hebrew issue with English based logic.

Where did “Yahweh” come from? Many have theorized that because “Yafe” was a euphemism for the Divine Name, that these vowels were applied to the Divine Name. Others have said that the Caananites pronounced the name of their god this way. But I have never seen a Heberw manuscript that uses these vowels or even addresses the issue of this pronunciation. I prefer to use only pronunciations that have been recorded in Hebrew history. After all, if God wanted to preserve His Name with His people, would a correct pronunciation not be recorded *somewhere* in Jewish history?

Piecing it Together

I've seen some 40-50 pronunciations of YHWH used in many different Hebrew books. I've never seen "Yahweh", "Yehuah", any past tense form, or any Piel or Pual form used. So while many pronunciations are used, that does not mean that "anything goes".

Ancient Judaism decided to stop saying the Name in incremental steps. It is never used in the Aramaic parts of the Tanak. And it is never used in the New Testament. In fact, none of the three earliest languages the New Testament was made available in; Greek, Aramaic and Latin, all omit any reference of the Divine Name. In fact even when the quote the Tanach where the Divine Name appears, the Divine Name is replaced by however "Lord" is said in that language.

Because the New Testament does not use the Divine Name, the early Church adopted the Jewish standard of not saying the Divine Name as well. It is largely unknown in any common discussions among early Christian writings, and on those rare occasions where it is found, it is found only when the Name is being analyzed, but never included in ordinary speech. So the weight of historical evidence from both Jewish and Christian tradition is to not speak the Divine Name out loud in public conversation.

Keep in mind that:

- **It is wise to generally avoid pronunciations to which you can't find 2 Hebrew witnesses.** Scripture requires 2 witnesses to establish a matter.
- **Some pronunciations are blasphemous, or nearly so.** If you're trying to pronounce the Divine Name, are you certain you're NOT saying "He Who Is Evil" or "He Who Has Become" or one of the other blasphemous pronunciations? If you don't know the rules of Hebrew grammar, you can't really know what you are saying. And if "He Who Was" was avoided even though there may be nothing wrong with it when combined with "He Who Is" and "He Who Will Be", how much more would we not want to avoid saying "He Who Has Become"? There's a way to say "He Who Caused Himself To Be" in Hebrew. If you're trying to say the Divine Name without knowing the rules of Hebrew grammar, that could be what you are saying.
- **Some pronunciations are meaningless,** and we're not to render the Name "for vanity".
- **Some pronunciations are problematic,** without being blasphemous or meaningless, such as "He Who Allows To Be".
- **Some pronunciations have reserved meaning or contexts.** I mentioned earlier the pronunciation for the Day of Atonement. There are others that are to be used in certain contexts, and their meaning is known, and it is well known why they are used in that context and not another context. Explaining this would require explaining a lot of things about how the vowels are interpreted, why it is considered important for the pronunciation to fit, etc. That would involve about an hour or two of lecture time, or several hundred pages of written text, which is beyond the scope of this dissertation.
- **Some pronunciations are philosophically debatable.** I've never seen the Piel form used, but I've heard some Christian theologians say that the Piel form makes more sense to their line of thinking.
- **If you don't know the difference between when a PATACH and a QAMATZ or other vowels, don't say the Name.**

- **We write a *patach* (ְ), a *qamatz* (ֿ), and a *hataph patach* (ֿֿ) as “a” in English, but they are three different sounds.** If you don't know the difference between these three vowels, you're not ready to say the Divine Name. In fact, *patach* (open) and *qamatz* (closed) are understood to invert the meaning of one characteristic of a word when the vowel is changed from one to the other. It doesn't invert the meaning of the whole word, but it does invert the meaning of one characteristic to that word. In fact there are indeed some pronunciations where “ַ” (Ya) is a valid first vowel but “ֿ” (Ya, but shorter) means something one would not want to say.
- **We might write an “e” in English to represent a *shwa* (ְ), a *tsere* (ֿ), a *segol* (ֿֿ) or a *hataph segol* (ֿֿֿ), but these are four different sounds in ancient Hebrew.** If you don't know the differences, you may end up changing the meaning of the Name by saying them wrong.
- **If you don't understand how Hebrew pronunciation is affected by open versus closed vowels, don't say the Name.** The “He Who Is Evil” mispronunciation can occur by not knowing this difference. This is not minor. In fact, it may be one of the most crucial problems of mispronunciation of the Divine Name out of all of them.
- **If you can't speak Hebrew with a Hebrew accent, don't try to say the Divine Name.**
- **Avoid saying it around someone who doesn't speak Hebrew fluently.** This is what has caused many blasphemous mispronunciations throughout history because the listener thinks he understands the pronunciation perhaps better than he does.

Never use any pronunciation without first investigating how it was used in Jewish history. If it's valid, it has been recorded somewhere in the many thousands of pages that have been written in Hebrew about how to say the Divine Name. It may not have been translated into English yet. But it's almost certainly to have been written about or discussed somewhere.

In short, it is nearly impossible to think that one can actually learn to say the Divine Name correctly, without using some sort of blasphemous mispronunciation, without mastering Hebrew.

More than time can be involved

Over and over again, we find that commentators have related the Divine Name to time, most frequently telling us the Name means “He Who Is”. Can it mean something other than a time reference?

I once heard a story of a man who was told that Hebrew verbs have no time tense, and he proceeded to rewrite the King James Bible by paraphrasing it and removing all sense of past, present and future tense. He thought he had put out a new version of the Bible that was more accurate than the King James, which “incorrectly” added time tense to the Hebrew Scriptures. That would represent a horrible misunderstanding of what may have been an attempt to explain something he did not completely understand. The reality is that he had horribly misunderstood what he had heard.

For starters, “הוה” and “היה” do indeed have tense. In the original Holy Language, “הוה” definitely refers to present tense and is never used for past or future expressions. “היה” is never used for present tense and is the basis for past and future tense expression in both Biblical and Modern Hebrew. The verb “to be” often does have properties that are unique from other verbs in many languages, including Hebrew.

So irregardless of how much of level of interpretation there is for typical verbs as to whether they are past, present or future tense, there is no room for interpretation as to whether “הוה” is past, present or future tense; it's always present tense. And there's no room for interpretation as to whether “היה” is present or past/future, because it is never used for present tense; only past or future.

The tense of most verbs in ancient Hebrew works a little different than in English. Ancient Hebrew verbs have an incomplete or complete tense. A verb is complete if the action is complete, and incomplete if the action is incomplete. An action can be complete because it is in the past, or incomplete because it is in the future; in such a case. If something is in the future tense, the timing of it is incomplete because the timing has not occurred yet. But it can also be incomplete or complete for reasons that have nothing to do with time.

The fact that most verb don't *have* to be tied to past, present or future tense does not mean that they aren't. The fact that something is in the future may indeed be why it is put in the incomplete tense. In fact, it is not easy to find examples in the Scriptures of the incomplete tense being used in which it is not describing something to happen in the future. Examples can be found, but it is rare and one must examine from the context whether it is incomplete because it is in the future (thus the timing is incomplete) or if it is incomplete for some other reason. It is simply that time *doesn't have* to be the reason for the tense chosen. That does not mean that any English translation is “wrong” by interpreting some or many verbs as past, present or future. Time can be the reason for the tense chosen, it's up to the interpreter to make a decision as to what he thinks the text means.

In the case of the Divine Name, we would have a very bad theological problem trying to explain why the Divine Name has a prefix that generally makes a word “incomplete”. For is there something “incomplete” about God? Is He not complete in every sense of the word? So if the YUD prefix to His Name is **not** there because time is what is incomplete in the equation when His Name is being put in the future tense, there's a serious theological problem in explaining what is incomplete if time is not it. This is one reason nearly all rabbis in nearly all ages have concluded that the Divine Name is expressing his eternalness even though they understand that while the incomplete tense could refer to future tense (where time is the incomplete element

since the timing has not yet occurred), it could refer to other things as well where something other than time makes the verb incomplete. They simply could see no legitimate explanation in any of those other things.

Also, there's frequently “helper” words that describe time sequence and can therefore remove the ambiguity, such as . Even many Hebrew grammar books that have been written to correctly describe Hebrew grammar have maintained the philosophy that “היה” / “הוה” have a time tense to them. For example, in *A Grammar for Biblical Hebrew*, by CL Seow, the author makes a strong effort to teach Biblical Hebrew and explain not only Hebrew of the Bible, but makes numerous comments of some differences between Hebrew as it was when the Torah was written and post-Torah Hebrew. Yet even this “back to the original” book makes this statement:

“To indicate the existence of someone or something in the past, the verb “הָיָה” is used.

אִישׁ הָיָה בְּאֶרֶץ עוּז *There was a man*
in the land of Uz
(Job I:I)”

(A Grammar for Biblical Hebrew, Revised Edition, page 165)

It goes on to cite other examples. It is true that it is *rare* to find an example of “היה” that does not fit into past tense usage. But I am of the opinion that “הוה” and “היה” can indeed mean more than time reference.

הוה does indeed mean present tense, and could be understood as implying even more than present tense, but a present reality structure included as well and essentially means “present *olam*”, with present tense being one of more than one ingredient needed to make that true. In my opinion, I have concluded that this is the original etymology of the word for several reasons that I will document herein. I can't document all of them because part of that is based on some usage of the word that did not seem significant at the time, so I took no notes that could be provided as references. So I can only offer that opinion. But there is other evidence to support this, at least in part.

Assuming this theory to be correct, the meaning of “הוה” would have evolved over the years a little bit. “הוה” is also an Aramaic word that simply means “is” without the same connotations attached to it as in Ancient Hebrew. And in modern day Hebrew, “הוה” has taken on the Aramaic meaning and the original Hebrew meaning indicating “same *Olam*” seems to have been lost.

Those of you who have read my book *The Creative Forces* may already understand how I proposed that every word in the Hebrew language can be understood as having a meaning defined by the contributing meaning of its individual letters. “ה” relates to existentiality and “ו” to connecting two things together. So based on the rules of interpretation I set forth in that book, one could interpret “הוה” as meaning “that which is” (the first “ה”) “connected to” (the “ו”) “that which is” (the second “ה”). Connected in what way? In the sense that they are connected at being in the same sphere of things at the same time. It is symbolizing two HEYs being in the same *Olam*. Yud (“י”) symbolizes the hand and can represent many of the things the hand symbolizes; nearness, power, or “measuring off” something (since the hand was used as a measuring unit). “היה” could therefore refer to two things a measurement of some sort apart.

This connection of two things is seen in how many commentators have discussed the Divine Name. The Zohar (*an ancient Jewish commentary on Torah attributed to Shimon Ben Yochai who lived in the 2nd century AD*) teaches,

“YUD (“י”) is the Father, HEY (“ה”) is the Mother (The Holy Spirit), VAV (“ו”) is the Son of YUD (“י”) and husband of the lower HEY (“ה”) [mankind]”
(Zohar 1 Bereshit A, section 25 on Idolatry)

So the Zohar sees the Divine Name of “יהוה” as symbolising the connection between the Father, The Holy Spirit, the Son, and mankind. This interpretation is visualizing the same sort of link that exists in the grammatical interpretation of “יהוה” as something existing in the same *Olam* as something else.

I think the root meaning of “הִיָּה” in ancient Hebrew was to refer to something that exists in another *Olam*. The word *Olam* can be translated “world” or “age / era / time period”. So I think “הִיָּה”, in its most generic sense, means “exists outside this *Olam*”, or in other words, either in a different world, or in a different time period. If your *olam* of reference is time, then it basically means “not present tense”, though perhaps not necessarily past tense. Although some sort of prefix is attached to it, then certainly it would be future tense if your *olam* is time.

“הוא” or “היא” can be used for either pronouns or to mean “is” as well. They can be translated “he”, “she” or “is” / “are”, depending on the context. For example, we see this in Scripture

יהוה ¹ הוא ² האלהים ³	YHWH ¹ is ² God ³
	(Deut 4:35)

Generally, while “יהוה” references to something existing in the same *Olam* as a reference point, and “היה” as in a different one, “הוא” and “היא” have no such implications. Today in modern Hebrew, these distinctions have been lost.

I did not go into this theory before in order to avoid confusing the reader. Because if I tried to write this entire treatise and what it explains around such an interpretation, I'd be asking you to accept a new idea, then build on that with another new idea, and then build on that with another new idea.....and why try to introduce too many new ideas at once? It's much easier if you only have to absorb one new idea at a time. Time references are easy for people to comprehend, and thus make the explanation easy. So it's much easier to explain the Divine Name *that* way and then build on that.

But I do believe one could take what I've said about “הִיָּה” meaning “He Will Be The One Who Is” and apply it not only to the *olam* of time, but to the *olam* of other concepts and interpret the same thing as potentially “He Is in other dimensions just as He is in This One”. That doesn't make what I said earlier about “He Will Be The One Who Is” wrong, it only makes it merely one example of what this concept can refer to, and one could apply other parallel interpretations that also fit. If I were to try and talk about what all possible *olams* could be involved, it would get confusing, not clearer, so up to this point, I restricted my discussion to time references, knowing fully well that time is *not* the only way that a reference point could exist for this word.

One of the problems with trying to explain some of the other potential meanings is that English has no well defined way to phrase the concept of an *olam*. To try to explain this concept to an English thinker requires phrasing things in ways that English phrases it. So a particular example has to be chosen, because there's no real word in English that we can relate an *olam* to very easily.

I do think there are definitely examples where “הָיָה” is used in this sense. Psalms 1 says, “Happy is the man who does not walk in the counsel of the wicked.....and he shall be like a tree planted by streams of water.” (Ps 1:1...3, JPS). Here, the word “הָיָה” was translated “he shall be”. It is certainly not being used for “past tense” here. But it is not necessarily best interpreted as only meaning future tense either, although the JPS translation did phrase this in the simplest way possible for the English reader by putting it in future tense. But it may well be that this word is talking about how such a man will be in another spiritual *olam* completely. That is, an entire spiritual *olam* will surround this man, protect him, and put him in a spiritual dimension different than what he is in without God. Physically, he's still in the same place. And time hasn't changed for him – it is simply not the factor here. But his sphere of protection has changed.

There's no easy way to phrase that in English. Putting it in the future tense is not a bad way to phrase this for the sake of simplicity to English ears. If you want to get more particular about the meaning of the word than how it was translated above, one would simply need to begin to learn to read Hebrew and think in Hebrew, rather than worrying about how it is translated into English. Any attempt to express Hebrew thought into English is going to have some limitations.

So by telling you that “הוּוה” and “הייה” can mean more than present or past tense, that does not mean that they cannot be used for present and past tense as well or that what I told you beforehand is 'wrong'. It is simply a simplification of the possible things it can mean in order to make it easier to introduce you to it's usage. It is rare that one sees “הייה” to mean something other than “was”, but it is also important to remember that it has a broader meaning than that. In many ways, this is no different than pointing out that the word “ברך” (*barak*) in Hebrew can mean “*ble*ss”, “*cur*se” or “*kneel*”. For example, in Psalm/Teh 135:20 it says,

בָּרַכְוּ אֶת-יְהוָה	Bless/kneel to YHWH
----------------------	---------------------

Should this be translated “ble

ss” or “kneel”? In fact, when compared to “ברך” (*barak*), the word “הייה” is used to describe the same consistent meaning more frequently than “ברך”. And to say that it is wrong to translate “הייה” as “was” because it can mean something else is like saying it is wrong to translate “ברך” into English as “ble

Summary

There's a lot more that could be said. My main point in all of this is to demonstrate:

- There's multiple ways to say the Divine Name.
- The understood meanings come from a variety of sources.
- This topic has been very well documented, and recorded in Jewish history. It has not been translated into English very much.
- That lack of translation into English has created confusion in English theology concerning this topic.
- There is no way to truly master the pronunciation and understanding the various meanings of the Divine Name without becoming fluent in Hebrew. We can only introduce the concepts involved to an English audience.

May **He Who Is** bless you abundantly in all your endeavors.

Appendix:

The original Hebrew text of Segulah Niflah

סגולה נפלאה

לומר בשעת צרה ויולדת

א' י"א ה"ה י"ג ה"ה יכוין בכל פעם

למנצח מוזר לדוד יענך יְהוָה ביום צרה יִשְׁנַבֵּךְ שם
אלהי יעקב (יכוין בשם הו"ה הנזכר בניקוד
(הצירוף נא מיד אחי) (ויכוין נ"כ י'חוד כ"יום צרה יִשְׁנַבֵּךְ נ"י
יב"ק כמנין נ' שמות כידוע מה שהוא מכוין ויאמר בלשון נקבה

יענך ישנבך ישלח עזרך

מקודש (מתלת אילעי דאי קרי קודש ויושפע בציון דהאי יסוד
סלוק בכתר ברוא דמוסף) ומציון יסעך יזכור מנחותיך ועולתך
ידשגה סלה יתן לך כלכבך וכל עצתך ימלא גרנגה
בישועתיך ובשם אלהינו נגדול ימלא יְהוָה ויכוין בשם הו"ה
הנזכר בניקוד (ומיד עשו כי ירא) כל משאלתיך עתה
ידעתי כי הושיע יְהוָה בניקוד (אנכי אותו סן יבא) משיחו
יענהו משמי קדשו. בגבורות י"שע (ס"ת למפרע נ"י יב"ק)
ימינו אלה ברכב ואלה בסוסים ואנחנו בשם יְהוָה (בניקוד)
חסול עליהם אימתה וסחד) אלהינו נזכיר המה כרעו
ונפלו ו"אנחנו ק"מנו ו"נתעודד (ר"ת נ"י יב"ק יְהוָה (בניקוד)
בגדול זדועך ידמו כאבן) הושיעה המלך יעננו ב"יום
קדאנו (ר"ת יב"ק ויאמר פלוני ב"פ סאן דעני לאמך הוא
יענה יתך אין כמוך בשמים ובארץ מי יוכל לספר שכחך :
ידי רצון מלפניך אלהי השמים ואלהי הארץ אלהי אברהם
אלהי יצחק ואלהי יעקב האל הגדול הגבור והנורא אהיה
אשר אהיה יְהוָה אלהים יְהוָה צבאות שדי אֲדֹנָי רחום וחנון
העונה לעתות כצרה את יראיו הוא יקבל
תפילתינו ותפילת עמך בית ישראל ובכללם יזכור ויפקוד ברחמים
אשה עצורה חזקת בחבלי מרת פלונית אשת פלוני היא יושבת
על המשבר היא שוברת על אלהים הש"י יראה צרתה ודמעתה
ויעתר לה ותעלה לרצון תפילתה הש"י ברחמיו הרבים יפלטה
וברחמיו הרבים יחלצה ממ"ה הקב"ה ששמע וענה תפלה
אמתה הקדושות והטהורות שהיה טבעם עקרות והפך ושנה
מערכתם והיו מאותו עקרות נסקדות ונזכרות בורע אנשים הוא
יזכור לאשה הנזכרת שיושבת על המשבר כי עיניה תלויות לך לכרך
ישמחה

סגולה נפלאה

כשפחה אל יד גבירתה עד שתוציא אותה לרויה ותענה לה בשעה הזאת כמו ששמעת מי שהתפלל לפניך מזמור זה ותעלה תפילתי לפניך כמו שהיה עושה ריח ניתוח וריח קמורת מעל גבי מזבח קראתיך בכל לב ענני יהוה תוקיך אצורה *

וילחש באזניה צידוה זה פוק פקו ופק וקפ וקפ פקו קום

בזמן שאדם בצער הן יהיד הן רבים יאמר מזמור זה י"ב פעמים ויאמרו ג"כ מלמדים עם תלמידיהן (דהיינו מזמור יענך עם כל הכוונות הכתובים לעיל וגם ניקוד השמות כנ"ל) **למנצח** מזמור לדור ס"ח חרד כשבא לומר מזמור זה צ"ל באימה וביראה ובחררה גדולה וצריך כוונה גדולה וצריך לכוין אות אחת מאלו ג' שמות הנוראים (אהי"ה יהו"ה ארנ"י) כזה אי"א ה"ד יו"ג ה"י ור"ל הנרמזים באמ"ת אותיות אהי"ה מלכות תפארת וגם באמ"ת נוטריקון בדקריק אותיות מלת תנועות וצריך ליהר מאוד שלא ישנה בתנועה בל"א פינט"ל כי מכה התנועה משתנה התיבה ומבנים לענין אחר עיין בזה שיר השירים וגם עיין א"ה ס"י ס"א וז"ל שלא ירפה החזק ולא יחזק הרפה ולא יניד הנח ולא יניח הנע שלא לשנות שום אותיות מתנועתם ומנקודתם הנחונה בסיני וצריך לידע כל בג"ד כפ"ה דסמוך ליהו"א כפי זולת מבטלים כמבואר בס' פרק שירה וזה הכלל נקוש בדרך ששב"א אחר תנועה גדולה יש מתג להראות שהוא נע ושאחר ח"ק נח וד"ל *

גם אם ירצה אדם שיקוכל תפילתו צריך תיקון אברים ובפרט שלא לפגום המוצעות ולכן חסידים הראשונים היתה תפלתם בוקעת כל הרקיעים שהיו גוהרים שלא לפגום המוצאות בלשון הרע ובלצנות ובשבועות שוא וכדברים בטלים : ויש במזמור זה שיי"ג אותיות כנגד ש"י עולמות הנרמזות בחכמה עליונה שנאמר להנחיל אוהבי י"ש והג' נגד ג' עולמות בי"ע *

ואח"כ יאמר יה"ר בכוונה גדולה *

ידני רצון מלפניך ד' אלהינו ואלהי אבותינו אביר יעקב קדוש ישראל שתשים עלינו משמר ששים גבורים מסביב וחר"ב מפי"ת (גימטריא רי"ו) כדינו לעשות נקמה בשונאינו וכשם שענית ליעקב אבינו ע"ה כבית אל כשאמר ואעשה שם מזבח לאל העונה אותי ביום צרתי וכך היה ד"ה ע"ה מתפלל כשהיה יואב במלחמה יענך ה' ביום צרה ישגבך שם אלהי יעקב הוא השם

סגולה נפלאה

השם שאמר יעקב לאל העונה אותי ביום צרתי בשם הזה אקרא אריך (אהי"ה יהו"ה אדני) יעננו ביום קראנו וזכות שמות היוצאים מן המזמור הזה ונקודותיו ותיבותיו ואותיותיו וטעמיו יגן עלינו להכרית כל החושים והקוצים הסובבים את השישנה .

רבש"ע סדה את בני יעקב מחימה ואף (פור תפר כל הקמים עלינו בחרון אף) רחום וחנן יהיו נגד עיניך צרותינו וראה בענינו וריבה ריבנו וידעו כל הנזים כי אתה סדוש ישראל . זכור נא בניך עניים ואבינוים מצפים לישועתך כל הימים . אבינו שבשמים צדיק אתה וחסיד אתה וכל מעשיך באמונה יגולו רחמך על בניך כי צמאים אגחנו לרחמך . זכור לנו מה שצויתנו בתורתך הקדושה כי ימוך אחיך ומשה ידו והחזקת בו . ואנחנו בניך ילידי שעשועך רחם עלינו כרוב רחמך שמתנו כימות עניתנו . חי וקיים תעשה לנו ניסים ונפלאות בשם יהוה צבאות לנצח בו אויבך . ובשם אלהים צבאות להציל בו ידריך . וכשם אל שדי צדיק יסוד עולם לשמור בו צדיקט יראי שמך . בשם אהי"ה כתר ראשך . בשם יהוה תפארתך . ובשם אדני היכל קדשיך . כי רבים קמים עלינו לשהחינו . מקודש ומציון תסעדנו . ביום צרה תשנבנו . למען קדושת שמך וקדושת אותיותך למען אדני הושיענו ולמען ה' נירא שמך שמרינו . ולמען אהיה רחמים נמורים גואלינו . עמוד סכסא דין ושב על כסא רחמים פתח לנו שערי שמים לעלות הפילת דנפקי דלתך כי לך עמך ישראל מקיים לישועתך מלה . ישראל ראשית תבואתך . מקבלי אמונתך ותורתך . אר שדי הצילנו מכל הקמים עלינו . ותתנו לחן ולחסד ולרחמים בעיניך ובעיני כל רואינו . להמציא מרנוע לנפשינו . רועה נאמן מהרה יבא וינאלינו בכחך יהוה אלהינו . ותבנה עירך במהרה בימינו . ותכונן בית מקדשינו ותפארתנו ותשרה שכינתך בינינו כי באור פניך חיים לנו :

(גי' אהי"ה הוי"ה אהי"ה) א"ם :